

CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

SECOND SESSION—TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

18 ELIZABETH II

VOLUME III, 1970

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWELFTH DAY OF JANUARY, 1970, TO THE SIXTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1970, INCLUSIVE.

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

Queen's Printer for Canada, Ottawa, 1970

21611—1½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, January 12, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE OF TELEVISION CAMERAS IN FOYER—PROVISION OF OTHER SPACE

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members are aware, television cameras have been located for some time in the foyer adjacent to the House of Commons. Propriety of this procedure has been considered by the Chair in consultation with House Leaders and with the executive of the Press Gallery. It was agreed by all concerned, in the course of these lengthy discussions covering several months, that the decision should be left with the Chair. The decision has been made that on an experimental basis, the foyer should no longer be used for this purpose. To give effect to the decision Room 110-S, located at the foot of the stairs leading to the foyer, has been made available to the Press Gallery for the purpose indicated, in addition to Room 154-D which was already available to members of the Press Gallery for radio and television interviews. Technical objections having been made to the use of this particular space, Room 238-S has also been allocated to the Press Gallery on a temporary basis for interviews following Orders of the Day.

This decision has had the effect of bringing into focus a long-standing problem, that of television and radio coverage of the House and its committee proceedings. In view of the wide interest shown in the situation, I have taken the liberty of consulting with the House Leaders and suggesting to them, as they are representative of the members of all parties in the House, that the whole issue should be considered forthwith by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. I propose to have a further meeting with the House Leaders in the hope that a suitable reference will be made as soon as possible.

I think I should insist that in so far as I am particularly concerned, as the custodian of the dignity of the House of Commons and its proceedings, I feel as strongly as ever today that the foyer should not be used as it has in the past for the purpose of radio and television interviews. It is my hope that the House Leaders and the Committee on Procedure and Organization, in consultation with representatives of the Press Gallery, can find a solution which will be acceptable to all concerned.

• (2:10 p.m.)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—PLANS FOR RELIEF SUPPLIES AND ADDITIONAL OBSERVERS FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, hon. members will no doubt wish to know what steps the government is taking with regard to the rapidly changing situation in Nigeria. The latest information we have is that the Commander in Chief of the Biafran forces has ordered his troops to stop fighting and has asked General Gowon for an immediate cease-fire. The government welcomes General Gowon's statement of reassurance to the supporters of the Biafran cause. Bringing hostilities to an end in a territory like that of Eastern Nigeria inevitably results in confusion. The government hopes that General Gowon will spare no effort in maintaining the discipline of his forces and protecting the lives of all the peoples of Nigeria.

We have, at the moment, two senior officers of the Canadian Armed Forces in the area of operations as part of the International Military Observer Team. The government is offering to provide more observer personnel.

The need for relief is bound to increase very rapidly. The government considers it of first importance that outside relief activity should be co-ordinated on an international basis in co-operation with the government of Nigeria, preferably under the aegis of the Red Cross. With this in mind, we are in touch with the Nigerian government and other governments concerned with relief activities. There are considerable stocks of food and other supplies in Nigeria and neighbouring countries, including ports like Cotonou and Sao Tomé. The immediate problem is to move these supplies rapidly and effectively into the areas where they are most urgently required.

Now that hostilities have ended we hope that it will be possible to open up land supply routes. We have also asked our High Commissioner in Lagos to reiterate to the Nigerian government our willingness to mount an air drop operation without delay if this is the only means whereby relatively large stocks of food can be delivered quickly to otherwise inaccessible areas.

As announced on Friday, the government is providing $500,000 to the Nigerian Red Cross, $500,000 to the Nigerian Rehabilitation Commission and $250,000 to the International Committee of the Red Cross to aid in the delivery of food and other relief operations. Immediate steps are being taken to make these funds available and the government is exploring ways in which additional funds might effectively be used. As and when it should be required, we are prepared to provide aircraft for an airlift. Canadian Armed Forces Hercules are standing by for these operations. These should be regarded as essential interim measures because, in the long run, supplies in the quantities needed must be delivered by surface transport.

To assist our High Commission to deal with a vastly increased work load and with the special requirements that will be placed upon it, we are sending a small group of experts in relief, transportation and other fields to Lagos.

I am sure that members on all sides of the House will agree with me that we must spare no effort in co-operation with other interested nations to ensure that the tragic war in Nigeria is not followed by disastrous famine and unnecessary suffering.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not a time for recriminations about government policy touching on this very tragic situation. Nevertheless we must say that the maladroitness and ineffectiveness of the government's policies with regard to the Nigerian-Biafran difficulty to date have created a feeling of uneasiness on the part of all those in this country who are concerned about what may happen there now. After a very bitter and bloody war there is bound to be a legacy of bitterness which one can only hope will be overcome by appropriate arrangements. There has also been a very genuine fear of genocide on the part of the Biafrans, and it is not merely confined to the Biafrans because His Holiness the Pope and others have expressed concern about the possibility of genocide, either actively or through starvation.

The government of Canada is now offering to supply additional military observers, but the Secretary of State for External Affairs has not indicated the extent to which Canada is pressing for this; neither has he indicated acceptance of the government's proposal or where that proposal stands. It is vitally important not only that the team of observers be enlarged but that it should have freedom of movement. It should have not only the theoretical right to go to various parts of the country but the ability to get there. There has been a terrible loss of life, sir, and we must do all we can to keep any further loss of life to a minimum.

We, like the government, welcome the willingness expressed by the governments of Britain, United States, France and other countries to participate in measures to bring relief, but surely this has to be considered in its totality. The government should not simply offer to make observers available but should take the initiative to ensure that such a team is at work in the field to report on what is actually going on there. Furthermore, the relief that is needed should be in a forward position.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs stated that a lot of supplies were available nearby. Can he assure us that the supplies that are immediately required are available? For example, will additional truck transportation be required immediately to make this relief available to the various parts of the country? Is the government now using Hercules aircraft and is it doing its part to ensure that trucks are being put in a forward position to be able to respond when required?

I agree with what the Secretary of State for External Affairs has said about the importance of co-ordination. Obviously it is of vital importance; otherwise relief efforts could degenerate into chaos. The minister has said that Canada has made a proposal, but what response has the government of Canada received? Time is of the essence. It is not a matter for long discussions with the government of Nigeria and personal emissaries going to Lagos. There must not be the sort of delay there has been in the past. Time and vigour are of the essence.

We want more than just a general statement of intentions. We want to know what is going on. We need to send observers there in

adequate numbers. We need far more information than the Secretary of State for External Affairs has given us regarding the response. What is the actual state of these proposals put forward? To what extent are they being received? What action in fact is being taken? All we have heard from the Secretary of State for External Affairs are general assurances about the willingness of the government of Canada to do certain things. We want to know what is going on. We want action and not only pious declarations.

At the conclusion of the comments on the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs I will seek the unanimous consent of the House to have the House give instructions to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence with regard to the continuing surveillance of the government's program.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, it has now become clear that the military operations in Nigeria and Biafra are coming to an end, but that does not necessarily mean that the immense tragedy that has taken place there cannot be compounded and continued unless there is urgent and immediate action within a matter of hours. I want to reinforce what the Leader of the Opposition has said, that this is a question of hours, not of days or weeks. Something must be done right away.

• (2:20 p.m.)

The present method of feeding four million people in this unhappy country by airlift has necessarily been disrupted for the time being. Many people are on a knife-edge; threatened daily and hourly by death through starvation. In these circumstances it will be necessary not only to mount a massive international effort in the long run but to use the existing facilities provided by the people who are already there, the people who are operating the feeding centres, in the short run, which means within the next day or two. I put it to the Secretary of State for External Affairs that if there was ever a need for urgent and immediate action it is now.

I wish to pay tribute on this occasion to those gallant people who fought so tenaciously for independence and survival, as they saw it, against heavy odds. I wish to pay tribute also to all those who planned, executed and carried through the magnificent, imaginative and heroic air operation which, as I said earlier, has saved up to two million people from starvation despite immense hazards and difficulties. I refer to the operations under Joint Church Aid and, initially, the International Red Cross.

It seems to me the new situation imposes heavy obligations on the international community which permitted this situation to develop. There is need not only for an expanded military observer team, as the Secretary of State for External Affairs indicated, but for a substantially expanded team whose membership would not be confined to the military alone. There is an obligation on the international community to ensure that the fear of genocide does not turn into one of the tragic facts of this generation.

There is also a long term need to organize an international community which would be able to intervene even in civil wars to preserve human rights and lives. We cannot afford in this world to experience tragedies like Biafra.

In view of the large number of questions which still arise despite the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, and the immense concern of the Canadian people, I shall put forward, when the occasion arises, a motion that this matter be debated further today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of 1970, we have gone through very tragic hours and very dark days. The Ralliement créditiste has been calling the attention of the government to the problems of Biafra and Nigeria for the past two years.

We note, following the minister's statement, that the government can act quickly when it wants to. It is unfortunate that this action has not been taken without any political consideration, in order to prevent the starvation of Biafrans and Nigerians. The genocide of Biafrans is really an unfortunate event.

We cannot understand why Canada did not intervene before today. I think that love of lucre was stronger than Christian charity. Unfortunately, pressures to prevent England from selling arms to Nigeria failed. We have rendered valuable services to that country in the past and stronger pressures from us would surely have brought results.

Finally, since the tragedy is now over, I would suggest to the Secretary of State for External Affairs that we could send to Nigeria,

besides military observers, representatives of all parties of the House who could examine the problems on the scene.

If members of Parliament can attend United Nations meetings as observers, can go to Paris, to India or to any other country, why would it not be possible for representatives of each party accompanied by military observers to visit the scene of the hostilities in order to get clear and precise information about the situation and to report to the House so that the government will be in a position to take the steps necessary to eliminate misery from that part of the world.

[*English*]

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion:

That the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence be instructed to take under consideration immediately the plans of the government to give assistance to the victims of the Nigerian-Biafran conflict; that the committee exercise continuing surveillance over the efforts of the Canadian government in this respect; and report with all possible speed to this House as to the adequacy of the measures proposed and recommend any further measures it considers appropriate.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we on this side of the House would be quite prepared to have the committee study this question if it is agreeable that the question on the motion be put without debate today.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, which can be accepted only by unanimous agreement. There may be a difficulty in that the President of the Privy Council has placed a condition on putting the motion which places the Chair in a somewhat embarrassing position. Since there can be no debate under the rules I can only ask whether there is unanimous agreement to the motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, though I am willing to hear any member on the point of order raised by the President of the Privy Council.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise one point. The motion has been placed before the House under Standing Order 43.

[Mr. Dumont.]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, it has not.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): All there is for the House to decide is whether or not unanimous consent is forthcoming. I do not think that any member or any party in the House can put a proviso on their approval. As far as we are concerned we are prepared to give unanimous support.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am in agreement with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, who raised the same point I had in mind. I was trying to be helpful to hon. members, but according to the terms of Standing Order 43 I can ask only whether there is unanimous consent to the putting of the motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition.

[*Translation*]

Is there unanimous consent of the House for the Chair to put the motion submitted by the Leader of the Opposition?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: As there is not unanimous consent, the question cannot be put to the House.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PUBLIC SERVICE—FILLING OF VACANT POSITIONS

Question No. 2—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

How many vacancies by category of position in each department of the Public Service were filled by persons (a) from outside the Public Service and (b) from inside the Public Service, between July 1, 1969 and October 1, 1969?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: The total number of appointments made under the Public Service Employment Act between July 1 and October 1, 1969, in each category of positions, is as follows: (a) From outside the Public Service: Administrative and Foreign Service, 428; Administrative Support, 465; Operational, 328; Scientific and Professional, 524; Executive, 5; Technical, 286.

(b) From within the Public Service: Administrative and Foreign Service, 613; Administrative Support, 552; Operational, 52; Scientific and Professional, 98; Executive, 36; Technical, 47.

This information is not segregated by departments in the Commission's records.

URBAN RENEWAL—FREEZING OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

Question No. 4—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. On what date this past summer did the Minister responsible for Housing announce a freeze of federal government assistance for urban renewal projects?

2. On what date were cities and municipalities in Canada informed of the federal government's decision in this matter?

3. On what date were the provincial governments informed of the federal government's decision in this matter?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1. On August 14, 1969, the Minister responsible for Housing issued a public statement which in part indicated that "Until a more well-defined and logical long-term Canadian urban renewal policy can be formulated and enunciated, municipalities with urban renewal schemes presently in preparation will have to elect either to susped further study or, alternatively, to complete their work in the knowledge that additional federal funds for implementation of the schemes may or may not be forthcoming." Discussions with the provincial governments during the summer dealt with the urban renewal program among other matters of mutual interest and the provincial and municipal officials concerned were notified officially of the government's decision immediately after the public announcement.

2. See answer to 1. above.

3. See answer to 1. above.

URBAN RENEWAL—BAN ON PLANS

Question No. 5—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. Is there presently a ban on all urban renewal plans in Canada financed by the Government of Canada?

2. When is it expected that the Government of Canada will formulate its policy on urban renewal projects?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1. No.

2. See the statement made by the Hon. R. K. Andras in the House of Commons December 18, 1969.

URBAN RENEWAL—PLANS AFFECTED BY SUSPENSION OF ASSISTANCE

Question No. 6—**Mr. Gilbert:**

Which urban renewal plans submitted to the federal government have been affected or cancelled by the suspension of all urban renewal projects funded by the Government of Canada?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): The processing of applications for financial assistance for urban renewal studies, the preparation of urban renewal schemes and the implementation of urban renewal schemes, was suspended following the announcement of August 14, 1969. The following is a list of applications received by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which have been affected by the suspension.

Part V, NHA Urban Renewal Studies	Section 23A, NHA Preparation of Urban Renewal Schemes	Section 23B, NHA Implementation of Urban Renewal Schemes
Hawkesbury, Ontario.	St. John's Nfld. (TherBattery)	Cambellton, New Brunswick
	Yarmouth, N.S.	Cornwall, Ontario.
	Dartmouth, N.S.	Hamilton, Ontario.
	Halifax, N.S.	Kitchener, Ontario.
	North Sdyney, N.S.	Mountjoy, Ontario.
	Fredericton, N.B.	Winnipeg, Manitoba.
	Brockville, Ontario.	Calgary, Alberta.
	Cobalt, Ontario.	Drumheller, Alberta.
	St. Thomas, Ontario.	New Westminster, B.C.
	Regina, Sask.	Vancouver, B.C.
	Estevan, Sask.	
	Yellowknife, NWT	
	Chilliwack, B.C.	
	Vancouver, B.C.	

The following is a list of applications received by Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which have been approved in part only:

Nil	Nil	London, Ontario.
		Niagara Falls, Ontario.

Questions

URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAM STUDIES

Question No. 11—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. What specific studies have been undertaken regarding urban renewal programs in Canada as mentioned by the Minister responsible for Housing in his statement at the press conference in the National Press Conference Theatre, at 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, August 14, 1969?

2. Which civil servants or outside individuals or groups are working on each of these studies and when are each of them expected to be completed?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1. The comprehensive study of urban renewal policy currently underway covers the over-all social, physical and economic aspects of urban renewal.

2. The study is being undertaken by the officers of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation responsible for urban renewal and the related professional services within the Corporation. The study will take into account the views of the provinces, municipalities, residents' associations, academics and other interested outside individuals or groups. It is anticipated that this study will be completed next year.

PUBLIC SERVICE JOB APPLICATIONS

Question No. 35—**Mr. Gleave:**

1. How many applications for jobs in the Public Service were there during each month of the year of 1968?

2. How many applications were successful?

3. How many applications were not successful because the RCMP would not grant security clearance?

4. Is the RCMP obliged to explain to the department, or the individual concerned, the reasons for their decision?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. These statistics are not available. It is the usual practice to destroy applications for candidates who are not appointed after a period of one year.

2. Same as above. Figures are available on the number of appointments by month to the Public Service commencing with the period July 1, 1968. They are listed as follows: July, 860; August, 1,138; September, 1,157; October, 1,234; November, 941; December, 3,048.

The total number of appointments to the Public Service for all of 1968 were 20,379.

3. It is not the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, but each department which hires an employee through the Public Service Commission that has the responsibility of ensuring that a prospective employee is not a security risk.

4. Not applicable.

[Mr. Andras.]

TAX CONCESSIONS, SHAHEEN NATURAL RESOURCES

Question No. 70—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. When did Shaheen Natural Resources Inc., first apply to the Government of Canada regarding federal tax concessions for a refinery to be built on Trinity Bay, Newfoundland?

2. What was the response of the Government of Canada to this request?

3. What changes were made in the October 22, 1968 federal budget governing the tax-free status of Crown corporations that are under purchase option by private interests?

4. Has the Government of Canada now agreed to federal tax concessions for Shaheen Natural Resources of New York regarding this refinery and, if so, what are they?

5. For what reasons has the Government of Canada now allowed Shaheen Natural Resources Inc. of New York federal tax concessions for its refinery?

6. What is the estimated loss in federal government revenue due to these tax concessions?

7. What is the estimated period of tax-free operations of the refinery due to these federal tax concessions?

8. Is Mr. Charles R. Granger, a former Member of Parliament, an officer of Shaheen Natural Resources Inc., and if so, what is his position?

9. What other provincial or municipal tax concessions have been provided to Shaheen Natural Resources Inc. for its refinery?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Shaheen Natural Resources Inc. did not make an application to the government of Canada regarding federal tax concessions for a refinery to be built on Trinity Bay. The government of the Province of Newfoundland did make representations to Ottawa concerning the tax position of this refinery and of certain other Newfoundland corporations.

2. Not applicable.

3. The Budget Speech on October 22, 1968 announced that Parliament would be asked to amend Section 62(1)(c) of the Income Tax Act. This was subsequently done by Section 14(1) of Chapter 44 of the Statutes of 1968-69.

4. No measures have been taken applicable to a specific company. The Income Tax Regulations were amended on August 15, 1969, by Order in Council P.C. 1969-1643 to allow a fast deduction of the capital cost of certain depreciable property. This was intended to ease the transition from the old to the new law provided by the amendment to Section 62(1)(c) of the Income Tax Act.

The amendment to the Regulations allows any corporation, commission or association in existence on October 22, 1968 that would have qualified for tax exemption under Section 62(1)(c) of the Income Tax Act, if that section had not been amended, to claim capital cost allowance at a rate of 100% in respect of property acquired by the corporation, commission or association before October 23, 1968, or after October 22, 1968 and before 1974 where the property is acquired under an agreement in writing made before October 23, 1968 and ratified by a provincial statute that came into force before October 23, 1968. By this amendment, all of the corporations affected were enabled to use the full cash flow of their businesses to meet debt obligations and repayment schedules which they undertook at a time when they did not expect to be subject to corporation income tax.

5. See reply to part 4.

6. Given the nature of accelerated capital cost allowance, there may be some postponement of federal tax by some of the corporations involved, but there should not be any loss of federal government revenues.

7. Not available. It will depend on the future profits of the refinery and its applicable capital cost allowances.

8. It is believed that in August 1968 he was appointed a Vice-President of Shaheen Natural Resources Company Incorporated.

9. This is not a matter within the administrative responsibility of the government.

"MANHATTAN" PROJECT—ASSERTION OF SOVEREIGNTY

Question No. 91—**Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):**

1. Did the Government of Canada at any time in the course of the planning of the *Manhattan* project assert its sovereignty over the waters between the Arctic islands and, if so, in what way?

2. Does the Canadian Government have an obligation of any kind to undertake a rescue mission should a vessel run into trouble in the waters between the Arctic islands?

3. Does the Government of Canada have any plans to establish navigational aids in the Arctic?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of External Affairs and the Department of Transport as follows: 1. The government has outlined its position concerning the *Manhattan* exercise on a number of occasions and will in due course announce further measures that will be taken with respect to the waters of the Arctic archipelago.

2. Canadian legislation requires any Canadian ship at sea to go to the assistance of any other vessel that is in distress. No Canadian government has ever accepted direct responsibility for all rescue at sea, but the government has assumed a supporting role through the provision of an organization for the co-ordination of all marine rescue and has directed that all government ships will participate in these rescue efforts. There are no particular geographical limits to these undertakings and to the extent that they are practicable they would apply in Arctic waters in the same way as anywhere else.

3. Aids to navigation are currently established each season as required by traffic and further aids with possibly greater sophistication will be considered as traffic develops.

CBC SPORTS TELECAST SPONSORS

Question No. 98—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Which brewery company sponsors CBC Canadian football telecasts?

2. Which brewery company sponsors other CBC sports telecasts?

3. In August, was there a sponsor conflict which prevented the CBC from carrying, on a later newscast film, the remaining minutes of the Hamilton Tiger-Cat and Montreal Alouettes football game which was not televised due to a technical breakdown?

4. If so, what actions is the CBC taking to ensure that such conflicts do not reoccur?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Labatt Breweries of Canada Limited sponsor one-quarter of the CFL Football telecasts.

2. With respect to regularly scheduled CBC sports events coverage, Molson Breweries of Canada Limited sponsor one-third of each of the Hockey Night in Canada telecasts; Canadian Breweries Limited sponsor one-quarter of each of the NFL Football telecasts and, during the baseball seasons, sponsored 15 Montreal Expos games plus one-quarter of the World Series. With respect to TV sports reports, O'Keefe Brewing Company Limited, Canadian Breweries Limited and Labatt Breweries are the sponsors of local programs on some individual stations.

3. No. The coach's film could not be processed in time for the CBLT Sports Report on Saturday, August 9 but the two minutes

that were missed were telecast over CBLT on the late night Sports Report on Monday August 11. It was decided not to schedule the film on the Sunday Sports Report in order to preclude the possibility of impairing relations with the CFL and the sponsor of the live telecast.

4. See answer No. 3.

[*English*]

"GUIDE TO RELATIVE PRECEDENCE AT OTTAWA"

Question No. 109—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. How many employees are engaged in all aspects of the publication "Guide to Relative Precedence at Ottawa"?

2. For each fiscal year since, and including 1965-66, what has been the total cost of all aspects of the said publication?

3. Is there any intention of discontinuing this publication and, if so, when?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. Four.

2. 1965-66, $1,673.86; 1966-67, $1,969.55; 1967-68, $3,297.97; 1968-69, $7,025.65.

3. Consideration has not been given to discontinuing the publication.

[*English*]

COST AND REVENUE, CBC TELEVISION SHOWS

Question No. 174—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What is the cost to CBC-TV of each of the prime-time U.S. shows it imports?

2. What is the total cost to CBC-TV of each of the prime-time Canadian shows it presents?

3. What is total advertising revenue for Canadian prime-time shows and U.S. prime-time shows?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1 and 2. It has not been customary to require the CBC to disclose specific program costs since such details would affect the corporation's competitive position. However, it usually costs more to produce Canadian programs than to import U.S. programs.

3. No such breakdown is available.

FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID FOR URBAN MASS TRANSIT FACILITIES

Question No. 210—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Does the federal government make available to provincial or municipal administrations financial aid in regard to long-term planning and development of urban mass transit facilities?

[Mr. Pelletier.]

2. Is consideration being given to reviewing the present federal role in this matter?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion may do so in slow growth regions.

2. No.

PRIVY COUNCIL PERSONNEL

Question No. 216—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many people were employed in the Privy Council Office and/or the Prime Minister's Office as of September 1, 1963, 1965, 1967, 1969?

2. Of these people, what were the numbers receiving salaries in each of the ranges $4,000-$7,000; $7,000-$10,000; $10,000-$15,000; $15,000 plus?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister): 1.

	1963	1965	1967	1969
	181	125	185	232
2.				
$ 4,000- 7,000	79	67	94	106
$ 7,000-10,000	25	12	18	37
$10,000-15,000	28	9	15	23
$15,000 plus	8	12	31	53
	140	100	158	219

Note: Figures are for September 1 in each year.

ELEVATOR DELIVERY POINTS

Question No. 285—**Mr. Stewart (Marquette):**

1. How many elevator delivery points are there for grain in each of the Provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta?

2. Of these delivery points, by province, how many were unable to accept a 5-bushel quota at the crop year ending July 31, 1969?

3. By provinces, of these delivery points unable to accept a 5-bushel quota at the crop year ending July 31, 1969, how many were located on the C.P.R. and how many were on the C.N.R.?

4. As of October 28, 1969, how many of these points have been able to complete the 5-bushel quota for the last crop year?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): 1. Manitoba, 324; Saskatchewan, 983; Alberta including Peace River Block of British Columbia, 509; Total, 1,816.

2. Number of stations submitting deferred delivery permits: Manitoba, 166; Saskatchewan, 683; Alberta including Peace River Block of British Columbia, 281; Total, 1,130.

3. Manitoba, C.N.R., 57; C.P.R., 104; C.N.R. and C.P.R. 5; Total, 166. Saskatchewan, C.N.R. 296; C.P.R., 374; C.N.R. and C.P.R. 13; Total

683. Alberta including Peace River Block of British Columbia, C.N.R., 124; C.P.R. 97; C.N.R. and C.P.R., 6; N.A.R., 49; G.S.L., 4; C.N.R. and N.A.R., 1; Total, 281

4. Information not available as bulk of Deferred Delivery Permits were not mailed until October 18, 1969.

PUBLIC WORKS—PROJECT TENDERS, CONTRACT AWARDS

Question No. 297—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. Would the Minister of Public Works give consideration to publishing the complete list of tenders for each project in his monthly announcement of major contract awards?

2. Would the Minister also give consideration to publishing the cumulative amount of contract awards for each company awarded another contract?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. and 2. After careful examination it is considered that the administrative procedures involved in providing the requested information would be very onerous. Therefore it will not be possible to institute such a report on a regular basis. Lists of tenderers for any specific project will continue to be available on request.

HOUSING—ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO PROVINCES

Question No. 319—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Has the Minister without Portfolio, responsible for housing, or any member of the government received a brief from the Government of the Province of Alberta complaining about the apparent unfair allocation of funds between provinces for housing arising out of the application of general monetary policy changes?

2 Has a reply been given and what was the nature of the reply?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The Hon. F. C. Colborne, the Minister of Municipal Affairs for the Province of Alberta presented a housing brief from the Province of Alberta to the Hon. Robert Andras on Monday, the 27th October. The brief dealt mainly with the flow of mortgage funds and in the private sector recommended that consideration be given to shielding the flow of mortgage funds from the full effect of the anti-inflation program. In the public sector, the brief gave the strongest support to the policy of the federal government of using the largest part of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation capital budget to provide housing for low income families. Mr. Colborne was assured that the priorities of the provinces would be carefully considered in developing the 1970 program.

A copy of this brief was referred to the Prime Minister for information by the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing.

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING POSTAL SERVICE

Question No. 325—**Mr. Coates:**

How many written complaints have been received by the Postmaster General and his department regarding the service presently available to the public since June 25, 1968?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 16,217.

Note: The Post Office handled, in total more than 7 billion pieces of mail in this 17 month period.

In addition to the figure stated, departmental managers at headquarters and the field received a limited number of complaints of the miscellaneous category. These are not recorded and determining the total number would involve search of thousands of files at headquarters and in hundreds of field components, entailing delay in replying and a very substantial amount of labour hours and cost.

CBC PROGRAMS ON PROGRESSIVE CONSERVATIVE AND NDP MEETINGS

Question No. 340—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Between October 9-14, 1969, how many CBC "Viewpoint" or "Preview Commentary" programs dealt with the Niagara Falls Conference of the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada?

2. When and by whom were such broadcasts made?

3 For what other CBC programs (television or radio) was the conference the subject matter?

4. How many actuality broadcasts originated from the Niagara Falls conference throughout its proceedings?

5. What was the total coverage given to the Niagara Falls Conference by the CBC?

6. How many interviews with participants at the Niagara Falls conference were carried by the CBC radio-television networks and who were the persons interviewed?

7. What sessions of the Niagara Falls conference were broadcast "live" by the CBC radio or television and what is the total time of such coverage?

8. How many CBC "Viewpoint" or "Preview Commentary" programs dealt with the 1969 convention of the New Democratic Party held at Winnipeg?

9. When and by whom were such broadcasts made?

10. For what other CBC programs (television and radio) was the convention the subject matter?

Questions

11. How many actuality broadcasts originated from the New Democratic Party convention in Winnipeg?

12. What was the total coverage (TV and radio) given to the New Democratic Party convention by the CBC?

13. How many interviews with delegates to the New Democratic Party convention were carried by the CBC (television and radio) and who were the persons interviewed?

14. On how many special affairs programs, news casts or public affairs programs did Professor Melville Watkins appear?

15. Is it the policy of the CBC to allocate time on its networks to political conventions of opposition parties in inverse ratio to the proportion of the votes received by the respective parties in the last preceding election?

Hon. Gerard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. There were no "Viewpoint" programs on the subject during the period specified but there were two following the Conference. There was one "Preview Commentary" program on the subject during the Oct. 9-14 period.

2. "Viewpoint"—Oct. 15 by W. A. Wilson (Montreal Gazette) and Oct. 21 by Dennis Smith (Trent University). "Preview Commentary"—Oct. 14 by Ron Blain.

3. Television—News items on the national TV news Oct. 9, 10 and 13 and on evening news Oct. 10. Also French network news items Oct. 9-13 inclusive. "Weekend—Saturday Edition", Oct. 11. "Weekend—Sunday Edition", Oct. 12.

Radio—News items on "World at Six" Oct. 9, 10 and 13; World at Eight" Oct. 10 and 13; One O'clock News Oct. 10 and 13; National News Oct. 9 and 12. Also French Network news items Oct. 9-13 inclusive. "Capital Report", Oct. 12. "Five Nights a Week at This Time", Oct. 13. "Matinee", Oct. 13 and 15. Closing Address by Hon. Robert Stanfield, Oct. 13. "Canadian Roundup", Oct. 13. "Sunday Magazine", Oct. 12. "Présent", Oct. 17.

4. Closing address by Hon. Robert Stanfield plus 20 actuality clips used as items on the English network; 14 actuality clips used as items on the French network.

5. Total CBC radio and television coverage on the English networks was just over 2 hours; total on the French networks was approximately one hour.

6. Seven. Flora McDonald, David Surpliss, Heward Grafftey, Richard Atkey, Senator Jacques Flynn and Fernand Alie (2).

7. Closing address of Hon. Robert Stanfield, Oct. 13, for 30 minutes.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

8. One "Viewpoint" and One "Preview Commentary".

9. "Viewpoint"—Oct. 31, by Ellen Simmons. "Preview Commentary"—Oct. 28, by Michael Wicks.

10. Television—News items on the national TV news Oct. 28-31 inclusive and on the evening news Oct. 30. Also French network items Oct. 27-31 inclusive. "Weekend—Saturday Edition", Nov. 1. "Weekend—Sunday Edition", Oct. 26 and Nov. 2. Two Specials on Oct. 30. "Format 60", Oct. 31.

Radio—News items on "World at Eight" Oct. 28-31 inclusive; "World at Six" Oct. 27-31 inclusive; One O'clock News Oct. 29, 30 and 31; National news Oct. 27, 28, 30 and 31; Nine a.m. news Oct. 31; Also French network news items Oct. 27-31 inclusive. "Radio Free Friday", Oct. 24. "As It Happens", Oct. 27. "Matinee", Oct. 30. "Five Nights a Week at This Time", Oct. 31. Closing Address by T. C. Douglas, Oct. 31. "Canadian Roundup", Oct. 30. "Sunday Magazine", Nov. 2. "Présent", Nov. 3. "Au Rythme du Monde", Nov. 2.

11. Closing address by T. C. Douglas plus 22 actuality clips used as items on the English network; 19 actuality clips used as items on the French network.

12. Total CBC radio and television coverage on the English networks was just over 3 hours; total on the French networks was 1⅓ hours.

13. Fifteen. T. C. Douglas (2), David Lewis (2), Melville Watkins (2), Charles Taylor (3), Laurier Lapierre, Mr. Lassiter, Dawn Carrol, Roy Atkinson, Enid Paige, Rolland Morin.

14. Five appearances in news programs, three in current affairs programs and two in special programs from the convention; plus one French network appearance.

15. It is the policy of the CBC to make convention coverage decisions on the basis of program judgment following assessment of the degree and kind of broadcast coverage warranted. Special attention is paid to leadership contests where the party concerned is consulted to ensure the most effective coverage possible.

GRAIN MOVEMENT MEASURES

Question No. 356—**Mr. Burton:**

What measures, other than the block system, are being considered to deal with the problem of grain movement?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The Grains Group which was recently established by the government, is examining

further measures to improve the grain handling and transportation system. Specific measures considered feasible will be outlined from time to time.

COMBINING OF SOCIAL WELFARE TAXES

Question No. 386—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the federal government consider the advisability of combining the Old Age Security Tax, Canada Pension Plan Tax, Guaranteed Income Supplement Tax in order to provide one comprehensive payment for the aged, widowed and orphaned?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The purpose of the Old Age Security program is to provide for Canada's senior citizens a universal flat rate pension as a base on which they can build for their retirement years. This plan is financed by a special tax on personal income, corporation income and sales. These taxes are not identified with the individuals who pay them and eligibility for the pension is not based on their payment.

The Canada Pension Plan is complementary to the Old Age Security program and is intended to provide Canadians with additional financial security through the payment of retirement, disability and survivors benefits. This is a contributory plan under which the amount of the graduated benefits paid is related to the earnings of employees and self-employed persons.

When the Canada Pension Plan was introduced it was realized that there would be some persons who would not qualify for full benefits during the ten-year period of transition while there would be others who would not have any entitlement due to non-employment. The Guaranteed Income Supplement program was brought into being as a means of augmenting the Old Age Security pension for this group of persons. Payments are made from the Old Age Security Fund.

Since these programs are based on two different principles, namely graduated benefits and a flat rate benefit, and since the Canada Pension Plan is not operative in Quebec, which has a comparable provincial plan, it would be extremely difficult to combine them as suggested. If in the future a decision is made to effect any changes, they will be announced at the appropriate time.

PAYMENTS TO NORTHLAND NAVIGATION COMPANY

Question No. 411—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

For each fiscal year since and including 1964-65, how much money has been paid to Northland Navigation Company for (a) providing service to B.C. Coastal communities (b) carrying of mail (c) other purposes?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):

	The Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development	The Canadian Transport Commission
(a) 1964-65	$15,000	$387,448
1965-66	18,000	388,000
1966-67	19,000	315,914
1967-68	20,000	398,666
1968-69	25,000	523,800

		The Post Office Department
(b) 1964-65	$ 8,000	$ 87,433
1965-66	8,000	66,785
1966-67	8,000	69,850
1967-68	10,000	65,463
1968-69	10,000	62,525

		The Department of Fisheries and Forestry
(c) 1964-65	$ 1,000	$ 3,649
1965-66	1,500	5,647
1966-67	1,500	3,481
1967-68	2,500	3,555
1968-69	2,500	2,401

Questions

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION PLANNING DIVISION

Question No. 420—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is there a planning division in the Public Service Commission and, if so, what is its composition?

2. What reports have been drawn up by this division in the last two years?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. There is in the Staffing Branch of the Public Service Commission a Planning Service. This Service is comprised of five divisions as follows: (a) Planning and Special Projects Division; (b) Delegation and Monitoring Division; (c) Selection Standards Division; (d) Information Management Centre; (e) Selection Procedures and Testing Division.

Group	Number of employees
Senior Executive	1
Personnel Administration	34
Administrative Services	5
Cumputer Systems Administration	20
Organization and Methods	5
Data Processing	11
Social Science Support	6
Secretarial, Stenographic, Typing	10
Clerical and Regulatory	26
Total	118

2. The following represent the major reports issued by the Planning Service during the past two years:

(1) Lay-off Procedures.

(2) Definition of Appointment.

(3) Management Reporting System.

(4) Use of Automatic Typewriters in the Staffing Branch.

(5) Employees Appraisal in the Appointment Process.

(6) Long Range Objectives of Public Service Commission in the Staffing Area.

(7) Unilingual Secretaries Career Opportunities.

(8) Planning and Performance Indicators for the Staffing Branch.

(9) Language Requirements in the Public Service.

(10) Research Proposal for the Executive Development Programme—Report No. 1.

(11) Characteristics of Successful Executives: Techniques: Rationale—Report No. 4.

(12) The relationship of background variables to the pass-fail criterion on the Air Traffic Controller Course.

[Mr. Forest.]

(13) Interaction Process Analysis; A method for the study of small groups.

(14) An analytical study of the stenographic battery in the Canadian Public Service.

(15) A critical review of the Employee Evaluation Program in the Public Service.

(16) Types of validity for language proficiency tests.

(17) Research on the identification, selection and evaluation of Research Scientists: A review of the literature—Report No. 2.

(18) Stenographic—Secretarial Group: Research Proposal.

(19) Interviewing and the Interviewer: Characteristics and Research findings.

(20) The summer intern looks at his job.

(21) Summary of reports on the Language Proficiency Examinations.

(22) Training the Trainee: An evaluation of the 1969 formal training session for Administrative Trainee.

(23) Attitudes of Managers in the Canadian Public Service.

(24) Interests of Managers in the Canadian Public Service.

(25) Work of the Manager.

(26) The Creative Manager.

(27) Prediction of Managerial Success.

(28) General description of the Manager.

(29) Personality of the Manager.

(30) Statistical treatment of criteria and predictors: Practical Approach.

(31) Preliminaries to Test Construction and Personnel Testing.

[*English*]

CBC POLICY ON POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

Question No. 439—**Mr. Broadbent:**

What is the policy of the CBC regarding radio television coverage of conventions of the major political parties in Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: It is the policy of the CBC to make convention coverage decisions on the basis of program judgment following assessment of the degree and kind of broadcast coverage warranted. Special attention is paid to leadership contests where the party concerned is consulted to ensure the most effective coverage possible.

[*English*]

ASSOCIATION QUÉBECOISE DES TECHNIQUES DE L'EAU BRIEF

Question No. 449—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Did the federal government receive a brief from the *Association québecoise des techniques de l'eau* concerning the management of water resources and, if so, has the government reached an agreement which would extend to the Province of Quebec the same benefits as the other provinces?

2. Does the federal government intend to accept the AQTE recommendation advocating the creation of a federal water board in which the federal and provincial governments, various agencies and private enterprise would participate?

3. By what methods does the federal government intend to take maximum advantage of this natural resource?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1. No brief has been received to date but recent correspondence from officers of the Association indicates such a brief may be expected in the near future. Canada is prepared at any time to negotiate with the province of Quebec toward the development of an agreement or agreements concerning the management of water resources. The proposed Canada Water Act will provide the appropriate legislative basis for such agreements.

2. Presumably the Association québecoise des techniques de l'eau recommendation will be contained in its Briefs, which will have to be received and studied before any comment can be offered.

3. Enactment of the proposed Canada Water Act will provide the basic legislation which will facilitate federal-provincial co-operative activities concerning the management of water resources.

URBAN RENEWAL, QUEBEC—SUSPENSION OF CONTRIBUTIONS

Question No. 467—**Mr. Matte:**

1. Did the federal government suspend its contributions to urban renewal programs in the Province of Québec and, if so, does it intend to grant to the Government of Québec equivalent fiscal points in order to permit projects already planned or under way to be completed without delay?

2. If not, is it the government's intention to grant any other assistance to the Government of Québec in the field of housing?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1. The announcements made on August 14, and December 18, 1969, regarding the federal government's policy in relation to urban renewal schemes had application in Québec as it had in all other provinces.

2. Pursuant to an administrative agreement made between Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Québec Housing Corporation, CMHC is making loans to the Québec Housing Corporation in respect of low rental housing projects, public housing projects and student housing projects under the relevant provisions of the National Housing Act, 1954. This agreement covers the period to March 31, 1970. The amount provided for such loans is $124.9 million.

LOANS TO STUDENTS IN QUEBEC AND ONTARIO

Question No. 473—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. In 1968-1969, how much has the federal government granted in loans to students in (a) Quebec (b) Ontario?

2. What is the percentage granted to Quebec students in relation to Ontario.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Finance as follows: 1. (a) No loans. Quebec does not participate in the Canada Student Loans Plan. (See 2 below) (b) 53,911 loans in the amount of $27,538,820.

2. The Province of Quebec has its own student assistance program and has chosen not to participate in the Canada Student Loans Plan. An alternative payment is made to Quebec each year and is determined by applying the ratio of the general population in the 18 to 24 year age group in Quebec to the same population in the rest of Canada at the beginning of the loan year to the total of the statutory costs incurred by the federal government during that loan year.

The alternative payments to Quebec have been as follows:

Loan year in respect of which payment made	Amount of payment
1964/65	74,262
1965/66	757,448
1966/67	1,230,572
1967/68	2,402,552
1968/69	2,915,698

INTEREST FREE LOANS TO PRAIRIE GRAIN GROWERS

Question No. 474—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many prairie grain farmers took advantage of the interest free federal government loans after August 1, 1969?

2. How many took the maximum loan and how many of them actually needed the loan?

Questions

3. Is there any definite time limit as to when the loan is to be repaid and, if so, when and, if not, what is the maximum time the interest free loan can remain unpaid?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): 1. As of December 12, 1969, the Canadian Wheat Board records indicate that 97,653 producers took advantage in the current crop year of the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act.

2. 5,443 producers took the maximum advance payment of $6,000. The Canadian Wheat Board records do not indicate how many producers actually need the advance payment.

3. Under the Prairie Grain Advance Payments Act the advance payment is to be repaid within a reasonable period of time after the quotas have been increased to the extent that the producer can deliver sufficient grain from which one-half of the gross value, when deducted, would equal the original advance payment.

VIEWER RATING, "SING ALONG JUBILEE"

Question No. 486—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What is the present viewer rating of the program "Sing Along Jubilee" on the CBC Television Network which replaced "Don Messer's Jubilee"?

2. What was the rating of "Don Messer's Jubilee" at the same time last year?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. On the metro network of eleven CBC-owned TV stations which carry "Singalong Jubilee", usually at 9-9:30 p.m. on Fridays, the program currently has an average weekly audience of about 1.14 million viewers. "Singalong Jubilee" is not carried by any of the CBC affiliated stations which make up the full CBC network.

2. At this same time last year, in that same part of the country now served by these eleven stations, "Don Messer", seen normally at 8:30-9:00 p.m. on Fridays, had virtually the same size of audience, an average 1.13 million viewers weekly. On the full network of over 40 CBC and affiliated stations which carried "Don Messer" throughout the country, the program's total weekly audience, at this time last season, averaged about 2.71 million viewers.

CABLE TELEVISION, CALGARY, EDMONTON, REGINA, SASKATOON

Question No. 495—**Mr. Southam:**

Is it the intention of the government to make available to the cities of Calgary, Edmonton, Regina and Saskatoon, microwave transmission for cable television purposes and, if so, how soon can this service be expected?

[Mr. Robinson.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission as follows: In a fully-documented decision (CRTC No. 69-397) issued on December 3, 1969, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission stated: "The Commission will not licence broadcasting receiving undertakings (CATV) based on the use of microwave or other technical systems, for the wholesale importation of programs from distant U.S. stations and thereby the enlargement of the Canadian audience and market areas of U.S. networks or stations."

[*English*]

INDIAN-ESKIMO RADIO NETWORK

Question No. 499—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Is the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation giving favourable consideration to the request of the Indian-Eskimo Association that a radio network be established to serve the Indians, Eskimos and Metis?

2. What assistance is being provided by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission in assisting the native peoples in the above project?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation that the Corporation has not had an opportunity to study the details of this request which was presented recently to the Canadian Radio-Television Commission. However, the CBC would be prepared to consider the request as part of its continuing review of overall CBC coverage and programming development.

2. I am informed by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission that on November 10, 1969, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission received a delegation from the National Indian Brotherhood of Canada, The Canadian Metis Society, The Indian Eskimo Association of Canada and representatives of the Alberta Native Communications Society. A brief was presented which has been studied. Spokesmen for the Commission advised the delegation to concentrate their efforts on producing programmes for Indians, Eskimos and Metis and in securing fuller distribution through existing facilities, rather than become involved in setting up separate facilities.

The CRTC is engaged in studies with the Department of Communications and the CBC

on the extension of services in general, and in particular with the requirements of this group.

[*English*]

ANSWERING OF ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Question No. 502—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Who is the individual in each department of government responsible for seeing that questions placed on the Order Paper of the House of Commons are answered?

2. What department of government is responsible for co-ordinating the answers to questions placed on the Order Paper?

3. (a) What are the qualifications of each person so designated in each department of government to answer questions placed on the Order Paper (b) is this function a part of his or her duty (c) what other duties does the individual perform (d) how many years has each been with their respective department (e) what is the degree of competence required for such a position?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): 1. The Minister.

2. The President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada.

3. (a) A Minister of the Crown must be a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada and a member of the House of Commons or of the Senate or must become a member of the House of Commons or of the Senate shortly after becoming a Minister; (b) in general, a Minister's function is to be answerable to Parliament both for matters of policy and administration; (c) a Minister may perform many other duties in addition to being responsible for the administration of his department; (d) this is a matter of public record; and (e) the maximum competence obtainable is required.

FREE TIME FOR POLITICAL PARTIES ON CBC

Question No. 511—**Mr. Matte:**

Have requests been made to the CBC concerning the possibility of making free time available each week to each of the political parties and, if so, when will this policy be implemented and, if not, is such action being considered?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC that, to the best of the Corporation's knowledge, no such requests have been received and the CBC is not considering such a policy.

[*English*]

LOAN APPLICATIONS, P.E.I.

Question No. 521—**Mr. McQuaid:**

1. How many applications were received during the past fiscal year from the Province of Prince Edward Island for (a) Farm Credit Corporation Loans (b) Farm Improvement Loans (c) Small Business Loans (d) Fisheries Improvement Loans?

2. How many of the applications were accepted for each of the above categories and what was the total amount loaned in each case?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Farm Credit Corporation and the Department of Finance as follows: 1. (a) 164, (b), (c) and (d). Information is not available. Under the administration of these Acts, the chartered banks report particulars only in respect of loans which have been approved. No record exists, therefore, of applications for loans which may have been declined by lenders.

2. (a) 112 loans for total amount of $2,612,200, in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1969. (b) 399 loans for $923,035 in the calendar year ended December 31, 1968. (c) 19 loans for $190,675 in the calendar year ended December 31, 1968. (d) 22 loans for $42,290 in the fiscal year ended March 31, 1969.

CESSATION OF USE OF SILVER IN COINS

Question No. 531—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. When did the Royal Canadian Mint cease to use silver in the minting of Canadian coins?

2. For a period immediately prior to this date, did the market value of silver in Canadian coins exceed the face value of the coins, and, if so, for how long a period?

3. What is the actual or estimated cost to the government during this period resulting from excess of market value over face value of silver used in minting of Canadian coins?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Royal Canadian Mint is concerned: 1. On August 1, 1968.

2. In September 1967, the Mint reduced the silver content of coins from 80 per cent to 50 per cent, which gave a break-even point of $2.67⅔ per ounce troy of silver. Market price for silver exceeded this point for one day only in 1968.

3. None. The minting of coins composed of 50 per cent silver resulted in seignorage to the government.

Questions

PURCHASE OF YACHT BY CANEX

Question No. 554—**Mr. Winch:**

1. Has CANEX, operating at CFB in Chilliwack, British Columbia, decided to purchase a $35,000.00 yacht out of its funds and, if so, who made the proposal and was it carried by a democratic vote of the members?

2. Is this for the use of officer staff or all ranks?

3. What opportunity will there be for non-officer ranks to use the yacht?

4. Was the base commander in any way involved with the decision to purchase this yacht?

5. Could this money have been spent to revive community facilities for all ranks?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): 1. The Canadian Forces Exchange System (CANEX) is responsible for issuing directives and guidelines to the Non-Public resale outlets in the Canadian Forces. The original proposal to purchase a 42 ft. ketch which will sleep eight was submitted by the Base Commander to the Base Fund Committee (of which he is not a member). After thorough discussion by the Committee, a vote was taken from all members of the all-ranks committee representing all units on the base, and it was agreed that the Canadian Forces Central Fund be asked to lend the Base Fund Committee, Canadian Forces Base Chilliwack, B.C., the necessary non-public money to purchase this sailing boat which would be berthed in Vancouver for the use of personnel at CFB Chilliwack when they proceeded on vacation.

2. The aim is to provide recreational sailing facilities for all ranks.

3. The schedule of fees is scaled so that junior ranks will be able to participate equally with senior non-commissioned officers and officers. For example, should three privates and their families decide to rent the ketch for one week, they would share the cost equally, i.e. $27. per family. At the present time, 19 men and 10 officers are undergoing winter training in sailing.

4. Only insofar as he proposed the idea to the Base Fund Committee for study.

5. The purchase of this sailing boat is only a small part of a comprehensive non-public fund program now underway to provide the military community at Canadian Forces Base, Chilliwack, with recreational facilities. The extension to the Junior Ranks Club, swimming pool, curling rink is now under construction and is expected to be completed on target. During the past year an auto-hobby club, a bowling alley and an extension to an all ranks lounge was completed. Further community facilities for the use and enjoyment of all ranks at Canadian Forces Base, Chilliwack, B.C., are in the planning stage.

[Mr. Richardson.]

*EXPENDITURES ON "VISAGES DU CANADA"

Question No. 557—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. What is the total expenditure to date paid or unpaid of the Caravan described as "Visages du Canada"?

2. For how many months will it travel through African countries?

3. On these travels, how large will be the staff, including working crews and all other employees?

4. What will be the total estimated costs of such travels?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows: 1. $138,559.00.

2. Twelve months.

3. Six persons.

4. In addition to the amount already spent, the costs of shipping charges, salaries and allowances for accompanying personnel and operating expenses total approximately $201,000.

[*English*]

IMPORTS OF DDT

Question No. 573—**Mr. Harding:**

1. How many pounds of DDT were imported in each of the years 1960 to 1968 inclusive and in that part of 1969 for which records are available?

2. From what countries was DDT imported?

3. What was the total value of these imports?

4. Is DDT produced in Canada and, if so, where and in what quantities for each of the above years?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as follows: 1. and 3. See table p. 2225.

2. DDT is imported only from the United States of America.

4. There was no production of DDT in Canada during the years 1960-68, inclusive, nor is it being produced at present.

Imports of DDT for the Years 1964 to August 1969

Commodity Class 407-87
DDT Technical (Pure DDT)

Year	Quantity (cwt.)	Value ($)
1964	19,526	349,642
1965	18,243	305,073
1966	21,021	383,141
1967	16,074	290,226
1968	13,565	234,995
1969 (Jan.-Aug.)	9,197	152,411

Commodity Class 418-30
DDT Dust, Solutions & Wettable Powder

Year	Quantity (cwt.)	Value ($)
1964	5,277	112,936
1965	3,633	66,623
1966	6,262	115,476
1967	5,309	93,931
1968	4,708	84,370
1969 (Jan.-Aug.)	4,917	90,956

Due to implementation of a new classification, comparable statistics are unavailable prior to 1964.

NUCLEAR RADIATION TESTING PROGRAM

Question No. 574—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the federal government have a program of testing the atmosphere for nuclear radiation and, if not, for what reason and, if so, how many locations are there in Canada, how often are samples taken and what is the permissible levels of fallout and has this level been reached at any time in Canada and, if so, where and what action was taken as a result?

2. Have any studies been carried out in Canada to determine the effects of nuclear fallout on the population and, if so, what are the results and, if not, will such studies be carried out as a preventive measure for protecting Canadians from the effects of nuclear fallout?

3. Have any studies been carried out to determine the effect of Strontium 90 entering adult bodies by food or air and, if not, for what reason and will such studies be carried out and, if so, what were the findings?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Department of National Health and Welfare has been regularly testing the atmosphere for nuclear radiation since 1958. Samples of air particulates are collected continuously at 24 stations throughout Canada and analysed daily in Ottawa. In assessing the data, the Department of National Health and Welfare is guided by the Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological Protection. These Recommendations identify various "permissible" levels for specific radioisotopes, but nuclear fallout may consist of mixtures of radioisotopes and its "permissible" level varies accordingly. The "permissible" level relates to conditions of continuous exposure and the Commission has recommended that, in practice, the annual average level should be used in health assessments. The annual average at all the Department's stations has remained well below the "permissible" level each year.

2. No direct determination of the effect has been made. For a scientifically valid study, extensive data would be needed on the incidence of various diseases, both in population groups exposed to fallout and in population groups not so exposed. Sufficient data of this kind are not available in Canada.

3. The Department of National Health and Welfare is carrying out a comprehensive program to determine the amounts of Strontium-90 entering adult bodies by food or air but it has not been able to determine directly the effect of Strontium-90 on the incidence of disease for the reason given in answer to question 2.

DESIGNATED REGIONS, NEWFOUNDLAND

Question No. 577—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Newfoundland regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Newfoundland by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Newfoundland regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Newfoundland submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

DESIGNATED REGIONS, QUEBEC

Question No. 578—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Quebec regarding the selection of

designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Quebec by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Quebec regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Quebec submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

DESIGNATED REGIONS, ONTARIO

Question No. 579—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Ontario regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Ontario by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Ontario regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Ontario submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

DESIGNATED REGIONS, MANITOBA

Question No. 580—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Manitoba regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act, and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Manitoba by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Manitoba regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Manitoba submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

[Mr. Burton.]

DESIGNATED REGIONS, SASKATCHEWAN

Question No. 581—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Saskatchewan regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act, and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Saskatchewan by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Saskatchewan regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Saskatchewan submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

DESIGNATED REGIONS, ALBERTA

Question No. 582—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Alberta regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Alberta by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Alberta regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Alberta submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions and correspondence.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters except for correspondence tabled in reply to Notice of Motion No. 140.

DESIGNATED REGIONS, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Question No. 583—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of British Columbia regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of British Columbia by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of British Columbia regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of British Columbia submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic mic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

POST OFFICE—DATA INPUT UNIT INSTALLATIONS

Question No. 585—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. In what post offices were "data input units" (manufactured by Pylon Electronics Development Co.) installed?

2. How many such units were installed and at what total cost?

3. What other equipment or material was installed to make these units functional?

4. At what cost for material and installation?

5. For how long was the equipment in Parts (1) and (3) above used?

6. For what reason was its use discontinued?

7. How does the function of "time clocks" in Canadian post offices differ from that in use before the installation of "data input units"?

8. What reasons prompted the introduction of "data input units"?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. Toronto Post Office. These units were installed and maintained by Bell Canada.

2. (a) 77; (b) $19,500 for wiring and cabling.

3. A central scanner which is an electronic scanning device which can poll up to 100 data input lines. Magnetic tapes required for the two tape drives which were used by the central scanner as data capturing devices.

4. Total cost for installation and material, $41,333.67 (this includes the $19,500 for 2 above).

5. From February 1968 until November 1969. It was a Pilot experiment necessary for the development of a future integrated Management Information System.

6. It was considered that information sufficient to establish the feasibility of using data input devices in a Post Office operation environment had been collected. Continuing the operation would have entailed unnecessary additional costs.

7. Prior to the advent of the input devices Toronto used a standard I.B.M. time clock which provided a visible printed record of the time clocked in. The data input device functioned manually, except that there was no visible record of the time a man clocked in or out, as this was captured (or relayed immediately) to the central scanner and kept on magnetic tape. An employee determined a successful clocking by receiving a "Remove" light signal or, on an unsuccessful clocking, a "Reinsert" light signal on the input device.

8. The electronic data input devices were tested in the Pilot Project to examine the potential of a more immediate and accurate form of data collection (it did not have to be transposed to a machine readable electronic configuration). This data was then manipulated to prepare production control and personnel information reports.

CBOT-TV COVERAGE OF OTTAWA CIVIC AFFAIRS

Question No. 586—**Mr. Coates:**

1. What participation has CBC Television through CBOT TV taken in civic affairs in Ottawa and the Ottawa coverage area associated with the Civic Election held December 1, 1969?

2. How many hours of free time were made available to those involved in Civic Election campaigns within the area?

3. What was the total cost to the CBC of their participation in civic affairs?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: On the program "Something Else":

September 10—Interview with Controller Fogarty, Ottawa mayoralty candidate. (6 min. 16 sec.)

October 30—Interviews with David Porter and Joseph-Louis Paradis Ottawa mayoralty candidates. (9 min. 1 sec.)

November 21—Interviews with Reeve Aubrey Moodie and Councillor Andrew Haydon, candidates for Reeve of Nepean Township. (17 min. 36 sec.)

November 26—Interviews with all seven Ottawa Board of Control candidates. (22 min. 10 sec.)

November 27—Assessment of Ottawa mayoralty candidates by commentator Roger Appleton, Ottawa Citizen. (2 min. 54 sec.)

November 28—A film about five Ottawa aldermanic candidates in Dalhousie ward. (12 min. 33 sec.)

December 2—A film about election night activities of Messrs. Fogarty and Paradis. (22 min. 51 sec.)

News Items:

November 17—Evening Report (3 min. 22 sec.) Night Final (1 min. 20 sec.)

November 18—Night Final (32 sec.)

Questions

November 20—Evening Report (1 min. 22 sec.)

November 24—Evening Report (24 sec.)

November 29—Night Final (2 min.)

December 1—Bulletins from 8:00 p.m. on; Full coverage 10:30-11:00 p.m.; Extended Night Final (9 min. 50 sec.)

2. No free time was allocated to candidates. The above programming was presented as a matter of current affairs and news interest.

3. It has not been customary to require the CBC to disclose details of its internal operations such as specific program costs.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVANTS' RIGHT TO STRIKE

Question No. 591—**Mr. Southam:**

Is it the intention of the government to take away the right of Public Servants to strike as was suggested on November 28, 1969 by the President of the Canadian Manufacturers Association?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): The suggestion made by the Canadian Manufacturers Association and by other individuals and organizations will be reviewed at the appropriate time along with many other suggestions which have been made from time to time to amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act.

SELECTION OF DESIGNATED REGIONS, NEW BRUNSWICK

Question No. 596—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of New Brunswick regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of New Brunswick by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of New Brunswick regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of New Brunswick submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

SELECTION OF DESIGNATED REGIONS, P.E.I.

Question No. 597—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Prince Edward Island regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Prince Edward Island by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Prince Edward Island regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Prince Edward Island submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

SELECTION OF DESIGNATED REGIONS, NOVA SCOTIA

Question No. 598—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Did the Government of Canada consult the Government of Nova Scotia regarding the selection of designated regions in that Province under the Regional Development Incentives Act and, if so, when and in what manner did the consultations take place?

2. What specific proposal or proposals were placed before the Government of Nova Scotia by the Government of Canada?

3. What view was expressed by the Government of Nova Scotia regarding the federal proposal?

4. Did the Government of Nova Scotia submit any counter-proposals and, if so, what proposals were made?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Yes, by discussions.

1, 2, 3 and 4. The details of such consultations are confidential matters.

PLANS FOR LEBRETON FLATS

Question No. 599—**Mr. Mather:**

Is the Government of Canada presently reconsidering its plans regarding LeBreton Flats and, if so, is it giving favorable consideration to turning the Flats into a National Park?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the National Capital Commission and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as follows: (a) The prospective use of LeBreton Flats has been under study for some time by the National Capital Commission. (b) No.

"PART-TIME" EMPLOYEES, INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Question No. 602—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Has Treasury Board acknowledged that so-called "part-time" employees of the Department of

Indian Affairs and Northern Development were "full-time" employees under the terms of Section 2 of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, and hence entitled to full benefits in terms of salary, isolation pay, cost-of-living allowances, pensions, etc.?

2. Did the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, before the Treasury Board acknowledgement was made, spend public funds in legal action to oppose the argument that such employees were full-time employees and, if so, how much was spent?

3. How many "part-time" employees were reclassified as "full-time" employees after complaints were lodged against the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

4. (a) Have all the affected employees now been reclassified as full-time (b) how many employees were affected?

5. Have all reclassified employees been retroactively paid the salary, allowances, pension and other benefits to which they were entitled as of the 1967 date of the passage of the Public Service Staff Relations Act and, (a) if so, what was the cost of the settlement (b) if not, how many have been so paid and how many remain to be paid?

6. (a) Have all the former employees, who should have been reclassified during their term of employment, received retroactive payments and, if not, how many have been so paid and how many remain to be paid (b) what will be the total cost of this part of the settlement?

7. What were the occupations of the employees involved in this reclassification?

8. How many of these employees were Indians or Eskimos?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Treasury Board acknowledges that if a part-time employee of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development is an employee for purposes of Section 2 of the Public Service Staff Relations Act, that person would be entitled to the benefits flowing from the applicable collective agreement.

2. No.

3. One.

4. (a) Yes; (b) one.

5. Yes. (a) $2,674.32; (b) not applicable.

6. (a) This Department gives full consideration to all requests from former employees as to the possibility of their warranting retroactive payments. No such claims have been identified as requiring such payment to date. (b) Not applicable.

7. Indian Day School caretaker.

8. The employee is Indian.

RADAR AND COMMUNICATION SCHOOL, CANADIAN FORCES BASE, KINGSTON

Question No. 629—**Mr. McKinley:**

What is the estimated cost of additional facilities or of renovating facilities that will be required at Canadian Forces Base Kingston to facilitate the Radar and Communication School now at Canadian Forces Base Clinton for the Department of National Defence?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Prior to integration, the three services operated similar training facilities for the electronic and mechanical trades at Clinton, Kingston and Camp Borden. It is now proposed to operate one school for each of these two trade groups at Kingston and Borden. It is estimated that it will initially cost up to $500,000 to relocate the Communications and Radar School into existing accommodation at Canadian Forces Base Kingston. In the long term, certain temporary facilities will have to be replaced or expanded but detailed studies and estimates will not be available until spring of 1970. As announced on August 13, 1969, the closing of CFB Clinton will result, when completed, in estimated annual savings of $4.6 million.

CBC-TV SERVICE, KOOTENAY REGION

Question No. 630—**Mr. Harding:**

1. (a) Is CBC-TV for the Kootenay area of British Columbia being brought into that district from Calgary, Alberta instead of from Vancouver, B.C. and, if so, for what reason (b) when was this service instituted?

2. Does CBC-TV plan on giving the Kootenay area access to all CBC programs and news through Vancouver, B.C. and, if so, when will the change be made

3. Is it possible, with its present facilities, for CBC-TV to provide the Kootenay area with the B.C. regional news and the B.C. weather reports and, if so, why has this service not been instituted?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. (a) The network service is fed from east to west via Calgary to an unmanned network relay station at Trail, B.C. from which rebroadcasting stations in the Kootenay area receive network service. Some B.C. regional programming is videotape recorded at Vancouver and sent to Calgary for use in non-network periods to partly circumvent the lack of direct programming from Vancouver. A separate west to east network to serve the Kootenay area would require the CBC to rent additional microwave circuits from Vancouver back to Trail. (b) The network service from Calgary to Trail, B.C., was instituted in 1960 when the Trail station began operating.

2. The Corporation has recognized the desirability of programming B.C. regional serv-

ice from Vancouver but it is a large and costly project which cannot be undertaken in the near future, particularly with current financial restrictions.

3. It is technically possible to supply B.C. regional programming eastward from Vancouver to Trail and other stations in the area at times when the national network service is not being relayed westward. However, this is not being done because it would be costly to maintain such a service on a regular basis. There are many communities elsewhere in British Columbia and in other provinces which are still awaiting the network service already available in the Kootenay area and these less fortunate communities must be given priority.

[*English*]

APPROVAL OF DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES

Question No. 639—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. Under what program or programs were the approvals given for the 278 development incentives recently announced by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion?

2. When will the new plants and expansions involved in the incentives approved come into operation?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Area Development Incentives Act—261, Regional Development Incentives Act—17.

2. At varying dates, some in 1969, most in 1970 and early 1971.

CONNECTION WITH GOVERNMENT OF HARRISON McCAIN

Question No. 645—**Mr. Skoreyko:**

1. Is Mr. Harrison McCain of Grand Falls, N.B. whose firm, McCain Foods Limited, was recently given a grant amounting to several millions of dollars by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion connected in any way with the present government and, if so, in what capacity?

2. Does the Minister or his departmental officials approve grants of such amounts of public funds to applicants without question and with some system of checking the reputation and standing of the application and his firm?

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

2. No.

REGISTRATION OF CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Question No. 648—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. For the years 1967, 1968 and 1969, how many applications were received by the Department of National Revenue regarding registration of charitable organizations in Canada?

2. For each of the above years, how many applications were approved by the Department?

3. For each of the above years, how many charitable organizations missed their annual deadline for filing a report of their operations with the Department?

4. What action is required under the Income Tax Act for those charitable institutions who have not filed their annual returns?

5. What action has been undertaken by the Department of National Revenue to enforce compliance with the law?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1. 1967, 34,630; 1968, 4,322; 1969 (to December 9), 2,055.

2. 1967, 31,373; 1968, 3,213; 1969 (to December 9), 979.

3. 1967, 13,250; 1968, 11,237.

1969 Returns are to be filed three months after the end of each fiscal period. Most organizations are on a calendar year basis and their 1969 returns are not due until March 31, 1970.

4. Section 27(3c) of the Income Tax Act provides that a charitable organization's registration may be revoked for failure to file an information return.

5. No action was taken for 1967 because that was the first year the requirements to register and to file an annual return were in effect. In the summer of 1969 requests to file returns, together with copies of the required forms were mailed to all registered organizations that had failed to file for 1968. Over 8,000 returns have been filed to date as a result of this action. No decision has yet been made as to what further action will be taken to obtain the balance of the returns not filed.

GARBAGE DUMPS, CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN RESERVE

Question No. 649—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. How many garbage dumps are in use on the Caughnawaga Indian Reserve?

2. How many tons of refuse are discharged daily into each dump?

3. How much are the Indians paid per ton for the use of these dumps?

4. To whom is the Kanawaki Golf Club in Caughnawaga leased, for what period and at what annual rent?

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

2. It is not possible to estimate the tonnage of refuse discharged daily into each dump. Information supplied by the Permittees for

1968 showed an average up to 900 loads a week being deposited by vans with a capacity of 20 cubic yards.

3. The rental is on area, rather than tonnage, basis. The rate paid is $200 per acre per annum.

4. The corporate body of the Kanawaki Golf Club holds 8 separate leases on the Caughnawaga Reserve to September 30, 1995.

The Kanawaki Golf Club annually pays $1,000 into Band funds and a total of $5,518.44 to individual land owners.

IMMIGRANTS WITH PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Question No. 650—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. During the past ten years, how many immigrants with professional qualifications have entered Canada?

2. How many of them have elected to take up permanent residence in Canada?

3. How many have returned to their countries of origin (other than the United States)?

4. How many of them have emigrated to the United States?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Manpower and Immigration as follows: 1. During the past ten years the number of immigrants with professional qualifications entering Canada is as follows: 1959, 6,947; 1960, 7,436; 1961, 6,696; 1962, 8,218; 1963, 9,640; 1964, 11,965; 1965, 16,654; 1966, 23,637; 1967, 30,853; 1968, 29,250 —Total 151,296.

2. 151,296 (an immigrant, once landed, becomes a permanent resident of Canada).

3 and 4. Permanent residents of Canada are not required to report their whereabouts or movements to the Department, hence the Department does not compile the kind of data required to reply to these questions.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—APPROACH AND ACTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS

Question No. 653—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

Has any attempt been made to identify the person or persons in the employ of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development who engaged in an approach termed "insidious" by the Crockett Writers Company in its quarterly report for the period ending March 31, 1969 to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and which approach involved "Xerox" processing and the distribution of copies of a contract marked "confidential" and, if so, what is the name and position held by each such person?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes, an investigation into Crockett Writers allegations was launched when their report was submitted and appropriate steps were taken to ensure that the firm receive the cooperation it required to perform the duties as outlined in the terms of the contract. Xerox copies of the contract were sent to all regional offices to ensure cooperation with the firm.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT—CO-OPERATION IN IMPROVING IMAGE

Question No. 654—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

Has any attempt been made to find the identity of the persons referred to in the Quarterly Report for the period ending March 31, 1969 by Crockett Writers Company to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as being "some department heads who will never co-operate with us in trying to improve the image of the Branch" and, if so, what is the name and position held by each such person?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Yes, as mentioned in the reply to Question No. 653 appropriate steps have been taken to ensure that the firm receives the cooperation it requires to fulfil the terms of the contract. It would not, however, be in the public interest to divulge names.

DISCONTINUANCE OF OPERATIONS BY KNITTED OUTERWEAR MANUFACTURERS

Question No. 666—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. How many manufacturers of knitted outerwear have discontinued knitting operations in the years 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69?

2. How many jobs have been lost as a result of these changes?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The information required is not available from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. However, according to industry sources, the numbers of companies discontinuing operations during the years requested were as follows: 1966, 3; 1967, 5; 1968, 8; 1969, 4 to date.

2. The numbers of jobs lost as a result of these changes were: 1966, 125; 1967, 170; 1968, 520; 1969, 155 in two companies. Information concerning the jobs lost as a result of the closing of the other two companies is not available.

Questions

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CANADIAN MACHINERY MANUFACTURERS

Question No. 671—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What action is the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce taking to combat discriminating practices facing Canadian machinery manufacturers, arising from their exclusion in the bidding on Canadian projects due to tied foreign financing?

2. What action is the Department of Regional Economic Expansion taking regarding the exclusion of Canadian machinery in projects receiving aid from the federal government due to tied foreign financing?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion as follows: 1. The Departments of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Regional Economic Expansion are in the process of completing a study of the impact on Canadian industry of tied foreign financing involving subsidized rates of interest and other concessional financing terms. This study will contain specific recommendations on appropriate measures to curtail this practice.

2. Section 11 of the Regulations under the Regional Development Incentives Act provides:

"It is a condition of a development incentive in respect of a facility that the applicant shall provide reasonable opportunities to Canadian manufacturers to supply the machinery and equipment included in the eligible assets of the facility, where such machinery and equipment are competitive in performance, price and delivery."

IMMIGRATION FROM CERTAIN COUNTRIES

Question No. 685—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. What has been the number of immigrants from the following countries for each year since the implementation of the point system (a) United Kingdom (b) France (c) Italy (d) Greece (e) Hong Kong?

2. What was the number from each of these countries for each of the three years preceding the application of the point system?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1 and 2. See following table.

Immigration to Canada from Selected Countries

Country of Former Residence	1965	1966	1967(1)	1968	To Sept. 1969
United Kingdom	39,857	63,291	62,420	37,889	24,128
France	5,225	7,872	10,122	8,184	4,238
Italy	26,398	31,625	30,055	19,774	8,112
Greece	5,642	7,174	10,650	7,739	4,828
Hong Kong	4,352	4,094	6,409	8,382	6,655

Note (1): New Immigration Regulations embodying norms of assessment, and a points evaluation system, were introduced on October 1, 1967.

GRANTS BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS

Question No. 688—**Mr. Gleave:**

For the fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70, what are the estimated grants made by the Department of Agriculture to the (a) Canadian Seed Growers Association (b) Canadian Horticultural Council (c) Canadian Council on 4-H Clubs (d) Advanced Registry Board for Dairy Bulls (e) Canadian National Livestock Records (f) Canadian Hunter, Saddle and Light Horse Improvement Society (g) British Columbia Beef Cattle Growers Association (h) Canadian Council on Plowing Associations (i) Federated Women's Institutes of Canada (j) Royal Agricultural Winter Fair, Toronto?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Annual grants made by the Department of Agriculture for 1968-69 and 1969-70: (a) Canadian Seed Growers Association, $44,000; (b) Canadian Horticultural Council, $8,400; (c) Canadian Council on 4-H Clubs, $23,000; (d) Advanced Registry Board for Dairy Bulls, $4,500; (e) Canadian National Livestock Records, $50,000; (f) Canadian Hunter, Saddle and Light Horse Improvement Society, $5,000; (g) British Columbia Beef Cattle Growers Association, $900; (h) Canadian Council on Plowing Associations, $5,000; (i) Federated Women's Institutes of Canada, $10,000; (j) Royal Agricultural Winter Fair, Toronto, $50,000.

LICENSING OF B.C. CREDIT UNION LENDERS

Question No. 689—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Are lenders associated with the British Columbia Credit Unions licensed under the Small Loans Act and do they make a complete annual report to the Superintendent of Insurance for Canada?

2. Was the Superintendent of Insurance informed by the Government of the Province of British Columbia of an order-in-council which increased the interest rate on loans made by British Columbia Credit Unions and, if so, on what date was the Superintendent of Insurance so informed?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. No.

2. The Superintendent of Insurance was not informed by the Government of British Columbia of an order-in-council that increased the rate of interest that might be charged on loans made by credit unions in British Columbia. However, he was informed of this order-in-council by representatives of the credit union movement of that province on October 23, 1969. Credit unions would be required to become licensed under the Small Loans Act if they wished to charge more than 1% a month on loans of °1,500 or less. The licensing of credit unions under that Act is now under consideration.

SUBSIDIES TO P.E.I. MILK PRODUCERS

Question No. 691—**Mr. McQuaid:**

1. During the past fiscal year, how many milk producers in the Province of Prince Edward Island were in receipt of subsidies payable by the Canadian Dairy Commission?

2. What was the total amount of the subsidy paid during that period to producers in Prince Edward Island?

3. How many producers in Prince Edward Island during that period had deductions made from their subsidy payments because their production exceeded their assigned quotas?

4. What was the total loss in dollars to producers because of these deductions?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. 2,554 milk and cream shippers.

2. $1,696,868.84.

3. Deductions from subsidy payments for the export equalization fund were made against each shipper's total deliveries, at the same rate for deliveries up to quota and over quota. 1,202 shipped more than their quota.

4. The figure of deductions on account of over quota deliveries is not available.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE GRANTS

Question No. 692—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. How many applications for grants have been received by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion since the coming into force of the Regional Development Incentives Act?

2. How many applications have been granted?

3. What was the total amount requested?

4. What amount has the Department decided to grant?

5. How many applications have been made to the Department for grants of (a) more than $1,000,000 (b) from $500,000 to $1,000,000 (c) from $250,000 to $500,000 (d) from $100,000 to $250,000 (e) less than $100,000?

6. What was the percentage approved in each of the above categories?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1, 2 and 4. This information is contained in the reports on the operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act tabled monthly in Parliament.

3, 5 and 6. The applicant does not request an amount. Within the maxima provided for in the legislation, the Department makes the offer judged appropriate to the particular case.

[*English*]

CHARTERED BANK EARNINGS, EXPENDITURES AND PROFITS

Question No. 697—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. What were the total earnings, expenditures and profits of each of the Chartered Banks of Canada in the past five years?

2. In each of the past five years, what were the Bank of Canada interest rates and on what dates did these rates become effective?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Published financial statements of individual chartered banks indicate the following amounts of Earnings, Expenses and Profits for financial years 1965-1969:

(millions of dollars)

Total Earnings	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Bank of Montreal	265.8	300.2	342.1	431.0	577.7
The Bank of Nova Scotia	183.3	213.9	247.8	325.3	439.4
The Toronto-Dominion Bank	147.5	168.3	194.9	263.4	260.7
La Banque Provinciale du Canada	31.4	34.5	39.2	49.1	62.8
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	300.8	339.9	386.0	503.7	668.4
The Royal Bank of Canada	295.8	364.0	418.6	528.0	696.1
Banque Canadienne Nationale	51.3	62.6	72.4	93.4	118.2
The Mercantile Bank of Canada	9.1	12.5	14.7	14.4	16.5
Bank of British Columbia	—	—	—	1.0	3.4
Total	1,285.0	1,496.0	1,715.7	2,209.2	2,943.1

Questions

Total Expenses	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969
Bank of Montreal	223.4	248.9	290.1	363.3	481.6
The Bank of Nova Scotia	161.2	184.5	212.8	275.9	379.3
The Toronto-Dominion Bank	126.0	143.5	164.8	221.4	307.0
La Banque Provinciale du Canada	26.5	29.7	32.8	41.0	51.6
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	248.1	277.2	314.4	407.5	543.2
The Royal Bank of Canada	244.4	302.4	349.7	425.8	575.8
Banque Canadienne Nationale	42.9	53.0	60.1	79.3	100.8
The Mercantile Bank of Canada	9.8	13.5	15.1	13.4	15.1
Bank of British Columbia	—	—	—	.7	3.3
Total	1,082.3	1,252.7	1,440.0	1,828.3	2,457.5
Profits					
Bank of Montreal	23.0	30.3	31.5	49.6	54.6
The Bank of Nova Scotia	11.6	17.6	21.8	33.5	29.5
The Toronto-Dominion Bank	11.3	13.8	17.8	27.4	26.4
La Banque Provinciale du Canada	2.6	2.5	3.9	5.3	7.0
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	30.0	36.3	44.5	60.5	57.8
The Royal Bank of Canada	29.1	36.1	38.1	65.6	58.2
Banque Canadienne Nationale	4.3	4.9	7.2	8.5	8.3
The Mercantile Bank of Canada	— .7	— 1.0	— .4	.9	1.4
Bank of British Columbia	—	—	—	.3	.1
Total	111.1	140.5	164.3	251.7	243.4

Notes: (1) Two banks (Royal and Nationale) had 11-month financial years in 1965. On a full year basis 1965 Earnings, Expenses and Profits would all have been somewhat larger.
(2) A special $15 millions contribution to Pension Fund in 1969 has not been included in Expenses of Bank of Montreal.
(3) Profits are the net of total Earnings and Expenses less all provision for income taxes.

2. Rate

Percent	Effective
4¾	December 6/65
5¼	March 14/66
5	January 30/67
4½	April 7/67
5	September 27/67
6	November 20/67
7	January 22/68
7½	March 15/68
7	July 2/68
6½	July 29/68
6	September 3/68
6½	December 18/68
7	March 3/69
7½	June 11/69
8	July 16/69

TRAVEL EXPENDITURES, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

Question No. 700—**Mr. Forrestall:**

What was the total cost of travel inside and outside Canada of the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his aides during the past fiscal year?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Total cost during the fiscal year 1968-69 was $7,103.99.

REPORT ON CONDITIONS IN VIET NAM

Question No. 703—**Mr. Mather:**

Did Doctor A. Vennema report to the government concerning conditions as he found them in Vietnam after the Tet offensive of 1968 and (a) if so, was this report confidential (b) if not, is a copy of the report available?

[Mr. Benson.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes. (a) Yes. (b) Not applicable.

ACCEPTANCE OF GOVERNMENT CHEQUES BY COMMERCIAL BANKS

Question No. 706—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Are commercial banks required to accept cheques issued by the Government of Canada, provided that the payee is properly identified?

2. Has the government received complaints that commercial banks are refusing to accept government cheques and, if so, what action has the government taken in this regard?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. No provision of the Bank Act requires a bank to accept cheques issued by the Government of Canada or any other cheques if the person presenting such cheques does not maintain an account with the bank.

2. There have been a few complaints from persons who did not maintain an account with the bank at which the cheque was presented. Letters have been sent to those who have complained, explaining the situation set forth in (1) above.

HALIFAX—POSTAL DELIVERY TO APARTMENTS AND HOMES

Question No. 711—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. How many apartment buildings and homes in the City of Halifax are eligible for postal delivery by mailmen but cannot receive same under the austerity programme?

2. How many extra post office employees would be required to service such?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. None.

2. Not applicable.

TOM LONGBOAT MEMORIAL TROPHY

Question No. 712—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. Since January 1, 1960, what is the name of each person who has been awarded the Tom Longboat Memorial Trophy?

2. In each case, did the recipient of the award have possession of the said Trophy and, if not, where was the Trophy located?

3. What form does the said Trophy take and is there any monetary aspect to it?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. 1960, Mr. Arthur Obey; 1961, Mr. Bruce Bruyère; 1962, Mr. Tom Watts; 1963, Mr. John Lewis; 1964, Miss Vivian Underwood; 1965, Mr. George H. Brown; 1966, Mr. Ron Jamieson; 1967, Mr. Wilton Littlechild; 1968, Miss Phyllis Bomberry; 1969, Bert Mistaken Chief.

2. In most cases the recipient is presented with the trophy but it is customary for it to remain in his Agency Office, where everyone can see it.

3. (a) It is silver approximately 18 inches high, and a new crest is placed on it each year with the recipient's name. (b) No money is awarded; however, each recipient receives a medal which he keeps.

CANADA SAVINGS BONDS

Question No. 716—**Mr. Harkness:**

1. As of December 10, what is the amount of 1969 Savings Bonds which have been sold?

2. What amount of this is represented by previous years' Canada Savings Bonds having been turned in for the 1969 issue?

3. What is the amount of new money actually secured?

4. What has been the cost of this operation broken down into (a) advertising (b) commissions to dealers and agents (c) payments to banks (d) cost of the new bonds (e) other expenses?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Total sales of the 1969/70 Series of Canada Savings Bonds to December 10, 1969 amounted to $4,721 million.

2. Canada Savings Bonds were redeemed between October 1st and December 10th in the amount of $2,591 million. The purpose for which Canada Savings Bonds are redeemed is not known and it is, therefore, not possible to state what portion of the total redemption was made in order to permit purchase of the 1969/70 Series.

3. The amount of the net increase in Canada Savings Bonds outstanding from October 1st (the date on which the 1969/70 Series went on sale) to December 10th was $1,130 million.

4. (a) $1,576,000. (b) and (c) The total sales commission and issuing fee payable to banks, investment dealers and other sales and issuing agents on sales made to December 10th is $42.2 million. Sales commission payable to investment dealers included in this figure is approximately $5.2 million. It is not possible at this time to determine the exact division of the remaining sales commission and the issuing fee between banks and other agents. (d) $1,260,000. (e) $787,000.

HMCS "KOOTENAY"—USE OF ARMED FORCES TUGS

Question No. 719—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What ocean going tugs are owned by the Canadian Armed Forces and which are in commission?

2. Did the Department of National Defence consider using such for the return of *HMCS Kootenay* after her recent mishap in North Atlantic waters?

3. For what reasons was a foreign tug used for the return of *HMCS Kootenay*?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): 1. St. Charles.

2. Yes. However this vessel was in refit at Pictou, N.S.

3. As the Commander, Maritime Command's operational plan called for the return of *HMCS Kootenay* to Canada in mid-November, tenders were called from companies which it was felt would be able to provide maximum security for the vessel. L. Smit & Company was considered to offer the best possibility for the lowest price.

ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTING PORT BICKERTON-COUNTRY HARBOUR ROAD

Question No. 722—**Mr. MacEwan:**

Has the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion received a communication from the Goldboro-Bayview District Board of Trade, Isaac's Harbour, Nova Scotia, requesting assistance for the construction of a 10-mile proposed road from Port

Bickerton to Country Harbour, known as the "missing link" and, if so, what action does the Department intend to take?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Yes, but federal assistance would be to the government of Nova Scotia, with whom the request will be reviewed.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENTS

Question No. 724—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

How many men of all ranks have retired from the Armed Forces, month-by-month, since January 1969 with service of (a) less than 6 months (b) 6-12 months (c) 12-24 months?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): The total number of men who have been released in 1969 for misconduct, unsatisfactory service, medical, voluntary and death is as follows:

	(a)	(b)
January	77	43
February	123	29
March	125	45
April	134	55
May	195	86
June	208	69
July	207	68
August	167	74
September	145	133
October	125	113

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT—APPLICATIONS AND OFFERS TO OCT. 20, 1969

Question No. 730—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. From the period of its inception up to October 20, 1969, how many applications were received under the Regional Development Incentives Act, and from whom were such applications received?

2. How many were rejected?

3. What were the reasons for rejection, in each case?

4. How many offers were made under the Regional Development Incentives Act up to October 20, 1969?

5. To whom were such offers made?

6. In each case, what was the location of plant, type of industry, type of project, estimated cost, estimated employment, and rate of offer?

7. How many offers were accepted?

8. What are the names and addresses of the companies accepting such offers?

9. Of the accepted offers, how many have begun construction or installation and where is such construction or installation taking place?

10. What is the estimated date of completion in each case?

11. Of the accepted offers, how many have not begun construction or installation?

[Mr. MacEwan.]

12. What are the reasons for delay in each case?

13. When is it estimated work will start and be completed in each case?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The first report on the operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act was tabled in Parliament October 27, 1969. As other information ceases to be confidential to the applicants, it will be included in future monthly reports.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT—APPLICATIONS AND OFFERS, OCT. 21-NOV. 30, 1969

Question No. 731—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. During the period October 21-November 30, 1969, how many applications were received under the Regional Development Incentives Act, and from whom were such applications received?

2. How many were rejected?

3. In each case, what were the reasons for rejection?

4. How many offers were made, and to whom were such offers made during the period October 21-November 30, 1969?

5. In each case, what was the location of plant, type of industry, type of project, estimated cost, estimated employment and rate of offer?

6. Which companies accepted such offers made?

7. Of the accepted offers, how many have begun construction or installation, and where is such construction or installation taking place?

8. What is the expected date of completion in each case?

9. Of the accepted offers, how many have not begun construction or installation?

10. What are the reasons for delay in each case?

11. When is the estimated date of start and completion in each case?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The second report on the operation of the Regional Development Incentives Act was tabled in Parliament December 4, 1969. As other information ceases to be confidential to the applicants, it will be included in future monthly reports.

VETERANS AFFAIRS SURPLUS EMPLOYEES, N.B.

Question No. 744—**Mr. MacRae:**

Of the 26 employees in the Department of Veterans Affairs, New Brunswick, including Canadian Pension Commission and War Veterans Allowance Board who have been notified they are surplus to staff requirements (a) what are the names of these employees (b) which ones are War Veterans (c) what is the period of service of each?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):

(a) (b) (c)

Name	War Veteran	DVA Service			War Service
		Years	Months	Days	
Cosman, I.	No	17	9	—	—
Hersey, C.	No	16	10	1	—
Kennedy, F. D.	No	8	8	13	—
Morrison, R.	No	7	6	27	—
Wallace, E.	No	21	3	20	—
Holmes, W. S.	No	6	3	3	—
Campbell, N.	Yes	19	1	19	2- 9-39 to 6- 3-45
Isnor, M. E.	Yes	12	5	30	3- 3-43 to 16- 5-46
Doncaster, A. A.	Yes	22	2	28	3- 9-39 to 10-11-44
Harquail, T. D.	Yes	3	2	22	10- 7-40 to 6- 9-45
Oakford, E. C.	Yes	13	1	18	3- 8-42 to 5- 3-46
Waddell, A. D.	Yes	13	2	30	28- 4-43 to 6-10-45
Mazerolle, J. F. A.	No	4	7	3	—
Cooper, G. R.	Yes	4	4	25	1-12-43 to 27- 3-46
MacDonald, A. L. R.	No	15	—	28	—
Wilson, M. A.	No	4	4	17	—
Clark, J. L. J.	Yes	2	3	—	26- 6-42 to 22-10-45
Lanteigne, N. C. D.	No	4	3	13	—
McNamara, P. E.	No	3	5	16	—
Horncastle, F. H.	Yes	24	2	26	20- 7-40 to 16-10-45
Anderson, M. G.	Yes	23	10	—	8- 9-40 to 6- 3-46
Parlee, M. C.	No	4	8	6	—
Wood, I. M.	No	27	6	29	—
Henry, W. A.	Yes	24	4	—	11- 9-39 to 25- 9-45
Johnston, G. F.	Yes	23	4	25	13- 9-39 to 13- 6-45
Collins, Elinor K.	No	16	—	—	—

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF LABOUR

Question No. 28—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70, what specific research studies have been undertaken by the Research and Development Branch of the Department of Labour?

2. Who are the individuals involved in these studies and when is it anticipated that these studies will be completed?

Return tabled.

MOVEMENT OF DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES

Question No. 46—**Mr. Lewis:**

1. Which federal government department is responsible for the safety control of transferring or moving dangerous materials, poisons and poisonous gases within Canada?

2. Which federal government department is responsible for the control of dangerous materials, poisons and poisonous gases moving across Canada's border?

3. What specific standards have been established for such shipments within and across Canada's borders?

4. Did officials stop the shipment of phosgene gas from the United States to Canada during the first week in August, 1969 and if so, for what reason?

5. At that time, were all shipments of poisons, poisonous gases and other dangerous materials being stopped from entry into Canada?

6 Are officials of the Department of National Revenue presently prohibiting all shipments of poison gas from the United States to Canada and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

OIL LAND EXPLORATION PERMITS

Question No. 95—**Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):**

1. What permits for oil land exploration in Canada's Yukon and Northwest Territories have been issued by the federal government?

2. For the above permits, what are (a) the names and addresses of individuals or corporations holding such permits (b) the names of the members of each consortium holding a permit, with the percentage interest held by each member of the consortium respectively (c) the total acreage covered by the permit or permits held by each individual or corporation and by each consortium respectively, and (d) the percentage owned or controlled by non-residents of Canada for each individual corporation or consortium respectively?

Return tabled.

Orders for Returns

OFFSHORE OIL EXPLORATION PERMITS

Question No. 96—**Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):**

1. What permits for offshore oil exploration have been issued by the federal government for (a) the east Canadian coast (b) the west Canadian coast (c) the Hudson Bay-Hudson Strait region, and (d) the Arctic coast?

2. For the above permits, what are (a) the names and addresses of individuals or corporations holding such permits, (b) the names of the members of each consortium holding a permit; with the percentage interest held by each member of the consortium respectively, (c) the total acreage covered by the permit or permits held by each individual person or corporation and by each consortium respectively, and (d) the percentage owned or controlled by non-residents of Canada for each individual corporation or consortium respectively?

Return tabled.

"TELECOMMISSION" INQUIRY

Question No. 246—**Mr. Gilbert:**

1. Who are the members of 'Telecommission', the inquiry into all aspects of the telecommunications industry?

2. When is it anticipated that the above inquiry will be completed?

3 Will the report on the above inquiry be made public?

4. What specific studies are to be undertaken with regard to the above inquiry?

5. What studies will be undertaken within the public service and which officials will be participating in each of these internal studies?

6. What studies will be carried out by outside consultants?

7. Have these consultants been chosen, and, if so, (a) what expenditure is involved in each study (b) was there a competitive tender for each of the outside studies?

8. If no competitive tendering has taken place, what are are reasons?

9. Will each of these specific studies, undertaken both internally and externally, be made public and, if not, for what reason?

Return tabled.

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD—PRICE QUOTATIONS

Question No. 252—**Mr. Burton:**

What were the daily price quotations announced by the Canadian Wheat Board for each day since June 1, 1969?

Return tabled.

ACCESS TO TELEVISION NETWORKS

Question No. 315—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. What cities in Canada have access to the two Canadian television networks, CBC and CTV and, what is the population of each of these cities?

[Mr. Thomson.]

2. What Canadian cities of 20,000 and more population do not have access to the two Canadian networks?

3. What plans are in process to make the two networks available to all populous areas of Canada and, when is it expected that this objective will be realized?

Return tabled.

FORT WILLIAM-PORT ARTHUR—GRANTS TO HOSPITALS

Question No. 376—**Mr. Badanai:**

What federal government grants have been made each year since 1957 to (a) McKellar General Hospital, Fort William, Ontario (b) St. Joseph's General Hospital, Port Arthur, Ontario (c) Port Arthur General Hospital, Port Arthur, Ontario?

Return tabled.

• (2:30 p.m.)

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—CANADIAN ACTION FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), 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 situation arising out of the destruction of the Uli airport and the possibility of the collapse of Biafran resistance, to the end that Canada may play an effective role in organizing and participating in an expanded observer team in Biafra, so as to ensure that guarantees given by the federal authorities against reprisals upon Biafran personnel be fully observed, and that a massive international relief operation be urgently organized, utilizing where possible existing relief distribution personnel, so as to minimize the widespread starvation which is imminent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Greenwood has given the Chair the required notice of the proposed motion. I have had occasion to consider the matter very seriously, and I have listened to the contributions made earlier today following the statement made on motions by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

On reflection and after taking into account all the factors in this matter I tend to the conclusion that this is the kind of urgent

situation to which the House might want to direct its attention on an urgent basis. Considering all the factors and all the circumstances I would rule that the motion should be put and, if it is carried, that the debate take place at eight o'clock this evening. Therefore I will seek the opinion of the House on whether or not the hon. member has leave to move the motion for the purpose of discussing the matter stated by him under the terms of Standing Order 26.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The debate on the proposed motion shall stand over until eight o'clock this evening.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BIAFRA—SAFETY OF CANADIANS—LOCATION OF AIRCRAFT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I realize that we are going to have a debate this evening on this question but I should like to direct a related question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will the minister say whether he has been in touch with the High Commissioner in Lagos to ascertain the whereabouts and safety of Canadians engaged in relief work in Biafra?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, before the collapse of the Biafran resistance it was our understanding that there were only three Canadians working in that area. Our information is that they were all safely evacuated.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs inform the House whether or not the Canadian aircraft are being moved into forward positions in order to be able to provide relief, or are these aircraft being maintained in Canada at this juncture?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will allow the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition and certainly will allow the minister to reply. However, I think it should be in order for me at this time to caution hon. members that in view of the fact there will be a debate tonight these questions might perhaps be asked at that time. I assume the minister would then make a statement in reply to points raised by hon. members. As I have said, the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition is quite in order and it might be replied to at this time by the minister.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we have been looking at this question very carefully. The advice we received from the military authorities in this country is that under present circumstances, if we have our planes ready here to fly, they are probably in as good a position to fulfil the vital role of relief operations as they would be if they were at a place like London, for example. There is no question, of course, about moving them into Lagos until we have an agreement with the Nigerian authorities.

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF SITUATION BY STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might put a supplementary question to the Government House Leader rather than to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the motion made a few minutes ago and the apparent willingness of all hon. members to deal in some continuing way with the situation, and because of the necessity at this point of having a small body of people able to look at some of the details which undoubtedly will be presented in a general way during the debate this evening, would the Government House Leader be agreeable to meeting with other House Leaders some time during the day with a view to bringing forward a suitable motion, perhaps this evening, so the committee might be empowered to carry on this type of activity?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there is a House Leaders meeting scheduled for 3:30 p.m.

While I am on my feet perhaps I could point out that there was agreement that the business to be called for today, Bill C-12, would be disposed of at today's sitting. Perhaps we might have an agreement that private members' hour be suspended in order that Bill C-12 be disposed of by six o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. Baldwin: Possibly we could discuss that also at 3:30, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—USE OF CANAIRELIEF SERVICES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether I might direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in relation to his statement on motions which he can answer now or answer tonight when we are having the debate. It might give the House some information that would be useful in that discussion. The minister has mentioned the fact that the Red Cross will be used and that there may be an air drop to supply relief to the people of Nigeria. He has made no mention of utilizing the services of Canairelief which is associated with the Joint Church Aid Program. I want to ask him whether it is the government's intention to use that organization, and will the $1 million which was to be appropriated to assist them in this task be available to that organization?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this morning when we received the news that the Biafran resistance had collapsed I was in touch with both General Wrinch of the Canadian Red Cross and Dr. Johnson of Canairelief to discuss the resulting situation. I informed General Wrinch, of course, about our desire to use the Red Cross as the acknowledged international authority as far as possible. I spoke to Dr. Johnson who told me that Canairelief had supplies on the island of Sao Tome and was ready to co-operate. He wanted me to convey this to the government in Lagos. I asked him in return, if Canairelief was not acceptable to the Nigerian authorities, whether the available supplies would be available to any other organization. He answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Have any direct representations been made to the government of Nigeria in Lagos in respect of allowing Canairelief to fly into Uli and has any favourable reply been received?

Mr. Sharp: Our High Commissioner has, of course, quite recently been in touch with the government in Lagos about the operation of Canairelief. Needless to say, because Canairelief operated night flights contrary to the wishes of the Nigerian government its position is not as strong in that regard as it would otherwise be. However, I do accept the statement of Dr. Johnson that they would wish to co-operate with whatever agency is in control, and I hope the supplies can be moved quickly into position.

[*Translation*]

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONFLICT

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Since the nations which supply the belligerents with arms as well as armament makers are among those mainly responsible for the situation in Nigeria and Biafra, does the minister intend to propose, at the next session of the United Nations, that a study be made on the position of those countries and on the military assistance they have granted to Nigeria and to Biafra, with a view to determining who is actually responsible for this war, and preventing further military disorders of this type?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the cause of the war did not lie particularly with those who, contrary to our wishes, supplied arms. It lay, of course, in the internal situation in Nigeria.

MANITOBA CENTENNIAL

SUBSTITUTE FOR CANCELLED WORLD HOCKEY TOURNAMENT

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, since the Biafran situation is to be debated this evening might I change the subject by asking a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that the world hockey tournament has been cancelled and because the hockey series was an important item in connection with Manitoba's centennial celebration, what alternative is the government considering in order to compensate Winnipeg for the expense already incurred?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The CAHA and Hockey Canada, on which body the government of Canada is represented, are now working out some other suitable arrangements whereby we can have, we hope, a very interesting, hockey tournament of very high calibre in Winnipeg during the centennial. We think it

will have attractive features. The details of the tournament, as I say, are not yet developed but are being worked out.

[*Later:*]

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare which is supplementary to an earlier one. Can the minister assure the House that Canada's national team will not be disbanded and will continue to be available for games throughout the nation?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, my advice is that the national team is carrying on its operations in respect of outstanding commitments it has had in Canada for some time. How long after that the team will continue has not been decided.

RCMP MUSICAL RIDE—ASSUMPTION OF MAINTENANCE COSTS

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Solicitor General in respect of the centennial celebration. In view of the importance to the Manitoba centennial of the appearance throughout the province of the RCMP musical ride, will the government give consideration to helping Manitoba communities to finance the ride by assuming the maintenance costs of the personnel and horses during the tour?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a suggestion which is really not a question. I think he must assume the suggestion has been placed before the government for consideration and will be considered in due course.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Could he not make it possible for the existing parliamentary hockey team to participate in the Winnipeg festival?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: That is also a suggestion which we can assume will be considered by the government.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ABOLITION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. On behalf of the war veterans of Canada would the minister agree to take steps to have the serious question of the abolition and reclassification of military awards referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs before a decision is made so that the opinions of some one million veterans in Canada can be heard?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal that we are willing to consider, but no decision has yet been made to that effect.

[*English*]

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I should like to ask the Secretary of State why British Commonwealth gallantry awards have been suspended since, I understand, February of last year?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any announcement was made along this line. However, I know that a committee has been formed in which six federal departments are represented at the civil servants level in order to study the question of gallantry awards.

I want to point out at the same time that some press reports these last few days were somewhat absurd. Indeed, they were dealing with awards granted only in war time, which is irrelevant at present since Canada is not at war with anybody.

[*English*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

DISCONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN SERVICES—REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to the Minister of Transport. In view of the adverse effect on railway passengers and railway employees as a result of the discontinuance of certain CNR trains from Vancouver to Winnipeg, would the minister discuss with officials of the CNR the possibility of at least continuing those trains until the application for permanent discontinuance is heard and decided by the Canadian Transport Commission?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad to bring these representations to the attention of officials of the CNR. I have already discussed the matter with them.

Inquiries of the Ministry

While I am standing may I apologize to certain members to whom I inadvertently gave an incorrect assessment before the recess. I said in the committee that there would be a hearing, but I was thinking in terms of a discontinuance. The CTC does not have authority to hold a hearing on this particular matter, but as I say I will discuss the matter in line with the representations made.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which is based on the undertaking the minister gave us on December 10. What has happened in respect of the offer he made to convene a meeting of the CN management with members of constituencies affected in order to discuss the discontinuance of trains 5 and 6.

Mr. Jamieson: Nothing has happened. Perhaps it is my fault. I was under the impression that hon. members interested would get in touch with me and indicate a time. If you will let me know the time I will be glad to do it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The offer was accepted on December 10.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): In connection with this discontinuance of railway service will the minister press Canadian National Railways not to act in the arbitrary and altogether cavalier manner it has? After all, Parliament votes the money for the CNR and Parliament should have some right to say whether or not such action is justified.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I repeat that I shall be very glad to make these representations to both railways, but I have to emphasize that where it is only a reduction in service there is no legal mechanism that can be employed. Where there is a discontinuance the CTC has indicated it will hold hearings on such discontinuance.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I realize this is so, but what about Parliament? Parliament votes the money, and surely these railway services should not be discontinued in the manner in which the CNR is now carrying on.

Mr. Orlikow: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the so-called reduction is in fact a complete cancellation, if only for some months, would the minister consider the possibility of amending the legislation so that this kind of discontinuing could be considered by the CTC?

[Mr. Jamieson.]

Mr. Jamieson: I shall be glad to consider that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

SAINT-ROMUALD—LAY-OFF OF 325 EMPLOYEES OF B.V.D. COMPANY

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Could he tell the House what steps the government intends to take to prevent the dismissal of 325 employees at the B.V.D. plant at St. Romuald?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I met the mayor of St. Romuald, on Saturday, in Quebec City. Today, he is in Ottawa and we are in contact with the Department of Trade and Commerce of both the federal government and the province of Quebec. We are trying to find a way to prevent the closing of this plant.

Mr. Dumont: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Has the minister considered the possibility for the government to subsidize the construction of 24 Greek ships so as to prevent the Davie Shipbuilding yards in Lauzon from closing down?

Mr. Speaker: This is not a supplementary question.

[*English*]

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION BASED ON THIRD REPORT OF COMMISSION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Does the government expect to introduce at this session legislation based upon the recommendations in the third report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, which report was given to the government early in December, and may I say I feel sure that the Prime Minister and his colleagues have been studying it assiduously in the weeks that have intervened?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member has been studying it as assiduously as I have he will know that I do not see that it necessarily involves legislation at this session to implement some of its recommendations.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister has not answered the question. When does the government expect to make known its views on the recommendations in the third report—

Mr. Trudeau: That is not what you asked.

Mr. Hees: Yes, I did. I asked first of all—Mr. Speaker, I will ask my question again. Does the government expect to introduce at this session legislation based on the recommendations in the third report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism—

Mr. Trudeau: That is what you asked.

Mr. Hees: —which has been in the hands of the government for several weeks and which I feel sure members of the government have studied very hard. Can we have an answer, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Then may I ask another question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked a question, and I understand that the hon. member for Annapolis Valley has a supplementary.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Yes, Mr. Speaker, and again it is to the Prime Minister. I hope he will come down out of the clouds and off the ski slopes to answer my question. In his statement on December 19 last the Prime Minister said that after he had reviewed the third report of the commission he would make a statement to the House on motions. Is he considering making a statement and when will it be made?

Mr. Trudeau: I am not certain.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true that the government has decided to shelve this whole report because it is a little too hot to handle?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—MONETARY AND FISCAL POLICIES AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Arising out of a press conference which he held, according to my information, on December 22 last I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is now government policy to pursue monetary and fiscal policies that will result in an unemployment rate of 6 per cent across the country which, of course, would mean a much higher rate of unemployment in some parts of the country?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked the question in such a way that it is difficult for the Chair to accept it procedurally. He has asked merely for a statement of government policy. I would think the question as asked in this way is not in order. Perhaps it might be rephrased.

Mr. Lewis: May I first ask the Prime Minister whether his reported statement that the government is prepared to have an unemployment rate as high as 6 per cent was a statement of government policy?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Not of policy, Mr. Speaker. It is something we hope will not happen but it is something that might happen if the private sector does not combat inflation as vigorously as the federal government has.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, following upon the answer which the Prime Minister gave. Is he stating to the House that the government will not change its policies even though the unemployment rate may go up to 6 per cent?

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the Prime Minister's concern about getting the co-operation of the private sector of the economy, may I ask whether or not his government is prepared to accede to the request of the United Steelworkers of Canada that a public inquiry be held into the increase in the price of steel, which they claim is completely unwarranted and unjustified?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, if I may answer that question, it is quite clear that there will be a public inquiry when the report of the Prices and Incomes Commission is referred to the committee. The motion for the setting up of that committee is on the order paper and I hope it will be debated very soon so that the committee can be set up and can consider the report.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a further supplementary question, will the inquiry by the Prices and

Incomes Commission be a public inquiry or a hole-in-the-corner inquiry which will make it impossible to question the steel companies with respect to their exorbitant profits?

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of his recently expressed desire to have the private sector agree to reasonable guidelines, is he now willing to call a meeting himself of the leaders of industry and labour to try to persuade them of the necessity for coming to such an agreement?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the ministers of the government in various departments have been consulting with various sectors of industry to ensure the results that the hon. member is seeking. There is no need at this point for me to convene a general meeting of all industry.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES

USE OF PICLORAM TO DEFOLIATE BORDER STRIP

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the government agreed to a proposal to defoliate a strip of the eastern section of the Canada-U.S. border with a chemical called picloram?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, for years brush and tree cutting was done by hand in this area. Since the mid-1950s the Boundary Commission has benefited from the experience of hydro companies, highway departments and other organizations maintaining brush-free rights of way and has used selective herbicides. The commission has consulted conservation authorities to ensure that the herbicides used not only permit desirable growth such as grass and ferns but are also non-toxic to animal life.

Mr. Aiken: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, am I to take it from this that the minister's department and the other departments involved are satisfied that there is no danger to the environment through the use of this chemical?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

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

DRUGS

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF LEDAIN COMMISSION—LEGALIZING OF MARIJUANA

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Can he tell us whether the LeDain Commission on drugs has finished its report, and when it will be brought before the House of Commons?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, my latest information is that the preliminary report of the LeDain Commission will be available some time during the latter part of February. As to whether it will be made available to the House of Commons I cannot answer that because no decision has been made.

Mr. Woolliams: As a supplementary question, does the minister follow the Prime Minister's stand in reference to legalizing marijuana or the Solicitor General's stand? What is the policy of the government at this time prior to the presentation of the commission's report?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice. Does he intend to order the suspension of proceedings against the users of marijuana and hashish until the LeDain report is published?

[*English*]

Mr. Munro: That matter has not yet been decided.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please! May we have some order, please. We might go on to another question.

Mr. Woolliams: But I have just started it—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member says he has just started. That is what I am afraid of. There are a number of hon. members anxious to ask questions, starting with the right hon. member for Prince Albert.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question would not be exactly supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret that I have to interrupt the right hon. member but I believe the hon. member for Saint-Denis has a question of privilege.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Saint-Denis on a question of privilege.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the Minister of Justice was preparing to answer the question when the Minister of National Health and Welfare did answer it.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: In the circumstances, it might be in order to allow the Minister of Justice to reply to the question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa Carleton): The answer to the question is, Mr. Speaker, that we are not in any way prejudging the issue and as the law is the law the Department of Justice will attempt to give the appropriate advice to the courts on the basis of existing law.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder if I might follow that up, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he intends to amend the law to fit the Prime Minister's philosophy or the Minister of National Health and Welfare's philosophy?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, my question arises out of a statement made at a press conference. Would the Minister of National Health and Welfare be able to inform the House whether, when the Prime Minister at a press conference made the announcement that marijuana was going to be legalized, he was speaking for the government or just speaking *ex cathedra*?

LABOUR RELATIONS

VANCOUVER WATERFRONT—STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. In view of the imperative necessity that there should not be a lock-out or strike on the waterfront in Vancouver and the three-month peace arrangement made with the Minister of Labour, which is rapidly nearing an end, could he inform the House now as to the status of negotiations?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the negotiators representing the workers on the various waterfronts in Vancouver have submitted new or revised demands to management and a meeting is going ahead as scheduled.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Winch: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, regarding the Harbours Board in Vancouver. Could I ask the Minister of Labour if he understands that both the employer and the union will conclude their new negotiations and report prior to the deadline of three months which he was able to arrange, after which there is the right to strike?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, theoretically the right to strike exists at this moment. It was the unions themselves who volunteered not to strike before February 5 in an effort to arrive at a satisfactory settlement with management. I am hoping that such a satisfactory settlement will be arrived at, and I am rather encouraged by the fact that both parties are now meeting for that very purpose.

MONTREAL WATERFRONT—PUBLICATION OF REPORT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister going to make public the report dealing with conditions in the port of Montreal?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that no senior official of any department, no member of the House of Commons on either side nor anybody in private industry has suggested that the report be suppressed or not made public. What I said stands. As I said on December 17, I received the report in October, sent it out for translation and printing and it was then put before a departmental committee of the Department of Labour for analysis and study. That work was completed during the holidays and it has now been referred to the Department of Transport and the National Harbours Board for their observations. When and if the report is to be tabled will be announced in due course.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask

the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion a question which I have asked on two previous occasions concerning the fact that the position of chairman of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, a position of great importance, is vacant. Is the minister in a position to inform the House as to who the new chairman will be? I find it difficult to believe that it is beyond the capacity of this government to fill this position with a competent person.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I am not in a position to announce that appointment. I hope I can do so shortly. Several people have been approached; however, some refused and others were probably not able to fill the job. As soon as we can appoint somebody, we shall be glad to proceed.

[*English*]

ALLEGED ILLEGAL USE OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION FUND

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion also. I should like to ask if he has received a protest wire from Local 4527 indicating illegal use of the UIC fund by Devco and, if so, what would the nature of his answer be?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I have not received it. I shall check with the departments to ascertain if they received the wire and who received it.

Mr. MacInnis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would speak to the authorities who have been quoted on several occasions but to my knowledge have yet to come forth with any decision. Would he look into the question of the legality of the plan put forth by Devco? I think it is a matter of interest to all members of this House that legislation passed by this House has been used as a back-door method to violate existing contracts.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): A short supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Labour if he received a wire with reference to this particular problem of unemployment insurance?

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. It is possible that the Unemployment Insurance Commission received such a wire. Indeed, I think members will recall the fact that, contrary to the opinion expressed, the procedure is a legal one not unique to Devco; there are 100-odd such arrangements. The Unemployment Insurance Commission and the then Minister of Manpower got together to do what they thought was in the best interests of workers and miners. As a result of that action, many people who would have been prematurely out of work with no income are at least guaranteed a substantial income.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any legal opinion because I have already asked for such an opinion from the law officers of the Crown. I ask the Minister of Labour if he does not consider that the fact a man, who is released from his position is forced to use the UIC fund to pay for his retirement, is a violation of the insurance fund?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that the question as asked would invite an expression of opinion by the minister and, therefore, the question is not phrased properly.

Mr. MacInnis: The Minister of Labour has tried to imply that a legal opinion has been given, but that is not the case because I have put the question to both law officers of the Crown, the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice. I put it to them verbally and in writing some time last September, but as yet neither one of those law officers has expressed an opinion. Therefore the Minister of Labour is not in a position to state what the law officers of the Crown have said on this matter.

PESTICIDES

FAO RECOMMENDATIONS RESPECTING RESIDUE TOLERANCE IN FOOD

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the important two-week December meeting in Rome of pesticide experts from the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization on the evaluation of the hazard to man of pesticide residues in food, have the recommendations arising from the meeting on residue tolerance for use in regulating residues in food moving in commerce been received by

his department? If so, what action is planned on these recommendations? Is it the intention of the minister to make a statement to the House on this important matter?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the last part of the hon. member's lengthy question might be in order. I think it might be concentrated in these terms to inquire of the minister whether he proposes to make a statement on motions.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, my department is constantly in touch with the activities of the FAO. Whether or not they have received the report that the hon. member speaks of, and whether or not I can make a statement on motions I am not sure, but I shall look into it.

PARLIAMENT HILL

HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS ON ADJACENT GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. I wonder if the minister could consult with his colleague, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, and make a statement in the House with regard to the applicability of height restrictions on federal government buildings in the neighbourhood of Parliament Hill, with particular reference to the new National Defence building?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that could be arranged.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): A supplementary question for the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister or anyone on his behalf apply to the city of Ottawa for a building permit before commencing work on this building?

Mr. Laing: Yes, Mr. Speaker, about two months ago.

FISHERIES

RATIFICATION OF ICNAF RECOMMENDATION RESPECTING HADDOCK

Mr. Lloyd Crouse (South Shore): I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker. In view of the serious decline in the supplies of groundfish on the east coast, especially the supply of haddock, can the minister indicate whether the recommendation of ICNAF calling for a maximum annual haddock yield during the next three years beginning in January, 1970, of only 12,000 metric tons from Georges Bank and 18,000 metric tons from Browns Bank, has been ratified by all member countries of ICNAF?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we have high hopes that all member countries will take note of this recommendation and act accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Spadina.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

IMMIGRATION

MEASURES TO REMEDY DECLINE IN NUMBERS FROM EUROPE

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank hon. members on this side of the House. My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Does the government intend to take measures to remedy the drastic two-year decline in immigration to Canada from Europe?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question asked by the hon. member should normally be answered by way of a statement on motions.

Mr. Ryan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister make a statement in the near future about the drastic decline in immigration from Europe to Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, shortly before the House rose for the Christmas recess I made a statement on the question of immigration from Europe. I will look at that statement and if there is anything further I can add, I will be glad to do so.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly resume his seat. I might recognize him in a moment. This is an opportune moment for me to remind hon. members that we are running out of time and perhaps we ought to have as few supplementary questions as possible. I recognize the hon. member on a point of order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Ryan: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration made a good statement; at least, it was good in part. It only went into the negative aspects of the whole situation and made excuses. It did not indicate what positive steps were being taken to encourage immigration from Europe.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baldwin: They were not even good excuses.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

LAY-OFFS OF EMPLOYEES—CHARGES FOR USE OF FILMS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. Has reconsideration now been given to the decision to lay off National Film Board employees and to introduce user charges for films? If so, will the minister indicate what decision or action has been taken?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is no doubt aware that, upon the request of the National Film Board Commissioner, I have asked an independent person to study this double question and that a report in this regard is to be submitted to the Commissioner himself with copies going to the interested parties, on January 15, which leaves another 72 hours for such submission.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

PROCLAMATION OF REMAINDER OF AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BREATHALYZER

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. It arises out of the proclamation of only part of the Criminal Code amendments dealing with the breathalyzer. When is the minister expecting those parts giving rights to accused people to be proclaimed as well?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will not accept part of the preamble to that question because we believe the accused has sufficient rights under the legislation as it stands. In so far as that part of the question relating to providing a sample of breath is concerned, that matter will depend on an appropriate container being approved.

GRAIN

PROVISION OF SUFFICIENT BOXCARS FOR MOVEMENT

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In light of the heavy build-up of space for grain at our terminal elevators, what action, if any, is the minister taking to ensure that sufficient boxcars are made available to move grain into market position and thus greatly improve the serious cash position in which prairie farmers presently find themselves?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the direct responsibility in this matter is, of course, that of the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. However, I am working with him on a daily basis and had consultations with the railways as recently as Saturday. I am assured that they are taking all necessary or possible steps to bring about the most desirable situation.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING IN SAINT JOHN, N.B.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Will he take the House into his confidence as to the outcome of the meeting that took place on Friday last in Saint John, New Brunswick, involving himself, the deputy minister, the Atlantic Advisory Council and Devco?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did such a meeting take place? If so, can the minister tell us whether, as a result of this meeting, we shall finally obtain a development strategy, to quote the communique, for the Atlantic provinces?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is common knowledge that the meeting did take place. This was the second meeting with a committee which is supposed to advise the

department and the minister. As and when the committee wishes to submit such advice to me, it will do so and if the matter seems to warrant it, we will discuss it and report to the House.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

PROVISION OF CHINESE INTERPRETER SERVICE AT VANCOUVER

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. On December 11, 1969, I asked the minister whether, in view of difficulties encountered by the Chinese people in conversing with immigration officials in Vancouver and surrounding areas, he would consider reinstituting the Chinese interpreter services which have been eliminated without any explanation. At that time he did not answer. Is he willing to answer my question now?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that all services of that character will be furnished as required in that area.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

DERAILMENT AT TORONTO—ADEQUACY OF MAINTENANCE FORCES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the recent derailment of a CNR passenger train near Toronto as a result of faulty equipment, will the minister say whether adequate maintenance forces are employed to maintain track and equipment in a safe condition for the travelling public and employees?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, that is obviously such a complex question that I prefer to take it as notice.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question with alarming implications to direct to the Minister of National Health and Welfare which results from a statement made by a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council, the Hon. Judy LaMarsh, during the recess to the effect that the Prime Minister has no heart. What arrangements are being made for a transplant and which minister will volunteer?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: I must bring to the attention of hon. members that the question period expired a few moments ago. A number of hon. members were anxious to ask questions. I have tried to take note of them and will perhaps give them precedence tomorrow.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. On the last day before the recess, namely, Friday, December 19, 1969, as recorded at page 2184 of *Hansard*, a statement was made from the Chair, and appropriate action ought to be taken. In view of the statement from the Chair—and the Chair is always right—that "the Senate has now expired", I wonder if appropriate steps will now be taken to advise their Honours that they need not bother to come back on January 27.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (3:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved that Bill C-12, to establish the International Development Research Centre of Canada, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this measure is one of the most promising and exciting proposals to come before this House for some time. The bill provides for the establishment of an International Development Research Centre of Canada. This can be a new and dynamic element in Canada's contribution to the global struggle to improve the quality of life in the less privileged areas of the world.

It is now two decades since Canada first entered the field of co-operative international development as a founding member of the Colombo Plan. The recent meeting of the Colombo Plan Council in Victoria demonstrated how greatly our understanding of the com-

plex problems and possibilities of international development has changed as a result of our collective experience during these two decades. We have learned that direct transfers of capital and knowledge cannot by themselves provide all the ingredients necessary for the advancement of the less developed countries. Their problems cannot be resolved by mere transfers of some of our wealth; they must be helped to develop their own capabilities of producing the wealth they require to meet the needs and aspirations of their people. If capital and technical assistance are to be effective, they must take root in the specific setting of each of the developing societies. This calls for a clear understanding of the basic social, economic, political and cultural forces which affect the processes of growth and development in each society. It requires the development of new ways of applying existing technologies to meet the particular needs of the less developed countries. It also requires a greater knowledge of the factors which enable such technologies to be used to achieve the social goals of the societies. It requires a concerted attempt to discover new technologies.

The gap between the low income and the wealthier nations of the world is to a large extent a science and technology gap. There has always been a gap between rich and poor within most societies, but the massive disparities between the nations of the less developed areas of the world and the more industrialized nations is a fairly recent phenomenon. The average inhabitant of Southeast Asia, prior to the industrial revolution, enjoyed a standard of life not so very different from his counterpart in Europe, despite the differences in their cultures and modes of life. Certainly, the vast material gulf which separates them today did not exist then.

In the last century, those nations which were in the vanguard of the industrial revolution have achieved unprecedented levels of economic activity. This has come about in large measure because of their ability to unlock the secrets of science and to develop technologies and techniques for the application of scientific knowledge to the processes of production and distribution. The burgeoning market economy of these nations continues to provide powerful incentives for the employment of our scientific and technological resources in the search for new products and processes for the affluent consumer.

There is no similar incentive to apply science and technology to the problems of the less developed world. The very science and technology which has provided the key to the wealth of the industrialized nations has added to the difficulties of the less developed nations. Eradication of disease by mass immunization and the use of antibiotics has reduced death rates in the developing countries dramatically and brought about rapid increases in population. It has proven much more difficult for these countries to develop the increased productive capacity required to provide their growing populations with the basic ingredients that enable men to live in dignity. At the same time, science has devised synthetic substitutes for many of the natural products which these countries have depended upon for most of their export earnings. Despite the fact that in absolute terms the less developed nations have made a significant amount of progress in recent years, the gap between them and the wealthy industrialized nations continues to grow.

A recent study indicates that some 98 per cent of all of the world's research and development expenditures continues to be made in the wealthy, industrialized nations which already have high growth rates. There is almost as much money spent on research and development in the field of synthetics alone in the industrialized nations as is spent on all forms of research and development in the less developed world. The scientific advances and the new technologies which will shape tomorrow's world will come out of today's research and development expenditures. The relative position of the less developed nations can only worsen if the balance in the deployment of the world's scientific and technological resources remains so heavily biased against them.

It is not likely that this bias will be rectified except by a deliberate act of policy on the part of the industrialized nations who possess a near monopoly on the world's scientific and technological resources. A larger share of these resources must be made available to the less developed nations. One of the most practical methods of doing this is by devoting a portion of the funds available from wealthier nations under their development aid programs to this purpose.

Despite the fact that this need is fundamental to the whole development process and that this field is a new and complex one, less than one-half of one per cent of the aid budgets of donor countries is currently devoted to development research at a time when the average

growth corporation in North America spends approximately 6 per cent of its annual income for these purposes.

This situation is of great concern to those who are close to the heart of the international development process. The report of the Commission on International Development headed by our former Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, highlights this concern and recommends, and I quote:

> —aid suppliers should devote a significant share of their research and development resources and facilities to projects specifically related to problems of developing countries.

This Commission proposes that by 1972 such expenditures should amount to 5 per cent of all public expenditures in the industrialized countries for research and development, of which at least half should be put to work in the developing countries. The United Nations Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology goes further and has proposed that donors be asked to allocate 10 per cent of their research and development resources to projects of concern to lower income countries and an additional 5 per cent to help create institutional infrastructure for science and technology in these countries.

This is an area in which Canada can play an important role and it is for this purpose that we propose to establish the International Development Research Centre of Canada. This bill results from two years of careful investigation and planning by the Canadian International Development Agency with the active assistance and participation of a number of other government departments and experts outside government, particularly the Canadian universities and a number of international institutions. A great deal of care has been taken to design an instrument that will complement and supplement the work that is being carried on by others in this field. I can assure the House that Canada's initiative in creating this body is welcomed by the entire international development community.

The centre will be basically a Canadian institution with an important international dimension. The chairman and most of the members of the centre's board of governors are to be Canadian as well as the majority of its executive committee. Both the board and the staff will include specially qualified people from various parts of the world, including the developing countries. The centre will be structured so as to provide the best possible environment for creativity and problem solving.

International Development Research Centre

The centre will identify, initiate and encourage, support and undertake research into the problems involved in the development of economically deprived regions of the world. It will seek to develop the most effective application of the results of this research to the needs of the people of those regions. It will give high priority to programs that assist the developing countries to build their own scientific and technological capabilities so that they will not be mere welfare recipients, but contributors in their own right to the solution of their own problems.

I have said that the centre will be "problem oriented". A small expert headquarters group will identify specific development problems and develop programs designed to focus resources upon them. In the development and implementation of its programs the centre would work closely with other government departments and non-governmental institutions, particularly Canadian universities and industry. A typical project might consist of a number of programs carried out on a decentralized basis by institutions and individuals chosen for their specific capacity. The centre will also be able to provide financial support to specific research activities of other institutions that contribute directly to its own programs and objectives.

• (3:30 p.m.)

For example, a program designed to improve the protein content of cereal grains might be spearheaded by a Canadian university with special experience in that field. It would involve a number of other Canadian and non-Canadian organizations, each of which would be engaged in a specific aspect of the work as part of a co-ordinated program. Appropriate authorities in the less developed countries would be involved in the crucial work of applying and adapting the results of all the work to the environmental and social conditions of those countries.

After a project has been undertaken, the function of the headquarters group will be to oversee the programs and to audit and disseminate their results. Discussions with the OECD Development Centre, the United Nations and some of the United Nations Specialized Agencies indicate that the centre's headquarters might also provide a centralized system for assimilating, storing, retrieving and disseminating scientific and technical data relevant to international development. In this way the centre would help provide an

important and presently missing link in the co-ordination of world international development programs.

It is too early to be specific about the centre's programs, but emphasis will certainly be given to those problems to which Canadian capabilities seem especially applicable. Final decisions on program priorities will be reserved to the centre's board of governors. CIDA and the United Nations Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development have already indicated several possible areas of special interest: the development of new techniques for identifying and evaluating mineral resources, improved methods of preserving food and reducing waste; the development of genetically improved plants of high protein value; the study of some specific aspects of the world population problem; and the development of efficient, labour-intensive industrial techniques.

Most of the problems with which the centre will deal will require co-operative effort by both the physical and social sciences. The very nature of the development process requires that the special skills and perspectives of the engineer, the physicist and the chemist be harmonized with those of the economist, the sociologist and the anthropologist. The centre will be concerned with the application of science and technology to the effort to improve the quality of life, not only the processes of material production.

We should not overlook the important benefits the centre will bring to Canada. The funds provided for its support will be an addition to the funds normally available for Canadian research and development. It will create new opportunities for the use of Canadian human and institutional resources in the field of science and technology. It will help to attract to Canada highly qualified people in various fields, including Canadians who have had to leave Canada to pursue their special interests. It will also help to keep in Canada some who might otherwise leave.

In all its programs, the centre will provide important linkages between Canadian and foreign science and technology, enabling Canadian specialists to obtain international experience which could make a valuable contribution to our own development.

The funds needed to finance the centre's operations and programs will come out of Canada's international development assistance allocations. Within these allocations the amount of funds made available to the centre will depend upon the specific programs and activities which are developed by the centre's board and management after it is established. The government intends to give priority to this aspect of our international development program and I foresee the allocation of as much as 5 per cent of our total development aid funds to the centre. The government is prepared to allocate a minimum of $30 million for the administration and programs of the centre over the first five years. About one-third of this would be for the headquarters operations and the remainder for programs to be carried out outside headquarters.

Successful operation of the centre will call for the full co-operation of the Canadian scientific and technological communities and an especially close relationship with Canadian universities. The science secretariat, other departments of the federal government directly concerned with science and technology and the university community, have contributed to the studies leading to the proposal for the establishment of the centre; they will be equally involved in its direction and operation. The proposed legislation provides for this.

I am sure hon. members will agree with me that the passage of the bill to establish the International Development Research Centre of Canada will provide Canada with a unique opportunity to make an exciting and worthwhile contribution to the cause of international development while enlarging the horizons and enriching the experience of Canadian science.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): First, it is reassuring to know that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is reporting on this legislation, in spite of the fact that Bill C-12 leaves parliament in some doubt as to which minister will be assuming responsibility for the new research centre. We in the Official Opposition are happy that the responsibility is to lie with the hon. gentleman. If a more imaginative proposal were to be forthcoming, it might be that authority should rest with a new minister for international development, and perhaps we shall see the establishment of such a post in this country before long.

The original hopes for rapid economic progress in the developing countries have been only partially and spottily achieved. We know this to be a fact, regardless of which party we support. There will, of course, be other opportunities to discuss the uncertain record in this

field as well as Canada's external aid program. Today we are dealing with one method which the government has proposed, namely, the establishment of an international research and development centre in Canada.

The Official Opposition welcomes this bill. We shall deal with it, hopefully, in a constructive as well as in a critical manner. We intend to offer a series of amendments which we hope will commend themselves as being sensible and worthy of adoption.

It used to be part of the doctrine connected with the development of emerging nations that economic growth was just a matter of time—that the process was an inevitable one. The harsh fact is that since the end of the second world war no new country has joined the ranks of the wealthy and advanced nations of the world. This is despite a good deal of energy, a massive injection of capital and, I would say, a considerable amount of goodwill. There are three crucial questions which must be asked about the proposed research centre; they were posed for us at a meeting of a sub-committee of the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, the sub-Committee on International Development, by Professor Irving Brecher of McGill. They are:

1. Is there a basic need for the agency?

2. Has Canada the capacity to carry through the projects envisaged for the centre?

3. What kind of results can Canadians expect?

To answer the last question first, and in a general way, I would say that Canadians cannot expect any quick results. This is, of course, one of the problems of our epoch, it seems to me—the epoch of instant coffee, instant answers, instant results. I suspect it will not be in the next five years or even in the next decade that the results of the research projects shared with the world through this research centre will make themselves felt in the poorer countries. We do not need to be reminded of the veritable maze of organizations already dealing with development problems around the globe. There is a jungle of alphabets in the international development field. I do not think we need worry about this as long as there are well defined trails through it.

• (3:40 p.m.)

It seems to me we have learned a good deal in the past few years about development aid. We have learned that we cannot superimpose on others, as we used to think we could, our culture, our ethics and institutions as the price for aid. In fact, this used to be the rationalization for aid in the early years before the introduction of that great project, the Colombo plan. We have learned that ways of doing things, which may be perfectly acceptable to Canada, are not necessarily wise or valid in other countries that are at a different stage of development and which have divergent histories and a variety of cultures. We have also learned—and this seems to me the core of wisdom—that we need to know a great deal more, that we require a vast amount of research in the field. We have, as the minister said, no real focus yet upon the provision of external aid.

Another thing we have learned is that a good many organizations, including those that are adjuncts to the United Nations itself, are hidebound by outmoded procedures. The Secretary of State for External Affairs reminded us of this when he spoke to the United Nations during the 24th General Assembly.

Just as an aside, may I say that the jargon in the field of external aid has evolved during the years. It seems to me that we have now a rather more hopeful set of words which are clearer than most others—"external aid".

In the 20 years since the inception of the external aid program, the underlying motives have shifted considerably. With the research centre in operation, and with the studies that have been commissioned during the past couple of years by the welter of agencies now involved in this field throughout the world, we can surely expect to be in a better position to give aid and to understand the consequences to be expected from the giving of aid.

As we abandon the old certainties—not a unique happening these days since we are abandoning certainties everywhere, much to the benefit of mankind, I think—we come to see that it is not a question of promoting this or that political philosophy; that it is not a matter of expecting, in a sort of selfish way, some long range economic reward because we have been good fellows and extended aid; that it is not even that we can expect these results to flow within a measurable time, by which I mean five or ten years. Rather it is that the goals are much clearer now, and they are clearer because the premise on which those goals were based has been simplified. I suggest we are arriving at the point where we recognize that external aid has but one focal point—the development in the world of the poor countries.

International Development Research Centre

One of the most imaginative pieces of paper issued by the United States Information Agency is the magazine *Dialogue*. In the 1969 fourth edition there is an interesting article on economic development, productivity and talent by Peter Drucker, wherein he discusses some of the implications of aid and economic expansion in the poor countries. I should like to share with the House one or two sentences taken from this interesting article. Mr. Drucker says:

> In the 19th century, industrializing countries financed their development out of farm exports, even though population growth in Europe, North America and Japan was almost as rapid then as it is in developing countries today. Instead of putting pressure on the food base of the economy, this growth created markets in the more industrialized nations of Western Europe for the expanding agriculture of Germany, Hungary, Russia, The Ukraine—

Then, he continues.

> It is no longer possible, however, to finance development out of agriculture. Today most of the developed countries have become food-surplus producers. And most of the underdeveloped countries need all the food they can produce to feed their own people, in any event.

There are, of course, exceptions which will be obvious to those who have studied this whole problem.

> Capital investment from abroad is no longer the answer to development.

The Pearson report on partners in development made it tragically clear that a good deal of the inflow of money to so many poor countries was being used for foreign exchange and to repay hard loans. Drucker comments on this in these words:

> But the bulk of development investment today is of a different kind. It aims at creating capacity to produce for the domestic markets of the country in which the investment is made. It does not, in other words, generate the exports with which to repay the investment.

Then, Mr. Drucker talks about the hazards of aid:

> Investment of capital in the developing countries, therefore, tends to create a foreign-exchange liability.

I am not going to bore the House by citing a long list of examples, but if one area of the world needed to be singled out, it would be Latin America where there has been, I think it is right to say, a very substantial amount of capital investment. Yet there the crisis looms as a result of the serious difficulties in which the various countries on that continent find themselves in repaying capital investment.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

I have said that during the 20 years since the inception of external aid program the motives have shifted. I like this because I think that the motives today are a good deal more honourable than they were. However, I think it is a little self-righteous to stand here today, armed with hindsight and the experience of the last two decades, and say: "Well, it might have been better to have made the nationalization for aid a good deal plainer when the programs were first introduced following the second world war".

This point was made, as a matter of fact, by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Indeed, somebody might do a doctoral thesis on the evolution of the language of Canadian statesmen in this whole field, which seems to get cooler as the years go by. It used to be that we would use the Dullesian phrase "rolling back Communism". It was said we had to buy our way out of the Communist menace. No such—I had better be careful here; I was going to say—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Jargon?

Mr. Fairweather: Certainly, there is much jargon attaching to aid, and there are a good many interesting articles on the subject. I prefer to say that there are poor countries and there are rich countries; that Canada is a rich country which should help the poor countries. Others can find more complicated philosophies and ways of expressing this concept.

The reason for the present program was stated by the Secretary of State for External Affairs in what I think was language that was a little negative. He asked: "In what kind of a world do we want our children and grandchildren to work? In what kind of a world do we want to retire?" The answer to that double-barrelled question should be a determinant as we assess our motivations for foreign aid.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) then referred to the threat of poverty in the world as greater than foreign investment, foreign ideologies or foreign nuclear weapons. Appealing to fear and increasing paranoia about the world is a politically ill-advised posture I suggest. It may result in an attitude of retrenchment rather than generosity.

Our committee on external affairs heard some interesting evidence from Dr. Theo

Sommer, a lecturer on international relations at the University of Hamburg. He said:

> The North-South confrontation is a myth, as far as we can look ahead. They cannot get at us, to put it in very crude terms. There will be no political catastrophe resulting from the difference in living standards and development. There will be a moral capacity, of course, if there are many Biafrans or if 50 million Indians die in famine.

This, then, surely is the crucial issue. If development growth does not overtake population growth the rich nations face the prospect of an intolerable moral crisis by the year 2000. This is a crisis furthermore which cannot be solved by the use of palliatives like food aid.

I realize that the house leaders are trying to work out a timetable, but there are one or two points I should like to highlight. These are points in respect of which the official opposition will be making amendments when this bill gets second reading and goes to the committee. Perhaps some of the points are obvious but nonetheless are worth repeating.

First of all, the centre is not the first organization to do research for international development. Other groups like OECD, FAO, UNESCO, the U.N. development program, the International Rice Institution, the United Nations Advisory Committee on the application of science and technology to develop third world plans, plus non-government organizations such as the Rockefeller and Ford foundations are even now doing very important research in this whole field.

I assume that one of the obligations, and this is one about which the new board and executive officers will be undoubtedly enthusiastic, is how to co-ordinate the plans of the research centre with existing research being done in the world today. I stress that perhaps the centre will have to keep the very closest liaison with all the various organizations in the field so that our efforts will be co-ordinated and so that the work will not be duplicated.

I think the minister made this point, but if he did not perhaps I can make it for him. Obviously, we will want to do research in respect of things that Canada can do well. We can do a good many things well and I presume that in the list from which the directors and managers will have to choose projects the easier choices—there will be some hard ones—will be made in respect of those fields where there are Canadian experts available.

I am still a bit uncertain after the minister's statement about the relationship of the new research centre and CIDA. The funds for the centre it seems to me should not just be taken from CIDA's budget. The financing of the centre should be added to the money we are giving each year to CIDA. This may be government policy now.

After the centre has completed a project, it seems to me we must make sure that it will be picked up and something constructive done with it. I do not mean that we should impose the results of our research on the world. Presumably countries will make application to the centre for projects in connection with every aspect of aid, as was made clear in Mr. Pearson's report from the commission on international development. We really should have the machinery for assessing the way in which various projects are to be carried out. I know there is a very fine line that has to be drawn. We cannot be the guardians of poor countries, checking on them all the time as to how the dollars are spent, but in most instances we have embassies or high commissions, part of the responsibility of which will be to see that the value is received for Canadian dollars spent.

I wish I had made this point earlier, but perhaps it is manifestly clear. I certainly hope that no research will be done or is contemplated in any military field. Perhaps this goes without saying. I will have an amendment to propose to make this certain. Perhaps the minister or somebody else will want to checkmate me by proposing an amendment to make clear that there are no military implications whatsoever in the proposed research centre. The developing countries should be involved in the research that will be promoted by the centre, whether through Canadian universities or universities in those countries to get the benefits of this research. One aim of the policy should be that the countries getting the benefit of the research will eventually be able to take over. This is a hopeful thing, but I hope that the research centre's ultimate future is to be phased out. Nobody present in the House will live to see that, but the hope does not become pious for having been made.

This is perhaps a simple thing, but the Bill uses the phrase "underdeveloped" countries. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that there is a jargon in this external aid field, but is not the current jargon the word "developing"? In order to avoid being in any fix about whether a country does or does not like to be

called underdeveloped, perhaps we could use the word "developing". I presume everybody is developing, and in this way we could get over a bit of a bind.

Let me make another suggestion very seriously. In view of the present hopeful movement in the world, I suggest that a couple of directors should be from eastern Europe, particularly if we are really serious about setting up an international research centre. There is some very excellent work being done and I think particularly of Yugoslavia. I do not wish to tie the minister down to this or that country. But if we are to have an international research and development centre, we should not shy away from an obligation to invite members from countries in eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R. to serve on this board.

• (4:00 p.m.)

There is one other point. The bill needs re-drafting in so far as the provision for budgetary control is concerned. Perhaps the minister will note this point and it will be covered when the committee discusses the bill. I hope the centre will report to Parliament through the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I would even hope the government would see fit to appoint a member of Parliament. Perhaps the government is not yet daring enough to appoint any member of Parliament, but at least it could appoint one of its own members to serve on the board of governors. I believe this would be a very hopeful initiative on the part of the government because it could be a technique for bringing to the attention of Parliament the work done in this research centre.

The minister said that over the next five years some $30 million will be spent on research projects, about one-third of which will be spent in respect of the headquarters, presumably in order to get the thing into operation. In respect of this centre which has been so long aborning and which has been the subject matter of a good many studies over the last couple of years, I hope the government will see fit to ensure that it has no military purpose, that there is some better technique for reporting to this Parliament, that the possibility will be considered of having a member of Parliament on the board of governors, and that at least five representatives of the board come from developing countries. This numbers game is dangerous, but I would think one or two members of the board at least should be from eastern Europe and that we should consider very carefully the tie-in this centre should have with the universities and colleges of Canada.

I hope the minister does not slough off this centre as some type of new toy in the international aid field to be used as an excuse for not coming to grips with the very serious implications of extending foreign aid budgets. I do not think this is the time to be negative about the centre. I do not believe it is a panacea in the development field by any means, but I hope that with some of the suggestions I have made, and some which undoubtedly will come from other parts of the House, the International Development Research Centre of Canada can make a contribution in a field of world concern which presses upon us urgently.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I begin my remarks on second reading of Bill C-12 by agreeing with the minister and with the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) that the proposal in the bill is a useful and imaginative one and that the research centre could be, and I hope will be, of immense value in the development of the most useful methods of giving aid to the developing countries of the world and the most useful methods for those countries to make use of the aid made available.

I wish to express some concern I have about the philosophical approach to the problem of international development and international aid. In doing so, I want to make clear that I am not carping critically in respect of the proposal but am trying to get the minister and his colleagues, and indeed myself and my colleagues, to look at the problem of international development in what I think might perhaps be the more appropriate context in 1970.

Paul Hoffman is reported to have said at some point that it is wrong to speak of giving international aid. One does not give international aid. The proper way to express the situation is to talk about the developing countries receiving aid and not the developed countries just handing it out to them. This is the first problem I have in respect of the suggestions in this bill and the speech introducing it made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). It seemed to me that all the time he was speaking in the usual terms used by statesmen of developed countries concerning international development; that is—and I hope I am not doing him an injustice—we, a developed western nation having all the scientific and technical know-how, are going to provide a research centre

in our capital that will involve Canadians in certain elements and areas of research and that we will provide the facilities for the developing countries to use if we can arrange with them for such use. In other words—and again I say I am not carping about this but am worried about it—we appear to be saying that we a rich, developed and knowhow nation will hand out to you, the poor ignorant developing nations which do not have it, all the wisdom we have and all the great things we have accepted in our kind of society.

My study of the subject, Mr. Speaker, which naturally has been as limited as that of any other member, has convinced me that when we speak in the field of international development we are wrong if we speak merely of scientific and technological matters, if we speak merely in terms of providing the developing nations with technical knowhow and the application in their countries of methods which may or may not be suitable for them, and if we speak of introducing into their societies a culture which they may or may not want introduced into their societies.

Mr. Sharp: That is why I said we had to consider the social and anthropological factors involved.

Mr. Lewis: The minister says that we must consider the social and anthropological factors involved. Precisely, but how can this be done with a board when, as I believe he said himself if I heard him correctly, the headquarters group would decide the priorities or the areas, whatever the term he used was, in respect of the research to be undertaken. Who is to be included in this headquarters group? We see in the bill that the board of directors must be composed of a majority of Canadians, 11 out of the 19 or 21, whichever the figure is. We find that the executive committee must consist of a majority of Canadians. There are other proposals of that sort.

I appreciate it is difficult to sell to people the idea that there is a need for international aid when it would cost the people money. This involves taking out of the production in Canada a certain amount in order to assist people elsewhere and it is necessary to persuade the Canadian constituency that this is a worth-while thing to do. My own personal experience with my fellow Canadians has persuaded me for many years that Canadians are ready to make this kind of offer to people who need assistance and are ready to make the kind of sacrifice involved if they are informed about what is being done and are informed about the purposes to be served by international aid.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I have personally, therefore, no worry about persuading the Canadian people to support an appropriate and imaginative program of assistance to developing countries to develop themselves. Therefore, I ask why the emphasis on having a majority of Canadians? What worries me, Mr. Speaker, is this: if you have a board of directors a majority of whose members must be Canadian then you will have some others, and in that case who are the others going to be?

If I remember correctly there is a total of 21 members. There is a chairman, a president, and not more than 19 others, and of this total of 21 a minimum of 11 must be Canadian. Who are the other 10 likely to be? I bet that of the other 10 there will be someone from the United States, someone from the United Kingdom, someone from the Netherlands and someone from France. In other words, in addition to the 11 Canadians there will be a number of other representatives or citizens of developed countries.

The hon. member for Fundy Royal says that he wants at least five members of the board to be from the developing countries. Why only five, Mr. Speaker? I want to emphasize that I am not playing the numbers game. I am saying to members of this House and through you, Sir, to everyone concerned, that in my estimation, after some considerable study and thought, the developing countries ought to have a full say in the kind of research that takes place which is supposed to serve their needs.

This is not only a matter of science and technology. It is a matter of the infrastructure that must be built in these developing countries—the educational facilities, the health facilites, the roads and all the other things that support a modern society. It is a matter of fitting into the culture of developing nations, their system of government, the desire they have and the objectives which they have for the future of themselves and their peoples. Who is going to determine that? A group of Canadians and citizens of other developed countries will have a majority say in this centre, and they will decide the priorities and the areas of research that are to be undertaken.

I am concerned about that. I am worried about it. I do not see the need for insisting that there be a majority of Canadians, and I

suggest to the minister that he ought to leave himself free to appoint anybody in the world who can make a contribution to the choice of the priorities, a choice that has to be made in order to carry on the most worth-while and relevant research in various aspects of international development—economic, scientific, social, educational and all the other aspects which must be considered. I am convinced that this cannot be done in the proper atmosphere and in the proper context if it is handed to the developing nations as a decision of a group of men representing mainly the developed countries of the world, which is what the bill now proposes.

Perhaps when the bill is before our committee some explanation will be given as to why we must have a majority of Canadians at every stage. At the moment I do not see it. In fact I see very great disadvantage, as I have indicated, in making the board and the centre mainly representative of the developed countries, once again telling the developing nations what they ought to have, instead of the developing nations having a full voice in what is to be done on their behalf and for their needs by this centre.

This is the first worry I have because if the plan is not implemented in an imaginative way, this research centre will simply be a duplication of research done in the United States, in Europe, and elsewhere throughout the world.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, without belittling the effort which the minister has placed before us today, I would like to indicate that I have some doubts as to whether this is the best way in which to set up research for the developing countries, and whether the better way is not to set it up inside those countries, or inside regions of those countries, rather than in Canada. I say this tentatively, Mr. Speaker. I can be persuaded that I am wrong about this, but I notice in the "Partners in Development" report of the Pearson Commission there is great emphasis laid throughout the book, and particularly at page 207, on the need for goal-oriented research in regional and national areas of the developing nations, that there ought to be regional or national laboratories and research institutes to study techniques of natural resource utilization and to make other improvements in the developing nations, and that there ought to be nationally based corporations for the purpose of developing products and processes in the developing areas.

[Mr. Lewis.]

It seems to me there is an obvious advantage in having this done in Asia, in Africa and in South America rather than in Canada. It seems to me there is an obvious advantage in having the research institute located in the area that is going to make use of the results of the research, so that the nations in the area, the representatives of the peoples of the area, can have a say in the field of research, the areas of research, the subjects of research, and the objectives of the research that will be undertaken.

You can do the same kind of thing, or at least you can assist that sort of development by a research institute located in Canada if the developing nations are given adequate representation on the board and on the executive which is to make the choice of research subjects and research areas. But when they are given only token representation the situation will be a different one.

I am worried about that because I notice that even the Pearson Commission, if I remember correctly, had only one or at most two members from developing countries. One was W. Arthur Lewis from the Caribbean countries. There may have been one Latin American person. I cannot remember where Campos was from, but most of the others were very fine people, extremely intelligent and competent in their areas but, as I say, most of them were from developed nations. I do not know why that was needed—

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, if I may interject to reply to this question, may I point out that one of the purposes of the Pearson Commission was to encourage the developed countries to give greater aid, and one of the ways to do this was to have a number of distinguished representatives of developed countries on the commission, who would try to encourage the citizens of their own countries to give greater aid.

Mr. Lewis: I thank the minister. I was going to make that suggestion myself, as to why the commission had this overweight of developed nations. In my opinion, the other reason was that it was an organization set up by the World Bank, and in my humble opinion the World Bank's approach to international development has been a disastrous one, concerned primarily with the superiority of the developed countries, concerned mainly with supporting development in developing countries which seemed to the bankers to be desirable and necessary, but which may not at all have been what the local governments

and the local people considered necessary and desirable. This World Bank approach was partly responsible for the choice of the commissioners, although I hasten to say that the report they produced was one of very great value.

I have emphasized this concern, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I have belaboured it. At the moment, although I am subject to persuasion by the minister and his assistants, I am personally very unhappy about the composition of the membership and leadership of the centre, the board and executive of the centre, which inevitably will mean mere token representation from the developing countries, so that again we will have an international undertaking by the developed nations—in this case Canada and its associates—to tell the developed countries what in our view they ought to have. More and more in the last number of years, Mr. Speaker, I suggest there has been evidence that the developing countries resent this approach and personally I sympathize with their resentment. When one visits the United Nations and listens to delegates of developing countries speak officially, and when one chats with them unofficially, more and more is there evidence that they resent the notion that the developed countries are going to have control of the methods and processes and goals of their development, which is what has happened to date.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I say to the minister that there is not very much difference between what he has proposed in his bill and in his speech this afternoon and the whole, in my opinion, ill-advised concept of tied aid which we have had up to now. This is another form of tied aid and the entire developing world has protested against this notion that when a government gives assistance to a developing country, then X per cent of that assistance must come in the form of goods produced in the donor country. In its report the Pearson Commission uses a great deal of space criticizing the tied aid idea and pleading with the donor countries to drop it.

In a sense, this research centre is a tied aid notion. It was significant that the minister emphasized the fact that the centre was going to give Canadians an opportunity to have certain experience, was going to promote research in Canada. In other words, they were going to use Canadian products and Canadian goods in the sense in which international assistance is tied in the normal way. That is not the objective that the minister and his advisers ought to have for the international research centre.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that this centre should be merely a source of funds for research projects for universities, and which would have been carried on anyway if the centre were not available, except that there will now be another source of funds to which the universities will be able to go to promote research projects that members of their staff or post graduate students have set for themselves. That is not the purpose of the centre. If assistance for research in our universities is to be given, let it come from the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and not from the Secretary of State for External Affairs; let it come from the Home Office; let it come from the Canada Council; let it come from whatever other source we may have for assisting research in our universities and for the development of our research and our universities. That surely is not the purpose of this international research centre, I am sure the minister would be the first to agree.

I am not therefore concerned, and I ask the minister that he not be concerned, with promoting research in our universities, with the development of Canadian research. Certainly, we will have a by-product, as will have every other country in the world, from any research carried on in this increasingly important field, but that is not the purpose. It worries me that the minister should have emphasized that because again we will have an emphasis on the things we want to do that we may think of value in promoting Canadian research, rather than an emphasis on what developing countries may require or think they require.

I agree fully with the hon. member for Fundy-Royal who spoke ahead of me. I want to support him without any reservation on the need to make absolutely clear that this research centre will have nothing to do with any military research, defensive or offensive. I am a little fed up anyway with this distinction made between defensive and offensive research. We should have nothing to do with any kind of research related to military activity in developing or developed nations, and we must make that clear. We must make it clear by the necessary provision in the bill, later to become an act, where the powers of the board or the centre are set out. We must underline that no research in military matters will be undertaken directly by the centre or indirectly by financing any such research in the universities or elsewhere.

International Development Research Centre

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister will reconsider the personnel of the leadership of this centre and open it up to people of developing countries to a larger extent than can now be possible. There are many people, and the minister probably knows them personally, in the fields of planning and development in countries like Ceylon, India, some of the African countries, Latin America or the Caribbean countries who could make a tremendous contribution to the research centre. They should be on the board and have something to say about the choice of research subjects.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have said on many occasions and so have other members, that any law and any institution can be reduced in value—and I am picking words carefully—if the people chosen to administer that law or run that institution are not the right people. In my study of history I learned that more good laws have been perverted by bad administration than by the Parliaments that passed them. Therefore the personnel chosen for the positions of President, Chairman, Vice-Chairman and other leaders of the centre are of immense importance.

There have been occasions, Mr. Speaker,—and I cannot help saying this though I hope I have a benign smile on my face as I do—when people have been chosen for positions of importance because they were defeated in a prior election. There have been such occasions.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Lewis: There have been occasions when people have been appointed to important positions because of political affiliation or because they have friends in high places.

An hon. Member: Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

Mr. Lewis: And elsewhere in Canada, Mr. Speaker. I made no distinctions and pointed no fingers. The minister's reaction is merely a measure of the guilt he feels.

Seriously, I want to emphasize that the people at the head of this research centre ought to be people who have had direct personal experience in the field of international development and have worked in this area, not merely academic people or public servants or whatever. There are such people in Canada and outside and I am sure the minister knows them as well as I do.

I merely throw out some names—I am not proposing any of them—to remind ourselves that there are Canadians who have given a great deal of time to this particular area. There is Dr. Hugh Keenleyside who was attached to the United Nations Technical Assistance Program very early in its life. There is King Gordon and Louis Sabourin here in Ottawa who have had a great deal of experience. There is Ben Higgins, an economist now with the University of Montreal, and who used to be with McGill University, who has had experience of this sort in the field. Of course there are people outside Canada like Gunnar Myrdal, and Arthur Lewis of Jamaican University and many others of that calibre.

• (4:30 p.m.)

What I am emphasizing and pleading for is that when the heads of this institute are appointed, the minister makes certain that they are people who themselves have had personal experience in the field of international aid and development. This ought not to be an academic exercise, but an exercise in practical, realistic, international co-operation and development. And if that is to come about you must have people who have lived with the peoples in the developing areas, who have a sense of their attitudes and desires and some understanding of how they think, act and react. What is done must be of the greatest use to the developing peoples of the world in order that the developing countries may have full confidence in the research institute and not consider it as just another bit of North American largesse which they distrust. It is because Canada can do this without awakening distrust that I greet the bill and the imaginative ideas contained in it. If this kind of institute is to be set up by a developed nation on its own soil, then I submit Canada is one of the few countries that can do so without arousing the fears and distrust of the developing countries.

A great deal has been written about the motivation behind international aid. Many kinds of motivation have been suggested. Some people are motivated on purely political grounds; they think international aid will help the world go in the direction in which they want it to go. I think they are blind and deaf, and quite possibly dumb. No international aid will affect the historical development of the various continents of the world unless and except that international aid helps the developing countries to develop in the direction they have decided to go. There are other people who say that international aid is necessary if we are to assure peace in the

world. This, surely, is obvious. It is surely obvious that hunger, disease and ignorance across many parts of the world are a great threat to the peace and order of the world.

There are some who say that international development is good because it will assure the developed countries of future economic growth. That is also true, Mr. Speaker, and one need not be ashamed of emphasizing the fact, because it is a fact, that the future prosperity of the people in the developed countries depends on developing prosperity in the presently undeveloped areas of the world. If at the end of 25, 30 or 40 years from now the poverty of two-thirds of the world remains as deep as now, the welfare and standard of living of the developed parts of the world will undoubtedly suffer.

Finally, there is the sheer motivation on grounds of humanity, the motivation of people wanting to help other people in need. I am not ashamed to accept that as a perfectly proper motive for the giving of imaginative and effective assistance to the needy peoples of the world. We ought not to apologize for feeling that morally we are brother's keeper, whether he is in Africa, Asia, Latin America, or here, on Canadian soil. We shouldn't feel embarrassed to admit that we are anxious to deal in a humane way with great international human problems and it should not be necessary for the minister or anyone else to emphasize Canada's advantage in this undertaking rather than the sheer, decent, civilized humanity which must impel us to help people who now suffer unnecessary want to overcome their degrading and depressing condition. These are good reasons for Canada's playing a much bigger role in international development than it has played until now. All these are perfectly good reasons why this measure should be supported by all sections of the House. I hope that when the bill comes before the committee the minister and his advisers will be prepared to accept suggestions for change which may improve the bill and improve the centre when it starts operations.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, the House is now discussing the bill to establish the International Development Research Centre of Canada.

After reading this bill, I have come to the conclusion that it is intended to establish some sort of corporation under the direction of a board of governors.

Secondly, under this bill, we would make available to the Centre the sum of $1 million to help them begin their research activities.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is of the greatest interest, and I wish to congratulate the minister on presenting the bill, because, as the previous speaker said, it shows great imagination as well as a desire to improve Canadian aid to developing countries.

It seems that the minister and his officials interested in Canadian aid to developing countries are trying to find new methods.

On the other hand, one should not be overenthusiastic as Canada is still in search of a policy. The actual aid given by Canada to developing countries since it joined the Colombo plan has often been inefficient.

Although Canada is an extremely wealthy and highly industrialized country, Canadians have voiced well founded criticisms of the government aid to developing countries. Canadians are perhaps right in asking their government for increased and gratuitous aid.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian policy concerns not only the members of this House but also our fellow-citizens, who do not only contribute to Canada's production and expansion, but also express their opinions unhesitatingly. And to support my views, I have here a letter from Father Fernand Noël, from Victoriaville, which I would like to quote:

> I would ask you earnestly to intervene in the House so that Canada's efforts in favour of the developing countries may be intensified. It is not necessary for me to make a statement to suport my request. I rely on you.

Mr. Speaker, that Canadian feels there is no need for him to give his opinion, as he considers that Canadian aid is necessary anyway although it is definitely inadequate.

I have here a letter signed by Mrs. Germain St-Pierre, 180 Notre-Dame Street West, Victoriaville, who says, and I quote:

> I have read in a newspaper your wishes for this New Year.
>
> And particularly your wishes for peace among men and between alien countries and for the development of underdeveloped countries as well.
>
> —I dare hope that you will use your influence with the government to promote a more equitable distribution of the funds allotted to developing countries as compared with the appropriations assigned to arms.
>
> I rely on your support.

I could also read a letter written by Mr. Fernand Turcotte-Dostie, 24 Onil St., Victoriaville, in which he expresses his views on world peace and on the problems of developing countries, and points out that affluent

countries are asking themselves questions on the assistance they must extend to them while two-thirds of the world is dying from hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of boring the House by reading other letters of this nature. I did read a few because I wanted to show that Canadians living in urban or rural areas take great interest in these problems and ask that the government take measures designed to solve them immediately. In that respect, Bill C-12—I am glad to say—seems to drive the first stake in the search for an answer to requests by Canadians.

This bill provides for the establishment of a centre for research aimed at determining the value and effectiveness of our assistance to developing countries. I must say, repeat or suggest that this research centre must be more than the faithful echo of the government's voice, but rather—and that is our hope—its conscience as regards external aid policy.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We want the Centre to make suggestions without taking the government policy into account. We want it to be, so to speak, free from instructions emanating from the Minister of External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) or any other Cabinet member, and to engage in serious, intensive research, using facilities available in each of the countries involved. The Centre should, in fact, serve as the conscience of our present policy and a source of information for the government.

Now and always, Canadian policy in this field has been a believe-or-else policy, in short a policy of coercion.

And although Canadians wonder about it, nobody demonstrates to the government its lack of efficiency.

We hope that this centre will help to demonstrate the lack of efficiency of the government policy in connection with the developing countries so as to oblige us to improve it all the time and render it more efficient and see that it really reaches its goal.

Since Canada is one of the best industrialized countries in the world and although a certain amount of poverty exists here, we must be keenly interested in the poor countries. Canada must also devote its efforts to research. That is why we welcome the introduction of this bill.

Finally, in this same context of aid to developing countries, Canada must increase its

financial, human and technical aid to these countries.

The Canadian policy must be restated, and we hope that this centre will give the government an opportunity to do so.

Canada should try to eliminate the exploitation factors in the developing countries. I shall give here an example which is a real scandal and I should like to suggest to the Secretary of State for External Affairs that he take note of it, so as to become aware of the contradiction contained in his own policy.

Mr. Speaker, on the one hand, primary responsibility for the tragic situation in Biafra and Nigeria lies with the countries that supply arms to the belligerents and that manufacture weapons. With regard to this, Canada has done nothing. As a matter of fact, this afternoon, during the question period, I asked the minister whether he intended at least to ask that there be an investigation into this by the United Nations. He answered that no problem existed and that those responsible for the hardship and poverty of certain countries were not those thought to be so.

Mr. Speaker, that is nonsense. One knows very well that those who supply arms have an interest in keeping those countries in poverty and hardship in order to be able to exploit them better.

The Canadian policy is inconsistent in this respect and only throws dust in the eyes. On the one hand, we would like to increase our aid up to 1 per cent of our estimates, which is insufficient, and on the other, we become the accomplices of those who take unfair advantage of the poor countries until there is bloodshed.

Mr. Speaker, it seems that we should be logical and reconsider our external aid policy, so that it would not be inconsistent.

In the United Nations, Canada has not taken any valid stand against the countries which provide arms to the belligerents and keep alive the ferments of war for the sole purpose of making a profit even if harmless victims must die.

I was talking about Biafra and Nigeria. The latter is precisely a developing country. I could also talk about Viet Nam which is another developing country. We know that many arms suppliers and financiers make money through the sale of arms and other destructive devices to those countries. Canada, the United States, England and other rich and industrialized nations promote destruction and the spreading of poverty.

Such a situation seems absurd to me and it shows the inconsistency of our external affairs policy.

I would not want to delay uselessly the business of the House. The previous speakers have sized up the present situation rather well. However, I want to emphasize that the minister should see to it that this Centre is independent from political parties, in order to really be the conscience of Canada in its foreign aid policy. Through the creation of this Centre, it is proposed to the government and to the Members of Parliament to make a review of our policy, namely, to continually assess our investments. Canada should not impose its aid on any country. It goes without saying that we must make this recommendation, because if Canada imposes its views, various conflicts will result. In this connection, let us remember the failure of the American policy.

The present aid of Canada is ridiculous. We shall never repeat it enough. It is high time that Canada, in addition to founding new research centres, should increase its financial, human and technical investments. When reading the reports of development agencies, it does not take long to realize that Canada is a country which cannot boast of the aid granted to developing countries.

It is already scandalous to note that two thirds of mankind are starving. Poverty, starvation, illness and ignorance prevail. It is unfortunate to note that owing to our non-participation policy regarding conflicts such as those in Nigeria, in Viet Nam, etc., we help widen the gap between the affluent countries and the poor countries that we want to assist.

Such a contradiction, I feel, should be recognized by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and his officials. The establishment of this new Research Centre should have priority. The Centre will suggest a global policy to the government, enabling it to dissipate the present scandal. So, Canada might really reach a top place among countries providing foreign aid.

At the present time, we can draw great lessons from the achievements of several other countries. I have here before me the September 1968 issue of the publication entitled *International Development*. Canadians will not find in it any reason to be proud of themselves. That publication shows the shameful shallowness of the Canadian policy. Indeed, it is again the consequence of its inconsistency. I therefore want to insist strongly on that point. Besides, it is the only one I want to rise now because I do not care to delay the debate needlessly. And once more I urge the minister to revise our external aid policy, in the light of his external affairs policy, so that we do not build on the one hand and destroy on the other but rather see to it that our country leads the way without expecting any return in order to eliminate poverty and hardships in two thirds of the world. We have in Canada, according to the minister, surpluses of wheat, of milk and of many other products still to be sold because the government is incapable of selling them. Those goods keep accumulating, while there is growing poverty in Canada, and two thirds of the world's population is starving to death.

Mr. Speaker, this should weigh heavily on the consciences of Canadians. That explains the intervention of my fellow-citizens of Victoriaville, in the riding of Lotbinière, who have asked me to urge the minister to revise that policy. Indeed, Canadians would be proud to increase their help to co-operate with the minister, and to tighten their belts, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has asked, provided it really helped to check poverty and hardship. Otherwise, this is nothing but a farce, and a lack of responsibility.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STATEMENT ON PROCEDURAL AGREEMENT

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might indicate to hon. members the substance of what I believe has been agreed between representatives of the parties with regard to this debate and to the proceedings this evening. I understand that there are others who wish to speak on this bill. It has therefore been agreed that Private Members' hour should be suspended for today's sitting and that if second reading of the bill now under debate should not have been completed by then, at six o'clock the question on second reading would then be put. If, however, the debate concludes before six o'clock and the question has been put, the House would at that point rise until eight o'clock and commence with the debate under Standing Order 26.

It has also been agreed that debate under Standing Order 26 shall be concluded by 10.30 this evening; it would be terminated at that

time and the motion proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) under Standing Order 43 earlier today would then be put to the House without debate.

If I have given a correct understanding of the results of our discussions, and if the House is agreeable, perhaps this could be made an order for today's proceedings.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I think that is quite correct, Mr. Speaker. I myself would be inclined to put it in a somewhat different way—that the House would deem the debate on second reading to be concluded at six o'clock, and the motion for second reading be then put.

Also, I would assume that the order which the hon. gentleman is proposing assumes that unanimous consent has been given pursuant to Standing Order 43 for the motion of my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition to be put at 10.30.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the order would assume that the notice requirement would be waived in order that the motion might be put.

With regard to the debate under Standing Order 26, perhaps I might be allowed to make what amounts to an exhortation rather than a procedural point, namely, that the 20-minute limit be strictly observed in order that as many members as possible might have an opportunity to contribute to the debate.

Mr. Baldwin: The House always listens to exhortations.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The points which have been made, especially the last exhortation, represent what we have agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, the Ralliement créditiste supports the proposals of the government house leader of parliament. It will be pleased to co-operate with a view to speeding up the business of the house.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The House has heard the proposal by the President of the Privy Council. Is it so agreed?

An hon. Member: Ordered.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT

The House resumed consideration of the motion (Mr. Sharp) that Bill C-12, to establish the International Development Research Centre of Canada be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): I should like to say a few words on this bill to establish an International Development Research Centre in Canada.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the minister for bringing forward this imaginative and constructive piece of legislation, the forerunner of its kind in this field of international affairs. I think the minister would support me if I were to extend my compliments also to Mr. Maurice Strong and to his righthand man, Dr. Peters, both of whom have done outstanding work behind the scenes in connection with this legislation. They are two men who are very well qualified indeed for the positions they hold.

This bill establishes a more efficient means of expending money under what used to be known as our foreign aid plan. Many countries, including Canada, have in the past allocated a great deal of money to assisting under-developed and developing countries without really placing a great deal of emphasis upon the efficiency with which the money was being used. This is understandable; it is difficult to tell other people how to spend money once they have it in their hands, especially at the international level. The bill now before us establishes a system which enables a research centre in Canada to find the best means of solving problems experienced by the countries to which we are providing assistance. It is necessary, of course, that this research organization should not become too centralized. If it is to provide information covering many different types of industry in developing countries having widely different needs, it is self-evident that the necessary research cannot be carried on in any one centre in this country.

The central proposal in this bill is that we should set up an international development research centre which is to be problem-oriented, and much of the work to be done will

find its way to other research institutions and other areas of Canada. This is as it should be. Personally, I should not want to see the establishment of an organization which is too strongly orientated toward the universities. In the past we have depended to a large degree upon university staffs for research, ignoring the fact that we have a wealth of scientific knowledge and experience at our disposal in industry and in many of the Crown corporations of Canada—a wealth of scientific staff who are not directly concerned with education in universities.

• (5:00 p.m.)

In this regard I can think of several, including Atomic Energy of Canada. We also have federal forest research stations across Canada. I am sure much can be done, for example in tree genetics, to assist some of the developing countries.

Last September when a group of us visited South America to participate in the Interparliamentary Conference at Lima, Peru, we were told that in various parts of Peru scientists had discovered several species of wood hitherto unknown. I agree with an earlier speaker in this debate who said that South America is certainly one place where a great deal of emphasis should be placed on assistance. It is only by helping people to help themselves that we are going to cure the social ills of other countries. Countries like the United States and other industrialized nations, regardless of financial wealth, cannot hope to provide all of the information and educational facilities required to assist the underdeveloped nations; the only way we can assist them is to help them to help themselves. This we can do through research programs of this type.

The humanitarian aspects of this bill have been mentioned and they are indeed very important. I think anyone who has visited South America and other countries of the world, where there is poverty, will realize that through research we can better their conditions. We must give these countries a plan and the trained personnel to solve their problems, and it is for this purpose that we require financial resources. In proceeding in this way and reaching solutions of this kind, we will be spending our money wisely.

In the Middle Ages scientists in the world did not gather together very often. Only recently have the best scientists of Europe and North America gathered together at the international level. In the old days scientists jealously guarded their knowledge; today the results of research in one country is almost straight-away passed on to scientists of other nations. This is one of the main purposes of this bill, and it would not be possible to put a bill like this into operation were this not the case.

This bill also breaks new ground in the field of international affairs by making provision for people from other developing countries of the world to sit on the board of governors. I think this is an excellent road on which to start out. While the majority of the board of governors will be Canadians, which I think is only right since Canada is providing the program, it is interesting to note that finally we are permitting people from other countries, who know their own problems firsthand, to sit on the board of governors of the International Development Research Centre of Canada. This is a step that will make the research program more effective. We will know the problems we have to face, the solutions we must work toward, and we will know the local conditions within which they must be applied.

I was pleased to hear the minister state in his speech that $30 million would be directed toward this plan over the first five years of operation. Although much of this $30 million is going to be spent in Canada, the nations we are assisting directly, with the balance of this money, will still benefit from this expenditure in Canada. This is a joint agreement. It is a plan whereby we will be solving our own problems both industrially and economically as well as solving similar problems in other countries.

I was astounded to learn that in the past only $1 out of every $200—I believe that is the correct figure one-half of one per cent—that was spent on foreign aid, has been directed toward foreign research aid programs. I think we have now come to realize that we could not continue to spend so little on research because we do not know whether our foreign aid program is being properly directed, and is actually solving problems in recipient countries. In fact, there have been times when past governments of Canada have not looked very seriously at this question of finding out how much good has been done by money spent in developing countries.

This bill starts us off on a new and very enlightened approach. Not only will we obtain first hand knowledge of problems existing in developing countries as a result of close relations with the representatives of other nations

on the board of governors, but we are also going to work together in research programs in order to find a plan to meet those problems and thereby help those nations to develop their economies. I think this in turn cannot help but build a better scientific and technological core, and hence a wider middle class society in developing countries.

As some of the members of this House have seen for themselves, one of the big problems in developing countries in the world today is that there are the two extremes: you have the very rich and the extremely poor. Developing a middle class society in such countries will give greater stability, and hence a better standard of living will result.

It is estimated that by the year 2000, 80 per cent of the world's population will live in those countries that today are classified as developing nations. One thing that we as a nation must strive toward is a plan to prepare the people of developing countries to look after themselves relatively well by the year 2000. I say this because if 80 per cent of the people of the world are still living in countries where they do not have enough to eat, proper clothing and the comforts of life, then we cannot help but have international problems that stem directly from such economic and social conditions.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I hope other countries in the world will follow this example and set up new agencies with a board of governors of an international character. I hope these agencies will go to work in this field of research as problem solving agencies. We in this Parliament must not only attack the problems of today. We must always attack those problems, but when we face a serious situation such as the suggestion that 80 per cent of the world's population faces possible poverty by the year 2000, we must look beyond today's horizon and do something constructive.

In this respect, I should like to give my full support and the support of a very interested group in my constituency. They support and congratulate the minister and his staff on the passage and implementation of this legislation. I am very pleased by the great interest of the Science Association of Deep River. The several hundred professional scientists and technological people in that association are interested in doing all they can to assist the government to implement this plan.

[Mr. Hopkins.]

We also have a forest research station at Chalk River. This staff is extremely interested in providing assistance where it is needed in the field of forest genetics and other scientific projects. I know I speak for them when I say to the minister that he can count on the wholehearted support of this large body of scientific and technological people. I wish the minister and his staff every success in the implementation of this measure.

If there are things about this measure that must be revised in years to come, we should not hesitate to make changes which will make the plan more workable. No one group could bring in legislation of this far-reaching type that is 100 per cent efficient. This measure is certainly off to a flying start and I am sure that members on all sides of this House will agree that if in years to come changes are necessary, the government will meet with the same co-operative attitude which exists at this time.

In closing, let me once again compliment the minister and his staff on this far-reaching legislation. I compliment the government in general for the international character of the board of governors. This is a new plan that we hope will provide for more efficient spending of the money provided to assist the developing countries of this world. By the year 2000 we will be in a position to say that at least Canadians have done something useful to create peace in the world. We have taken the humanitarian and economic steps necessary to provide the people of developing countries with the mental tools to look after themselves.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to use a few minutes of the time of the house to say a word or two about this bill before it is referred to the committee. I am sure all members of this house would endorse any policy or program this or any other government might introduce that is of benefit to developing countries. I have always been one of those who feels it is far better to teach a man how to grow a bushel of corn than it is to give him the money to purchase that corn. I hope this is the philosophy of the bill now before us. Anything we can do to encourage and support research in an international sphere such as this should be done.

Let me caution the minister and the government about the possibility of overlapping or duplication in the field of science. There is

not a university in Canada which is not conducting a great amount of research useful to developing countries. There are a number of agricultural experimental stations doing research across this nation. The Canada Council is supporting a great deal in this regard, as well as the Department of External Affairs. Many foundations such as the Ford Foundation are contributing large sums of money to research. We must make sure that we do not introduce another body or corporation that will duplicate this research. I hope this will be a more efficient way of conducting research for the developing countries.

This research must be channelled and brought together in one central organization, I hope this is what the minister has in mind. The bill sets out that this board shall meet at least twice in each year with at least one such meeting at the head office, which I understand is to be in Ottawa. It shall meet at other times and places as the chairman may deem necessary. Let me remind the minister and hon. members of the outstanding facilities which are available at the University of Guelph in the riding I have the honour to represent, particularly in relation to agriculture. This university is known throughout the world as being outstanding in the field of research, in soil science, crop science, animal science and veterinary science. It is also engaged in research and teaching household science and provides a home economics course, as well as facilities at the arts college. If this board is to meet from time to time in other places, I can think of no better place than the campus of the University of Guelph. The subjects taught there are those subjects of interest to developing countries. I am sure there would be a great wealth of knowledge available to such a meeting on this particular campus.

In concluding, let me repeat my hope that some of the duplication and overlapping in the various sciences will be overcome as the result of the establishment of this International Development Research Centre. It is my hope that this will provide a more efficient way of assisting those countries which so badly need our assistance. There is hardly a university in Canada that does not have a large number of students from foreign lands. They are learning the technical ways to improve the lot of their countrymen. I fully support this bill, providing it is not just another means to duplicate research at a great cost to the Canadian taxpayer.

• (5:20 p.m.)

There is no mention of the operating costs. There will be a grant of $1 million but there is no mention of the cost involved in respect of the operation of this centre. I believe, when we approve these things we should have some idea of the cost involved and the number of persons to be employed. Let us know where we are headed. So, I repeat what I said in the beginning. I endorse this bill provided it is not another example of duplication in the field of research.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Pursuant to special order made this day I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock.

At 5.22 p.m. the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—CANADIAN ACTION FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE

Mr. Speaker: Order. Leave has been granted to the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) to move the adjournment of the House pursuant to Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely:

—the situation arising out of the destruction of the Uli Airport and the possibility of the collapse of Biafran resistance, to the end that Canada may play an effective role in organizing and participating in an expanded observer team in Biafra, so as to ensure that guarantees given by the federal authorities against reprisals upon Biafran personnel be fully observed, and that a massive international relief operation be urgently organized, utilizing where possible existing relief distribution personnel, so as to minimize the widespread starvation which is imminent.

[*Translation*]

Therefore, the motion is as follows:

That the House do now adjourn.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the subject matter which requires the urgent consideration of this House is the

situation arising out of the recent damage to the Uli airport in Biafra and the collapse of Biafran resistance. I do not propose to rehash the past or attribute praise or blame for the past. History may have something to say about that. I do want to talk about the extreme urgency of the present. I want to stress that there are two things that are urgently required by the present emergency. The first is the necessity of organizing an expanded observer team. The second is the need for massive international relief efforts.

It is quite impossible for me to exaggerate the stark urgency of the situation, the immensity of the tragedy that lies just days ahead. The statement made to this House today by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) speaks of the need to co-ordinate outside relief activity on an international basis in co-operation with the government of Nigeria.

We in this party are in agreement as to the necessity of international action. We are agreed as to the necessity of co-operation from the government of Nigeria. But the fact of the matter, as was stated by Mr. James McCracken, director of the Church World Services of the United States of America, today is that there are 4 million people in the hospitals and feeding camps who have been receiving one meal a day and are facing imminent starvation. Mr. McCracken estimates that if supplies remain cut off—as they are now by the cutting off of Uli airport and the relief operations there—1 million people will die within 48 hours.

A statement issued today by Canairelief—I remind the House that Canairelief is the agency which, on behalf of Canadians, has been working in this field and knows what it is talking about—points out that virtually no food has been sent in during the past two days. Some 5 million people, according to its estimate, face immediate death by starvation or disease unless emergency steps are taken to increase the flow of relief supplies.

The statement by Canairelief goes on in these words:

> Thus the appalling death rate already standing at 2,000 to 3,000 a day could mount astronomically. This is a situation in which hours count.

I do not have the precise text, but I wish to read from what I understand was a telegram sent to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) by Canairelief today. It says:

> Some 5 million have virtually no food and relief supplies have stopped. Death rates will reach catastrophic proportions if relief supplies are delayed.

[Mr. Brewin.]

> Hundreds of thousands of people could face death within 48 hours. Action is needed not in days not in weeks, but in hours.
>
> Second: Canairelief and various agencies of the Joint Church Aid Organization could supply 500 to 1,000 tons tomorrow if permission is secured for use of the Uli airstrip. Our Sao Tomé based groups have supplies for immediate delivery in the neighbourhood of 5,000 tons.
>
> Third: we urgently request your government to secure permission from Nigeria for the free daily use of the Uli airstrip so as to deal with this interval until larger government programs can be set up.

I wish to add to this, Mr. Speaker, that if too much time is spent co-ordinating and discussing what is the appropriate action, the problem will have disappeared because the people whose need for action is so urgent will no longer be there. There has been much debate on the issue of genocide or destruction of a race. I do not propose to resume that debate here. I do assert that in the absence of effective, international action in the very near future the result will be precisely the same as if genocide had been deliberately planned. History, I suggest, will be the judge of this generation if the appalling result of the destruction of a gifted race by starvation stems from deliberate genocide or from inaction in this emergency.

The present method of supporting and distributing the food has been carried on by Joint Church Aid, the consortium of churches in which Canairelief has played a substantial part. In order to get on with the job, this organization has in the past acted heroically, imaginatively and effectively without the support of the Nigerian government. If it had waited for Nigerian approval it could not have saved the millions of lives it has already saved.

• (8:10 p.m.)

It must now be realized that the Nigerian government may wish to exclude this agency from the management of the emergency interim relief measures so urgently required. It is, however, a fact that the supplies immediately available for distribution in the next week or so are at Sao Tomé, under the control of Joint Church Aid. It is also true that the means of flying in these supplies immediately available for distribution in the next week or so, before land transportation or water route can be organized, is in the aircraft at present owned and controlled by Joint Church Aid at Sao Tomé.

It is also true that although some of the personnel have left, the people in charge of

the relief distribution centres are the only people capable of carrying on the job in an orderly way in the next short while. They are the personnel who have worked for Joint Church Aid and the International Red Cross, and they are still in Biafra.

If the existing stocks are not used, if the aircraft facilities available at Sao Tomé are not used, if the present distribution system is not used in the interim until some other assistance can be organized, there will probably be few people left in the country to be saved by the time other routes of supply by land, water or otherwise can be organized. It is for this reason that the executive working group of Joint Church Aid, meeting today in Stuttgart, Germany, said:

> According to reports from medical staff the physical resistance of the civilian population in the afflicted areas is at such a low ebb that if supplies are cut back for even a week, a high percentage of the population may not survive.

Joint Church Aid officials are fully confident that the Nigerian federal government will make possible the immediate continuance, and even an increase of the relief flights until such time as massive relief supplies are brought forward by normal surface routes. It is for this reason that Joint Church Aid in the United States has offered its facilities to the Nigerian Red Cross. It is for this reason that Canairelief, the Canadian agency, said that its personnel, its supplies and its aircraft will be handed over to whatever agency will do the job.

This is the reason why I urge upon this government that the highest priority be given to co-operation with other friendly governments—I am thinking of the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and many other countries—to urge the Nigerian government forthwith to approve the Nigerian Red Cross accepting the offer made by Joint Church Aid on an interim basis, and continuing to use the present channels until plans for the rehabilitation of a more permanent system can be worked out on an international basis. The relief of starvation could start tomorrow if this method were used. The food is there, the aircraft are there and the method of distribution is there. All that is needed is that the button be pressed, and the only people who can press the button are the federal government of Nigeria. I suspect that the only people who can persuade them to press it and agree with this method are the governments of the countries I have mentioned and the government of Canada.

With the stocks of food and drugs at present in Sao-Tomé, with the co-operation of the Nigerian government to enable daylight flights, and if necessary night flights, it is anticipated that from Sao Tomé alone 14 or 15 aircraft using the warehouse facilities now available at Sao Tomé could transport upwards of 500 tons a day to Uli airport. Joint Church Aid had in its warehouses at Sao Tomé at the end of December a stock of approximately 5,000 tons, with 1,600 tons en route. If these supplies could be flown into Uli at the rate of 500 tons a night, they could tide over the dangerous interim period while the land and water corridors are organized and a new set-up created.

It may be that the Nigerian government feels it has a grievance because of what it regards as the unauthorized activities of Joint Church Aid in the past, but no such grievance should be allowed to stand in the way of saving the lives of virtually a whole people. The Nigerians must be magnanimous in victory or it will be a hollow victory, a victory which has turned an important part of their country into a graveyard.

Mr. Speaker, I do not tonight propose to discuss details. The urgent needs are food, drugs and medical supplies. The Canadian government should consider once again making its Hercules Aircraft available for all necessary transportation. If land routes are to be organized, trucks will have to be flown in. Portable medical field hospitals are essential. During this period some degree of security must be afforded those working in the distribution centres. The Nigerian government should be ready to give such guarantees of security as long as personnel work under the direction of the Nigerian Red Cross.

I should now like to say a word or two about the observers. The statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs today indicated that the government was prepared to provide more observer personnel. There are two Canadian officers there at the present time. I urge that here, too, there is necessity for immediate and vigorous action.

This war arose out of fear of genocide. It started in an atmosphere of coups, countercoups and pogroms. It has been attended by massacres, the bombing of civilians and massive starvation. The international committee has entered into a solemn agreement which imposes upon it a moral obligation to see that genocide does not occur. The Nigerian government has intimated its willingness to accept expanded observer teams, but we are

in an area of great confusion with the population running into several millions.

To be useful the observer teams must be large enough in number to undertake a reasonable surveillance of all areas. It is important, in my judgment, that observers include not only military personnel but others qualified to consider and report the facts. Indeed, it is my suggestion that included in the observer teams should be experienced jurists who could be suggested by the International Commission of Jurists, and experienced representatives of the press whose function is not only to observe but to record facts. If the code of conduct described by the Nigerian government is to be carried out, if the issue of genocide is to be laid to rest, it is necessary that there be adequate and impartial observers and it is essential that they be on the spot now, when the strain is greatest.

I hope that during the course of this debate the Secretary of State for External Affairs will tell us, in more precise terms than those of his earlier statement, his plan in both these areas; I hope he will tell us what representations are being made as to relief, who he is in touch with, what instruments are proposed to be used in dealing with the immediate emergency I have described? In the observer field, how many observers are planned? Where they are to come from? Has contact been made with the Nigerian government for the acceptance of an expanded observer team? If the government is serious, and I believe it must be, about the events of the Biafran tragedy which has aroused the conscience of the people of Canada and of mankind, it must be prepared to act now, to act urgently and to give in the debate tonight precise answers to these questions.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, Canada has been proud to lead the world in humanitarian concern and in the field of peacekeeping. The time is now, tonight, to demonstrate that Canadians can and will give effective, vigorous and urgently needed leadership in this tragic situation. Humanity, respect for human life and the future of the world community alike demand that we do not fail.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, it is only the extraordinary nature of this debate that would make me impose myself on this Parliament twice in the same day, but you will have to put up with me and I make no apology for the necessity for the debate itself.

Canada and the world know where Biafra is now as countries scramble to provide food and medicine, freed from any political or diplomatic hang-ups. However, in a word or two I should like to recall the particularly brave people from various countries of the world who saw the need and responded, untroubled by diplomatic nuance, heedless of arguments about whether hundreds of thousands of deaths are an internal matter.

• (8:20 p.m.)

There is a great deal of cynicism about the relevancy of churches in today's order of things, but I suggest that without the churches the death toll would have been even more ghastly. Without the action of Joint Church Aid and Canairelief during the awful months from June until a day or two ago no food and medicine would have got into Biafra. It seems to me that on the occasions I have taken part in discussion on this issue I have been unable to get across what I think is the fundamental issue, that of man being willing to stand by. God knows, we have stood by enough in our generation, and that is what I cannot get out of my head.

I wish to read from what I think is one of the most splendid pieces of writing about this whole matter. The article was written by Renata Adler and appeared in *New Yorker* magazine last October. It summarizes the context that I have always felt applies to this matter. Why should I presume to suggest that others do not feel the same way? This is the context, surely, in which this tragedy should grip mankind. I read from this article as follows:

> The absurdist element keeps coming up in Biafra.

Of course, now "keeps" will have to be changed to "kept". I continue:

> The sense here is of a people about to die in isolation and pretending not to know it—convinced in any case by their recent history that they have no choice. Victims are seldom pure, or even entirely attractive, and a case can certainly be made against any victim of murder before some higher court of absolute irrelevance. But Biafrans (fighting a war, in a sense, for a position argued in Hannah Arendt's 'Eichmann in Jerusalem') are determined to avoid at least the accusation of passive complicity in their own destruction and resist, trusting their own interpretation of what the risks of capitulation and the costs of survival might be. Once the foremost advocates of Nigerian unity, they have been persuaded by a series, both before and since the war, of broken accords, systematic exclusions, and outright massacres, both total and selective (including the killing of all males over ten years old in a captured Biafran town whose civilians did not leave), that Nigeria intends to eliminate the peoples

of the region that is now Biafra, and that the intention of genocide is not one that you test, passively, until the last returns are in. In the massacres of summer, 1966 (nearly a full year before Biafra's secession from Nigeria), thirty thousand natives of the Biafran region were murdered. "I have just been reading 'Exodus'", Professor Nwosu told a group of friends, some time after his night of waiting at State House. "Before the war, a novel to me was a trivial thing. But I should have known the west would not be impressed by thirty thousand. Some of you literary people should have told me."

I suggest that there are some assurances—the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) mentioned some of them—that the government of Canada is entitled to obtain from the Government of Nigeria. They relate to these points: First, that no purges will take place and that prisoners will be fairly and humanely treated. The committee which studied this matter read a little booklet put out by the Nigerian government about the humane treatment of prisoners. I presume the contents of this booklet will be noted by the authorities. The second point is that the observer force be strengthened in scope and number and will be given carte blanche permission to travel throughout the entire country.

Third, experience and memory have made the Ibo people believe that mass slaughter will be their fate. The British government, which has a major responsibility for this war, now has an obligation to the peoples of Biafra, Nigeria and the world to ensure that the Biafran surrender is accepted honourably. Fourth, General Gowon will have to account to the United Nations, to the Organization of African Unity and to the Commonwealth, to say nothing of the ordinary peoples of the world who have watched the terrible war unfold. General Gowon has a heavy responsibility, and I sincerely hope that he will be persuaded to act mercifully by those governments which have seen fit to send him arms. Fifth, the United Nations and the ICRC must somehow evolve a formula which will allow the provision of humanitarian aid so that countries will no longer have an excuse to stand on the sidelines, waiting for permission to feed the people and administer medicine.

Recriminations have a hollow ring, particularly tonight. What might have been is conjecture. Surely we agree that self-righteousness is unacceptable when men have watched their brothers die. General Gowon has asked other countries to avoid or stay out of what he classifies an internal Nigerian matter. I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) does this interdiction still hold? Does Canada know about this? If the interdiction still holds, what have we done to force the government of Nigeria to change its mind?

Everybody is being bold now. The United Kingdom is flying in an aircraft and the Netherlands are flying 16 aircraft to Nigeria. President Nixon has telephoned the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. Have we telephoned anybody? If so, for what purpose?

Some people have questioned the amount of time our Parliament has taken on this issue. Some doubt the wisdom and efficacy of any involvement in what people classify as other men's troubles. Some are content to mask their sterility of policy with excuses. I suggest that those of us with public responsibility should heed the warning that I suspect is being given to us by a majority of thoughtful people who have been profoundly frustrated by the insensitivity of the United Nations to this issue.

Many people of good will consider it unacceptable for men to do nothing in these circumstances. These people have reason to be disillusioned because of the long months of inaction and indecision over the basically simple matter of feeding people who are starving. I think it would not hurt if we reminded ourselves that we are being overwhelmed by a surfeit of boasting about our technological achievements while at the same time we cannot carry a loaf of bread across a highway.

Since the dawn of history men have been able to feed other men. We have spent a year congratulating ourselves on our advances in the field of human rights and what we like to call fundamental freedoms. But hospitals, marketplaces and feeding stations are still strafed in the name of "one country". Man has landed on the moon and has transferred human hearts, but cannot land on a neutral airstrip and transfer food and medicine. Men say, knowingly, that war is ugly. This is their excuse. If we know that, and God knows we have reason enough to know it in this century, why cannot we evolve a formula to stop war?

• (8:30 p.m.)

Is a slogan worth a life? Is a concept of sovereignty worth a village? Is a boundary drawn by man worth redrawing with man's blood? The governments of the world are hurrying to help in a veritable tumble of concern, but many nights were filled by the sound of aircraft flying dangerously low, paid

for by modest people, inspired by the strangest collection of religious leaders ever gathered together to share a task. If we seek heroes, here they are. We should remember them as we pick up the pieces and wrest a formula for stopping this madness in which men engage.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, we have heard today the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) concerning the Nigerian tragedy.

On reading that statement, we realize that the government is disposed even to airdrop supplies, now that it knows the Nigerians have crushed the Biafrans. And yet two years ago, the government was told that it was time to help the Biafrans who were dying by hundreds of thousands through lack of food. If it had been decided then to airdrop supplies, our country would have helped to counterbalance the sale of arms by England and Russia to the Nigerians.

It must be said that the Canadian government behaved somewhat like Pontius Pilate saying it was not responsible for the Biafran victims. For my part, I prefer to have been one of those who demanded the adoption of emergency measures rather than an irresponsible member who would not have asked a majority government to take the necessary action.

If we recall briefly the history of this civil war, we discover that already in 1966 the "Southerners", also called Ibos, were being massacred.

At that time, they were already amputating the hands of Biafran civil servants to prevent them from writing. Trains of refugees from the South were being stopped by Northern Nigerian troops, and men, women and children tortured and butchered.

To show the Ibos what to expect if they came back to the northern part of the territory, some of them were deported after having had their noses, lips, ears and hands cut off. Despite such a massacre, one and a half million refugees were successful in reaching the Eastern province and on May 27, 1968, the Nigerian authorities attempted to divide this Biafran region into three parts. They wanted furthermore to deprive it of a very vital seaport, that of Harcourt, to protect British-owned oil wells. I feel that this was already unacceptable to the Biafrans. It is why they fought stubbornly until death rather than surrender.

[Mr. Fairweather.]

History repeats itself. We have at the present time a government which, to my way of thinking, was not firm enough when firmness was called for, a government without backbone which would rather see a people assassinated than express its disapproval to a country that we know well, a country to which we did immeasurable services in money and in human lives during the last two wars.

The Canadian war effort has saved England from disaster. Therefore it seems to me that this country should have listened attentively to our representations, had they been strong enough, and stopped selling arms to Nigeria to protect certain economic interests controlled by the British government: oil wells, peanuts or cocoa. To sacrifice human lives in order to secure control over the economy of a country is what we call a criminal act which will not go unpunished. I know that some will feel guilty for having watched the genocide of a people without saying a word.

What kind of arms did England sell to Nigeria? Firstly, the 120,000 Nigerian soldiers got ultramodern material, especially many British "Salodin" tanks, 18 bombers and many other British planes, six coast-guard vessels and all the military equipment that a modern army needs. All this has been furnished in order to ensure the protection of the interests of the British Shell company which discovered oil in 1955.

And in the meantime, our government said in the House that we cannot interfere in the domestic problems of a country. In my opinion, all this was nothing but deceit and even, sometimes, hypocrisy—just like the ostrich which would rather bury its head in the sand.

I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to the prose of a young 18 year old student who made an appeal to Canadians, and I quote:

L'APPEL AUX CANADIENS

Amitié, Fraternité.
De quoi êtres-vous les symboles?
De cet univers plein de cruauté,
Êtes-vous bien l'auréole?

Des hommes meurent par milliers
Là-bas, dans ce pays du Biafra,
Personne ne bouge, et, tel des piliers,
Chacun se dit: «Ce n'est pas le Canada» ...

Le Gouvernement se meurt d'insolence
Tandis que d'autres expirent de souffrance
Notre premier ministre fait la bise
Les autres subissent la crise.

D'innocentes victimes s'éteignent tous les jours
Et ce doit être un peu de chaque Canadien qui part aussi

Pourquoi alors, dans le dédale de notre vie,
Employer ces deux mots: Amitié, Amour?

Disons plutôt: Égoïsme, Injustice
On atteindra alors la vérité
Et cette vérité régnera sous d'heureux auspices
Dans notre fausse et futile cité.

Canadiens, écoutez le cri de ces malheureux
Au nom de l'amitié, de la fraternité,
Cessez votre double jeu

Délivrez votre conscience de ses faux atouts
Afin que dans le monde et partout,
Règne la «Paix» et la «Bonté».

If a young 18 year old student can write such things, I think that a responsible government should have also taken the steps which would have prevented, at that time, the enormous mistakes which were made.

Besides, as evidenced on page 15 of *Hansard* for September 13, 1968, I said, and I quote:

I should like to direct a question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Could the Prime Minister say whether the government intends to intervene as concerns England—which he knows well—to stop the shipping of arms to the federal troops in Nigeria now guarding the Shell Company oil wells?

On September 18, 1968, as can be found on page 190 of *Hansard*, I said that since the beginning of the war in Biafra more than 2 million people had died because the federal troops of Nigeria wanted to protect the oil wells and I wondered whether we should not discourage the Nigerians who were pushed by England to commit that genocide. I also asked the Prime Minister and his government if the Shell Company was not one of those which puts in office governments of its choice, with amounts of money which too often explain why election funds are so well filled.

• (8:40 p.m.)

And still England continued selling arms and airplanes which made possible the murder of civilians and the bombing of hospitals maintained by the Red Cross.

I said then that mothers begged the Prime Minister of Canada for help, because we have, as Canadians, the reputation of being a pacifist people. These mothers said that children were writhing in pain, crying their misfortune and begging for mercy. I implored the Prime Minister to put an end to that tragedy. In fact I said to him that if he had any children of his own and if he heard them cry: Mommy, I am hungry, he would hurry to England in order to ask the authorities to stop selling offensive weapons responsible for that war which should never have been.

Canadian Action on Nigeria-Biafra

On October 10, 1968, as can be read on page 1020 of *Hansard*, I asked the following question:

In a statement on the troubles in Biafra, the Secretary of State for External Affairs reaffirmed that Canada would support Nigeria against the secessionist rebels.

The Prime Minister was then asked if the Canadian government policy consisted in giving Nigeria aid which permitted it to murder Biafrans.

To another question, the Secretary of State for External Affairs answered he believed one of the essential reasons for not wanting to deal with such a problem was that we did not want to get mixed up in the internal affairs of a country. But all that time, countries such as England and Russia kept on selling arms.

On June 19, I asked the Prime Minister if the International Red Cross, that had put into service a maritime route to Nigeria's capital, could be permitted to provide for the transportation of food on such a route in order to assist Biafrans. And as one may read at page 10405 of *Hansard*, the Prime Minister replied and I quote:

I will have to rely upon the Secretary of State for External Affairs to answer that question, which I will pass on to him.

On February 10, 1969, the Pope himself made the following appeal to bring that civil war to a stop:

Before God and our conscience, we feel that we failed to resort to the action in our power in order to find a solution that would have reduced arms to silence.

The Christian conscience cannot bring itself to yield to discouragement and resign itself to mutual destruction.

In the meantime, our country refused to interfere in spite of our repeated requests and those of all the opposition.

One can see all the crimes a government is likely to commit when it stands for out and out federalism. The most sensible statement I have read is that made by the President of Tanzania. According to the Tuesday, October 28, 1969, issue of the newspaper *Le Devoir* he said:

"As President of Tanzania, it is my duty to protect the integrity of the United Republic. However, if the whole of the Zanzibar people, without any foreign aid and for reasons of their own, were to decide that the Union is prejudicial to their existence, I could not recommend that bombs be dropped on them until they surrender."

"No foreign aid! Were the Biafrans in the same situation? The President of the UAO did

not think so and I will quote again from the same newspaper. He contended that:

> —the sole explanation for the Nigeria-Biafra conflict was the greed of the colonialists and the imperialists and their determination to weaker the will power of Africa, to scatter its forces and to dissolve its great unity in order to stifle it before getting hold of it once more."

Since the people of Biafra, to whom Irish Catholics preached the gospel, tried to hold their heads up again, it was decided they were to be crushed. These people wanted to get an education. In 1961, out of 41,000 federal public servants, only 400 came from the North. Out of 437 graduates, 10 only came from the North and today, 5 million Ibos Biafrans, are waiting for death. These people, who in the old days, provided 20,000 slaves for America, in the 17th century, deserve a better fate, in my opinion, and America as a whole should have opposed this mass slaughter.

That is why in order to prevent the murder of our brothers, I urge the Secretary of State for External Affairs, as I did this afternoon, to delegate representatives of the four political parties and send them immediately as observers to the battle front in order to request first of all an immediate end to the slaughter and to the arms shipments which should be replaced right away by shipments of food, for Canadian neutralism has hitherto reeked far too much of oil. Such protection of economic interests has silenced the consciences and smothered all human feelings. No ideology whatsoever can justify this scandal. Indeed, the present crisis is that of the conscience of humanity as a whole.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I will add just one more word: War! Never more.

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all members of this House, and indeed all Canadians, share with me a profound feeling of relief that the long and agonizing conflict in Nigeria seems finally to have come to an end. I have just received a bulletin which indicates that the last remaining town is now in the hands of the Nigerian forces. I have also received information that General Gowon has announced an amnesty to all those who were led into futile attempts to disintegrate the country, adding: "We have arrived at one of the greatest moments in the history of our nation." This seems to indicate that the war has, indeed, finally reached a conclusion.

The task which faces the world community today is to give to the government and the people of Nigeria every possible assistance as they face the task of reconciling their differences and rehabilitating the areas where the fighting has been taking place.

I need hardly tell hon. members who have been following these events almost as closely as I have that the situation is this: Open warfare has now come to an end and the major obstacles to the supplying of relief and the rehabilitation of the country, which lay in the fact that there were fighting lines and the resources of the country were being used in a terrible war, are now being removed. Both General Gowon and General Effiong, who is now the active leader of the Biafrans, have made statements of a conciliatory nature expressing the hope that outstanding differences will be settled amicably and quickly. I was impressed when reading the statement made by General Effiong today, in which he said:

> I am convinced, now, that a stop must be put to the bloodshed which is going on as a result of the war. I am also convinced that the suffering of our people must be brought to an immediate end. Our people are now disillusioned and those elements of the old government regime who have made negotiation and reconciliation impossible have voluntarily removed themselves from our midst. I have therefore instructed an early disengagement of troops.

It is quite clear, when we look back on this terrible period, that there were difficulties on both sides. Very often an attempt had been made to paint one side or the other as trying to impose their will. In fact, I think the situation was of such a nature that the differences had to be composed either peacefully or by violence within the country, and that efforts at intervention from outside very often only had the result of prolonging the conflict.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Especially when countries supplied arms.

Mr. Sharp: Yes, especially when they provided arms. I am very glad that this country never participated in that kind of intervention.

The hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) asked whether there was evidence that General Gowon still maintained his position on outside intervention, and the answer to that is in the affirmative. I should like to quote an excerpt, not from General Gowon's actual speech, a copy of which I

have seen, but his words in the form in which I have them here:

The federal military government has warned foreign countries, organizations and individuals not to interfere in the internal affairs of the country in order not to prolong the sufferings of those trapped in the rebel held areas.

An hon. Member: When did he say that?

Mr. Sharp: Yesterday.

The government has also given the assurance that efforts as to rehabilitation and reconciliation among all Nigerians would continue. This is contained in the head of state's message of congratulations he sent to the federal troops for their capture of the rebel administrative headquarters, Owerri, and other successes in the war. The Commander in Chief renewed his call on the soldiers to adhere strictly to the code of conduct issued to them at the beginning of the military operations.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Would the minister indicate why newsmen have been excluded from the front during this period of engagement?

Mr. Sharp: I am sorry, I do not know the reason for that. I will go on to say something about the experience of our observers, who have not been excluded.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question about the statement concerning non-intervention from outside?

Mr. Sharp: Yes.

Mr. Lewis: Does the minister read that statement as referring to relief as well as to intervention in the political settlement that has to take place?

Mr. Sharp: No, I do not think so. I am very hopeful that the Nigerian government will be prepared to co-operate with all countries of the world in accepting relief and in facilitating its distribution. I do not think that that is the kind of intervention that General Gowon had in mind. I am quite confident that what he had in mind was the kind of intervention where countries sometimes acted without full agreement by both sides to the conflict, particularly without the agreement of the Nigerian government which is now apparently fully in control of affairs in that country.

Mr. Lewis: Has the minister had any assurance that General Gowon will agree to relief from outside?

Mr. Sharp: Not as yet. Reports have been coming from representatives of the Nigerian government which seem to point to that conclusion. My own conclusion is that the Nigerian government will certainly be ready to accept co-operation. The war was over only this morning, but I should think that without undue delay arrangements can be made.

Joint Church Aid and Canair food flights appear to have come to an end, for the time being at least. There are stocks of food available in Nigeria and in neighbouring countries sufficient to meet the immediate needs of the Nigerian population for the next few weeks, if not for the next few months, and these stocks will be replenished as required.

The immediate problem is to distribute this food in the areas where it is needed, without delay. In the first instance—and I say this to all hon. members—we must rely on the Nigerian Red Cross and the Nigerian Rehabilitation Commission, both of which have already been in operation in this field. The reports we have received from our observers in Nigeria during recent months have referred to the way in which the Nigerian Red Cross has been following the troops and looking after the refugees as they have streamed across the lines. The Nigerian Rehabilitation Commission, on the other hand, has been concerned with the problem of rehabilitation rather than immediate relief. It is upon these agencies that essentially we must rely. This is one of the reasons that last week, before the war had come to an end and when we were expecting it might go on for some time, we had decided we should support those operations which were concerned with the welfare of those who were formerly in Biafra as well as those who had been in the federally-controlled areas of Nigeria all the time.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, we have contributed $1 million to those two organizations within the last few days. We have also made a contribution to the International Red Cross which, as the House knows, the government has been supporting throughout the whole of this unhappy war.

We have felt—and I am sure the House will agree with us—that since the Red Cross is the one internationally recognized agency available to meet disaster of various kinds around the world, it is most important that that institution should always have the support of the Canadian government. As it turned out, it became relatively ineffective because it was not able to operate at night, the Nigerian government failing to agree to night flights. It was unable to operate by day because Biafra

refused to accept daylight flights. But as an institution the International Red Cross had to be supported. It continued to work behind the lines on both sides, and we shall continue to give it our support. I hope the International Red Cross will be the focal point of international efforts, because I think its workers have the greatest experience and can bring about the best co-ordination of international relief.

The government will provide additional funds and supplies as they are required and in co-operation with other interested nations. According to reports from our High Commissioner in Lagos and from our observers on the International Observer Team, these institutions have been operating effectively among refugees in the war area as the Nigerian armies have advanced.

The government is prepared to provide Canadian Armed Forces' aircraft to supplement the work of the organizations presently in Nigeria by way of airdrops to inaccessible areas or by making airlifts when landing facilities are available. We have three Hercules aircraft standing by and are prepared to activate others if they are needed.

In the end, however, the effective distribution of food to the population of eastern Nigeria requires the use of land routes. We today have a report from our High Commissioner in Lagos assuring us that the roads are in better condition than might have been expected in view of the fighting that has taken place in that area. Indeed, I read a report yesterday from our High Commissioner which spoke about a Red Cross team that had run quite freely up and down the roads. Therefore, we are not in the position of not having land routes; some are available and can be put to use immediately.

What is required over the next few weeks and months is a carefully planned, co-operative relief operation. It is our view that this can best be carried out under the aegis of an international organization, preferably the Red Cross, and with the co-operation of the government of Nigeria, which is after all in control of events there. We cannot do anything except in co-operation with them. We in this House should offer our sincere and hearty co-operation to the government of Nigeria, and I am sure we all do so.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Would the minister permit a question on the point about the Hercules aircraft and the necessity of having them in a forward position? I am wondering whether the government has conveyed to the

[Mr. Sharp.]

officials in Lagos the possibility of moving aircraft like the Hercules and other transport equipment into a forward position, in order that we can assist the people in eastern Nigeria as soon as possible?

Mr. Sharp: We have been looking carefully at what we can do in this respect most effectively. One of the things we have already done is to make available to the Nigerian Red Cross and the Rehabilitation Commission money with which to purchase trucks which are as close as possible to the areas affected.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The best place from which to get trucks is neighbouring countries. Taking them across the Atlantic is not the quickest way of getting them there. It may be possible to airlift trucks from some part of Europe down to Lagos, but to transport them across the Atlantic is a very doubtful proposition. Therefore, our judgment of the best way of helping was to make money available so trucks could be purchased there as close as possible to the area. That we did, and we told the Rehabilitation Commission and Nigerian Red Cross what the offer was.

For a year or more Canada has had a senior officer of the Canadian Armed Forces in the area as part of the International Observer team. The senior observers with the team have all had combat experience. They have assured us that they have been given every opportunity to carry out their responsibilities and that they have so far found no evidence of genocide. Some people have said to me, "These observers are not given freedom of action." This is not so. We have had no complaints whatsoever from our observers charging that the Nigerian government has prevented them from going where they wanted to go. Indeed, they have reported that the Nigerian forces have helped the Red Cross and the Nigerian Rehabilitation Commission in caring for refugees and restoring, to the extent possible, normal conditions as they have advanced.

I should like to point out to hon. members that it is both an unusual and a fortunate circumstance that we have in the field, and operating, an observer team, and that the Nigerian government long ago consented to have these observers there. This has certainly helped to remove any fears up until now that genocide is taking place. I agree with hon. members that if possible there should be an increase in the number of observers. This is a

decision, of course, that has to be made by the Nigerian government.

Our High Commissioner in Lagos has been instructed to offer the Nigerian government further observers, and a number of other countries have done likewise. I spoke to the French ambassador tonight. He told me that he hoped he would have the support of the Canadian government to a French initiative which is in favour of a greater number of observers, even though the French government is not represented on this team. I assure the House that we are in favour of that. We are prepared to offer them, but we cannot force them upon anyone. That responsibility must rest with the Nigerian government.

I think it is an indication of the essentially humanitarian approach of the Nigerian government in this field, at least until now, that they have permitted observers to observe the actions of their troops. I do not think there has ever been a civil war in history in which this has happened.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister permit a question? Has he or anyone on behalf of the government of Canada engaged in conversation with countries such as Britain and the United States about a common approach to Nigeria regarding enlarging the team of observers?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, we have informed our friends in Britain, the United States and France of our proposal to the Nigerian government. They are likewise making representations, and I hope that our joint efforts will be successful.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, can we be assured that the observers presently located in Nigeria are moving at the front lines and not, as was the case very often in the past, following at some later time the military engagements that take place?

Mr. Sharp: We expect a report within the next day or two on the situation in Nigeria today. The observers are due to make a report, I think on January 13, so we should be getting a report within the next day or two, which I hope I will be able to publish, which will give some indication of their observations of the recent past. The reports may not be up to date, of course, because there have been very dramatic developments within the last few days.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Were they instructed to be at the front during this extremely critical period?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, those are their general instructions. The International Observer Team has instructions to observe the conduct of the Nigerian troops and to report any evidences of genocide. So far they have found none. Indeed, they have reported, as I have said, that the Red Cross and the Nigerian Rehabilitation Commission have been following the troops and that refugees have on the whole been very well looked after, or as well as they can be.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, before the minister concludes his remarks, will he deal specifically with the suggestion I made regarding the emergency in the next few days, namely, that the stocks of supplies in Sao Tomé, the aircraft, the crew and the distribution machinery which is in existence be handed over perhaps to the Nigerian Red Cross for use, before millions die in the country?

Mr. Sharp: That was the next point of my remarks. I have today had conversation with Dr. Ted Johnson of Canairelief on the future of that organization. Canairelief has, as hon. members know, for many months been engaged in carrying out night flights in Biafra without the consent of the Nigerian government. Therefore, there must be some doubt whether they will be allowed to continue this activity. At least, this is the information we received from Lagos. I am passing on the views that have been expressed to me. Dr. Johnson told me that if they cannot continue their flights, they are willing to put their foodstocks at the disposal of the Red Cross. It is unclear what role Canairelief may be able to play. I have advised them that the most likely way for them to help is by co-operating fully with the Red Cross.

Dr. Johnson and Dr. McKay jointly sent me a message in which they urged me to make representations in Lagos to the effect that Canairelief be allowed to carry on its operations. I think we have to consider what is the best way of getting these supplies used. This does not really involve a question as to whether Canairelief continues, but rather a question regarding the quickest way of getting these supplies from Sao Tomé into the area. I have told Dr. Johnson that on that point we are fully agreed. We will have to decide what is the most efficacious way. If the Nigerian government says it cannot trust

Canairelief because they acted in contravention of their orders, we will have to find some other way of dealing with the problem. I certainly share the views of hon. members of the House that these food supplies should get in there, because they form part of the immediate reserves available. As the hon. member says, there are some 5,000 tons of most valuable foodstuffs and we should make every effort to see that they are moved into the area.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) seeks to ask another question, I should draw the attention of the House to the fact that the ministers' time has expired, unless it is the disposition of the House that he continue. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated that Canairelief officials have consented to the movement of their foodstocks by any other transfer agency. My question, which has not yet been dealt with in the minister's remarks, has to do with the transportation of these materials. Since the equipment, the crews and the system is there ready to operate, has any discussion taken place regarding another method that might be adopted, using the transportation facilities that are ready for use immediately?

Mr. Sharp: The answer to that question is that we have had some discussions but no decisions have yet been reached. As I said a little earlier, the war ended only this morning and within the last few hours the situation has been transformed out of all recognition. I think it is unreasonable to expect that at this particular moment all these problems should be settled. I assure hon. members that we are as anxious as they to see that this food is made available in these areas. This is one of the reasons we are making transportation available. Perhaps Canadian government planes could be used for this purpose. Perhaps the Red Cross could use the planes, if Canairelief is unacceptable as the agent. I hope it is not, to be quite frank, but this is something that is not entirely within our control.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I think the House wants to know whether the minister will give his assurance that he will make immediate representations to the government of Nigeria asking that the stocks of food, planes and personnel of Canairelief be allowed to operate either under Canairelief, the Nigerian Red Cross or the International Red Cross—I do not think it is important which one—and whether these personnel will be allowed to operate immediately to meet the situation which is so pressing and so distressing at this time. We want some assurance from the minister that such representation will be made immediately.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Sharp: I can assure the hon. member and the House that we are very anxious that those food supplies be moved into the area immediately. I did say earlier that the means is quite important. If we were to insist that Canairelief do it, that might hold up the operation.

An hon. Member: No one is asking that.

Mr. Sharp: I suggest we are trying to find a means to move the food whether it is done by Canairelief or otherwise makes no difference to us. This is one of the problems with which we are engaged and upon which we are trying to get decisions.

Perhaps I should say a further word about my talk with Dr. Johnson. When he was speaking to me on the telephone this morning, and in a later message, he spoke about the particular difficulty being encountered by Canairelief because they were not sure whether in fact their equipment, and so on, was going to be useful. He urged upon the government some assistance to Canairelief to meet the immediate costs. I said to Dr. Johnson that no decision to spend money in that way had been reached, and that we had made a decision to spend money in transporting food to the airstrip at Uli. Of course, he could make representations to us for assistance in this immediate problem.

This is another reason I agree with the hon. member who asked about the urgency of the matter. It is urgent from every point of view. The difficulty is that the equipment and planes standing there are costing Canairelief money while they are inactive. It is essential, from the point of view of Canairelief itself, that there be action as soon as possible.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): What possible objection could there be to the Canadian government guaranteeing

the cost of maintaining those planes for 48 hours or 72 hours until a decision is reached?

Mr. Sharp: We have not yet had an opportunity to discuss this question. I thought the House would be interested in hearing the position of Canairelief at the moment. This representation is now under consideration.

In conclusion, I agree with hon. members that this is a time for action rather than talk. It is also a time, of course, for effective action and not simply for propaganda. We have to be, and I think have been throughout this whole bloody and despicable war, careful to avoid participation in propaganda exercises.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: Our purpose is to help. That is the only purpose we have. Our motives are as pure as those of any government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: They are related entirely to humanitarian considerations. Certainly we do not want to engage in propaganda and we do not want to lay blame on one side or the other. Our only purpose is to help. I think if we act in co-operation with the Nigerian government we will achieve the most effective results.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone in this House, the people of Canada and the people of the world who have had their attention so vividly drawn to the tragedy of Nigeria during the last year or two rejoice today in the news that actual military activities have stopped. While this poses a tremendous challenge in so far as the immediate need in the next weeks and the longer range need so far as rehabilitation is concerned, we can rejoice that we can now look toward something positive.

I have spent most of today meeting with a church-oriented group in the city of Toronto in an effort to work out an emergency program for the most urgent need at the moment. I refer to the need for doctors, nurses and social workers who can take over or assist with the tremendous problem of distributing food and relief supplies that are presently stockpiled either on the Nigerian side or in some of the countries adjacent to Nigeria.

I believe I am right in saying there were between 500 and 1,000 workers in the area which we know as Biafra. Many of those workers have been evacuated in recent days. I believe it is also correct to say that many of them will not readily be able to go back and pick up what they have left. In other words, there is a need for replacements as well as an additional task force of people to handle the food and medical needs that are so urgently necessary for the survival of millions of people.

I do not think that most of my colleagues in the House are familiar with the fact that I spent a number of days in the early part of December, just a month ago, in Africa in relation to the situation in Nigeria. I was particularly concerned about speaking to the representatives of the member nations of the Organization of African unity who make up the special committee which had been set up by the OAU to deal with the Biafran situation. Emperor Haile Selassie is the chairman of that committee. At that time there was a major offensive to bring Nigeria and Biafra together to negotiate a final end to hostilities in order to prevent the heavy military action which took place during the last week.

To the credit of the Biafran administration at that time, which I believe was clearly able to see the writing on the wall, a delegation came from Biafra and arrangements were set up for negotiation away from the public eye where not only could they negotiate but also sign an agreement which would allow a settlement to be made by negotiation. Unfortunately, some of the interference that has come from European countries during the whole course of this tragic experience in Nigeria took place again, and the Nigerians were probably advised that it was in their own interest to continue the military activity which at that time they were prepared to begin.

There are several observations I should like to pass on which came out of the discussions I had with the various African leaders who are members of the OAU and are directly concerned with the Biafran situation. I do not intend to go back and try to review the situation which led up to the Secessionist action of General Ojukwu. However, perhaps I should go back briefly to the massacres in 1966 and the obvious hostile attitude of many of the Nigerian people and elements of the government at that time which led to the massacres of thousands of Ibo people.

One would also have to go over the history of the two coups. The first was the elimination of the original government of free Nigeria, which as we are told was basically instigated by Ibo officers in the army and which

gave governmental leadership to General Ironsi. Then there was the second coup, reportedly led by General Gowon which eliminated General Ironsi and the subsequent establishment of Lt. Colonel Ojukwu as governor of the eastern area where the Ibo people have their traditional home and where several hundred thousand fled following the massacres of a year or two earlier.

• (9:20 p.m.)

One would also have to recapitulate the trek home of the Ibo people. Certainly this is one of the tragic chapters in the history of independent Africa. However, I think we must at this time be pragmatic. It is not good enough now to try and lay the blame at the doorstep of this one or that. The people of Canada and the government of Canada have a tremendous responsibility to pick up the pieces wherever we are able, to attempt to prevent the deaths of tens of thousands of people, deaths that will take place in the next week or two unless efficient and prompt action is taken. The situation is far more tragic there today than we here can understand.

I wish to make a few observations as a result of my discussions with representatives of member countries of the OAU committee which was set up to deal with the Biafran situation. I was told there was no doubt that more than 2 million civilians had lost their lives during the course of this conflict over the last two years. I was also told that unless the war stopped within three months, it was conservatively estimated that there would be another 3 million deaths because the masses of people in the little enclave which was Biafran territory at that time were living on the threshold of death by starvation, malnutrition or disease.

One thing which was made very clear to me was that the political differences between Nigeria and secessionist Biafra would have to be settled by Nigerians with the aid of Africans who were members of the Organization of African Unity, and that there had already been far too much interference by European nations. Much has been said about the actions of the United Kingdom, Russia and France in this war. The inference was that their actions were not only concerned with the supplying of arms but were also political in nature.

I am convinced that those who criticized the Canadian government and said it should have gone in and stopped the war did not know what they were talking about. The question which immediately posed itself to me was: How could this have been done?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: It was legitimate to try to convince Great Britain that her policies were wrong and to make appeals to Russia, France and the United Nations, but how could Canada have involved itself in the internal affairs of Nigeria? Could it have been done by moving in an army? Of course, this could not have been done. Could we have tried to club Great Britain over the head until she saw some reason in the situation? This we could not do, either. We had a responsibility to use our influence, and I hope this has been done in the most effective way possible. If it has not been done, Mr. Speaker, then part of the responsibility for what has happened in Biafra will also be ours.

Again I say that the point of my remarks is not to try to accuse somebody but to try and outline the facts as they were explained to me by Africans. I discussed the matter of genocide with African leaders and expressed to them our concern. I explained to them how the emotions of the Canadian people had been roused in a very unique and commendable way through fear of what was happening in Nigeria.

I was reminded by these Africans, who wanted a settlement just as much as we did, and even more, that the International Observer Team which had gone to Nigeria could not substantiate with evidence the charge that there had been an intentional attempt by the government of Nigeria to eliminate or destroy the Ibo people. In fact General Gowon is not a Hausa, or even a Mohammedan; he is a Christian and belongs to one of the small tribes of central Nigeria. This is also the case with many of his leaders. Many Ibo people retained senior positions in the Nigerian government throughout the war years. In fact, General Gowon's own wife is an Ibo girl.

One of the things General Gowon has said to people who know him personally is that he did not want to have to accept the blame for military action killing millions of people, or at least tens of thousands of people more than had already been killed by direct military action and thus held back indirect military action. So, Mr. Speaker, there is another side to the story.

Without trying to minimize the situation in Nigeria that led to the secessionist action of General Ojukwu, it is important that we evaluate the situation from the standpoint that

it is General Ojukwu himself who really must carry the brunt of the blame for the war and for the death of so many of his people, especially during the last few months when surely he could have seen the handwriting on the wall and realized that it was impossible for him to win the war.

I urge hon. members of this House to consider the matter carefully. We must accept our responsibilities. There are those who say that Canada should have done more to stop the war. I remind them of what we thought of General de Gaulle when he came to Quebec and uttered just a few words extolling the independence of the province of Quebec. Certainly his cry of "Vive le Quebec libre" was not accepted by Canadians. In the same light, it was impossible for a foreign country such as Canada to go in and settle the war in Nigeria.

In relation to the situation in Africa, I would also point out that if the Biafran secessionist movement had succeeded and a country of Biafra had been established, there are a dozen potential Biafran situations in African countries. The tribal situation in many of the new countries in Africa is such that if some tribes thought there was the possibility of gaining their own ends, they would follow the lead provided by Biafra. I can give no better example than the crisis through which Kenya has passed in recent months.

Without belabouring this situation any further, may I commend to the House an article which appears in tonight's *Telegram*. It was written by Peter Worthington, a reporter who has spent several months on both sides. The article has much merit and is worthy of our consideration.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that during the last few weeks food shipments could have been made to Biafra if a land corridor had been used. But the Biafran leaders made it clear that they could not accept the use of a land corridor because they feared the food would be poisoned by the Nigerian authorities, even though assurance was given of international supervision. I also suggest that if the Biafran officials had allowed daylight flights it would not have been necessary for the International Red Cross or the World Relief Commission to stop its food flights, which occurred only a few weeks ago.

I wish also to refer to the statement issued today by General Philip Effiong, which I think is worthy of note. As I read it, I think he meant it to be interpreted as saying clearly that those officials who have been responsible for enforcing the continuance of the fighting in recent weeks have now been removed from the scene, meaning General Ojukwu and his senior officials, and he hopes to achieve as honourable a settlement as can possibly be worked out. I think this is commendable.

I am also concerned about the present attitude of many humanitarian agencies and many people who have been interested in relief efforts in Canada in recent months and years. I am concerned about why in some areas their reaction has been negative to the news that the war has stopped. It seems to me that we ought to be lifting our hearts in thanksgiving to the Almighty that this has been the case, and then ready ourselves for the responsibility which is the challenge of this debate.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I say to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) that the government has a responsibility to the tens of thousands of Canadian people who in the last year or two have been so concerned and have shown it in active participation by their contributions. The government must receive direct assurance from the Nigerian government that they will allow full and free distribution of food and relief supplies. If the Nigerian government intends to fulfil its stated policy, there is no reason, why they should not give this assurance.

Second, I think it is imperative that we ready the aircraft which the minister has said is available at the present time to move in and transport the supplies which are stockpiled. There are ample supplies for at least the weeks ahead. These should be moved into the area where fighting has ceased. Without four, five or six million people in that small area the confusion and breakdown of communications and the administration of law and order, except such as the military forces of Nigeria are able to provide, demands immediate action. This is of first importance.

Third, from reports which I have received today through a church oriented relief organization in which I am personally involved, it appears that the immediate need, in addition to the transportation of food supplies, medicine and relief supplies, is personnel. I am very pleased to say that one Canadian organization is moving to send a team of a dozen or twenty doctors, nurses and social workers. I believe there will be much response from the

private sector in Canada in this regard through non-governmental organizations, but the government must take the lead to make sure that relief supplies are moved in by supplying aircraft where necessary and helping to fill the general needs of the people as they relate to the distribution of essential supplies and services.

Fourth, I hope that we can interpret the remarks of the minister as meaning that the observer team will be strengthened. I believe that the government could very well assure the Organization of African Unity, as well as the Nigerian government, that it is ready to do all that is necessary in so far as international supervision is concerned. The government should request additional members for the observer team to ensure that the possibility of reprisals is minimized.

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 agreement for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have only a few more comments to make. I am very pleased to say that from conversations today with church leaders and members of various organizations who have been able to carry on relief work on both sides of the issue that there is going to be a further response by the Canadian people. I would emphasize, though, that the rehabilitation and reconstruction task in Nigeria will be tremendous. This is not just a problem for the next month or two until law and order is established and relief distribution centres are set up; there will be a continuing need over the next few years.

The Canadian government must show leadership here as well. It is one thing to rationalize; it is another thing to use our position to make demands of the Nigerian government whilst at the same time giving assurances of co-operation to the OAU, the Nigerian government, the International Red Cross and any other organization that might be able to participate directly. Someone will have to be responsible for the over-all supervision of the international relief effort, and this should probably be the International Red Cross. I hope the Canadian government will take steps to ensure that a single body supervises all international assistance and provides administrative co-ordination and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that the events of the last day or two have been some of the most momentous that have taken place in this House as we approach the decade of the 1970s. There is no question that this decade will probably be the most critical in the history of the world or even the history of civilization. We should be able to take some encouragement and hope from the fact that so early in this decade at least one international crisis seems to be subsiding, and I hope it will come to an end before too many more days have passed.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate one cannot help but over-emphasize the importance of this issue which must be of the highest priority. All members of the House should take this matter very seriously because it is one of the greatest tragedies affecting the modern world.

Just today one of my friends in the press gallery pointed out a very ironic incident that occurred at the question time. He noted that we were discussing the tragedy of the Biafra-Nigeria situation and then started asking questions about hockey and the troubles in the international hockey world. Many members seemed to view this as a more important question and feel more pain about it than they do about the matter now before us. There were then questions about the RCMP musical ride, veterans affairs and the British Commonwealth gallantry awards.

The question before us now concerns a matter of life and death. However, I was very disappointed in the speech and the statement given by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) in the House today because they demonstrated that the government did not feel any real sense of urgency in the issue. Also, when the Secretary of State for External Affairs was speaking just a few minutes ago he seemed to have a great deal of information from Lagos. I wonder why communications are so fast now, when a few weeks or a few days ago there seemed to be difficulty in communicating with Lagos when trying to arrange relief for people dying of starvation in Biafra. It used to take weeks and sometimes months to get an answer from the Lagos government, but that does not seem to be the case today.

Some members on this side of the House, and probably some on the other side as well,

were frustrated by the lack of urgency in the speech of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It was basically a manifesto of formalities, niceties and he gave many excuses for the lack of government action in the past. His speech was filled with procrastination and showed that Canada was refusing to accept the role of a leader in the international community, which would get some relief into the war zone immediately.

• (9:40 p.m.)

On reading the statement the Secretary of State for External Affairs made to the House this afternoon one can see that he has displayed hesitancy and nebulousness. These are attitudes the government has displayed in the Biafran tragedy. He said in his statement that the government hopes that General Gowon will spare no effort in maintaining the discipline of his forces and protecting the lives of all the peoples of Nigeria. He does not demand; he is asking.

He is not saying that we shall send over observers immediately to make sure no atrocities or massacres are committed as Nigerian soldiers overrun the unconquered parts of Biafra. The statement goes on to say that the government considers it of first importance that outside relief activity should be co-ordinated on an international basis. That point is of first importance to this government. It does not consider that bringing relief supplies immediately to the war zone is of first importance; it considers that precedence must be given to co-ordinating actions with other governments.

If we do all this and waste time, there may not be in the war zone many Biafrans left alive to be helped by our relief and church organizations. The whole statement was ambiguous and hesitant in tone and displayed an attitude that has plagued Parliament and this country too long when the Biafran tragedy has been discussed.

When the minister speaks later in the debate, I hope he will tell us why there was so much delay in giving the money requested for relief purposes. Was the government of Canada aware that Nigerian federal forces planned to mount a full-scale attack on Biafran positions before the announcement respecting financial aid was made? You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that Canairelief had asked for assistance and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had promised to reply before Christmas. No reply was given. Then the Prime Minister promised to reply after Christmas. Once again there was a delay. Then, suddenly, the government announced it would give Canairelief assistance to the tune of $1 million, and the next day we discovered that Nigeria had mounted an offensive to capture the remaining Biafran-held territory.

I ask the minister to clarify what happened, because many Canadians do not think it a coincidence that Canairelief should be offered money one day before the offensive that was to wipe out Biafra was mounted. I demand an answer to this question, and the people of Canada also demand an answer.

Mr. Pringle: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Nystrom: If the hon. member does not mind, I should like to finish my remarks, at the end of which I shall try to oblige him. All along the government has been delaying. It was aware that arms were going to Nigeria not only from Russia but from Britain. Yet the Secretary of State for External Affairs has come to us tonight with excuses. He still talks about protocol and technicalities that must be overcome before relief can be flown to the war-torn zone. He may still be worrying about daylight flights. By the time he has made all the appropriate and correct arrangements, many of the people we are concerned about, who are dying of starvation, will not be alive and the relief will do them no good.

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) told us earlier this evening that a director of a church-operated service in the United States stated today his organization estimates that unless relief is flown to the war zone immediately, within 48 hours as many as 1 million people will die. The relief must be provided immediately; it is crucial. For that reason we should not just sit down and talk about the problems and technicalities involved in giving relief. Canada must take the lead in this matter and must not be reluctant to act.

According to press reports a number of countries appear to be taking hypocritical action in this connection, but other countries are doing something. Although Britain was one of the main culprits in the Nigerian-Biafran tragedy, at least that country is trying to provide assistance. They have sent a cabinet minister to the area and have organized supplies which are ready to be flown in. Canada seems too hesitant and reluctant to act.

There was a time in our history when we led the world as peacemakers. In 1956, when

a man who was to become our Prime Minister won the Nobel Peace Prize, many Canadians felt they had participated with him in winning this prize. But in the last year and a half we seem to have been hung-up with nineteenth century theories and attitudes. Instead of tackling the realities facing us in the world today, our Prime Minister seems to hide behind a very cold, academic approach. That is true of this issue and many others.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs has fallen into the same trap and is showing the type of attitude displayed by the Prime Minister. If something looks good on paper, if it is good in theory and if there are precedents for it, the government will accept it. Yet we seem to be hung-up with our concepts of federalism and with a constitution that seems sacred. We have hidden behind our concepts of sovereignty and territorial integrity, and just look at what has happened! This is not good enough. In this matter Canada must act immediately: It must delay no more, because the lives of millions of people are involved. They may die of starvation and disease unless we take action immediately.

We cannot any longer tolerate past attitudes. Is it not ironic that countries making up the United Nations would not intervene in this struggle or even bring relief because this was a so-called civil war, and now that the war is over they are all anxious to provide help? That is one of the biggest contradictions in this matter. That is why governments must find alternative solutions to problems like these which confront peoples in this modern world. In our modern world of technology and electronics new solutions must be found. If we and others had taken different attitudes to this question, the tragedy in Biafran might have been averted. What has happened today is history. The immediate problem is how we are to act now. Hours count, not days; we must act within hours, and not within days or weeks. We must bring relief to these unfortunate people within a matter of hours.

I think we all know the history of the Nigerian-Biafran conflict, and most of us know that about 2 million people have died in it. But does anyone realize the seriousness of the situation today in Nigeria and Biafra? One has only to look at newspaper reports to know what is happening. May I read from an article that appeared in this evening's Ottawa *Citizen*. It was written by Richard Hall, who was the last foreign correspondent to leave the war zone on Saturday night. The headline at the top of the newspaper in bold red letters is, " 'They run like rabbits' in hail of fire". The correspondent gives us this story:

> Biafra is dying bloodily and terror-stricken.
>
> The triumphant Nigerian army is advancing into the chaotic heart of Ojukwu's breakaway country.
>
> The demoralized Biafran army has been stunned by the blitzkrieg onslaught mounted by the federal forces and is now offering little resistance and fleeing.
>
> Five million civilians are running rabbit-like from the remaining crowded areas.
>
> Several Nigerian MiG fighters add to the confusion by rocketing and machine-gunning lines of refugees.
>
> Amid the crowds are wounded and shell-shocked Biafran soldiers.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Further on he says:

> During the inevitable overrun of Biafra, their lives lie in the balance.
>
> As I left, Owerri was being shelled and rocketted. It is now a ghost town, yet last Thursday night it contained some quarter of a million people.
>
> As I went north, I saw appalling sights of Biafra's death throes.
>
> They are burned in my memory: men, women and children carrying pathetic belongings, some collapsing weeping at the roadside.

I could read more of the article. It describes the situation there at the present time. There is in today's issue of the Ottawa *Citizen* another article written by the same foreign correspondent. He talks about the soldiers at the war front and the situation many of them are facing, and says:

> Soldiers at the front ate on an average once every three days. They had only ground cassava with soup.
>
> A doctor told me: "Abdominal wounds are hard to operate on—the men are so thin."
>
> Against them the Biafrans faced well-fed and better armed troops.
>
> The Nigerians knew they had their enemies at their mercy. When the final push came, the line buckled.

This, Mr. Speaker, once again paints a very vivid picture of the real situation in Biafra and Nigeria tonight. This is why the Canadian government must act now. The member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) and the member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) mentioned a number of plans or alternative activities this government could adopt.

In the motion before us today there are two suggestions that should immediately be adopted by the government. I do not want to repeat the details at this time. Basically, we are calling for observers to go to the front lines

and into the villages that have been overtaken, to ensure that no massacre of Biafran civilians will occur. Activity of this sort will often take place in a situation like this, even though at times it is quite unintentional. There must be immediate action to prevent any such activity taking place.

I am not referring to military observers. It has been stated that military men should not be sent to observe military men. Civilian men are required as well and, as has already been suggested, we could include some jurists. We could send other people as well. Members of the press could be sent to expose the situation. This must be done immediately. A delay of even a few hours could be vital to the lives of many people on the west coast of Africa.

The second point we are making is that relief must be sent immediately. We cannot afford to delay even a few hours. Relief planes have been grounded for about two days and supplies in Biafra are virtually nil. When relief supplies were flown in at night, they were distributed the next morning. There is no stockpile of food or medicine in Biafra. In a few days many hundreds of thousands of these people could die like flies. This should be obvious to anyone who has knowledge of the situation.

I appeal to the government to immediately send observers into these areas that have been recently taken over. As I have said, these need not be military men. Relief must be given immediately. Canairelief and Joint Church Aid have issued statements that they have food supplies available and they will turn them over to anyone who will fly them in, such as the Nigerian Red Cross or the International Red Cross. This food must be delivered before it is too late. I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs to act on this suggestion tonight. I ask him to contact as many governments and relief agencies as possible. Then by tomorrow morning Canada could be well on the way to doing something in Nigeria which would ensure that the minimum amount of death and starvation will occur from the tragic situation which already exists in that area.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, at four o'clock this afternoon the Biafran army surrendered to Nigerian federal forces and the final desperate chapter of the Nigerian civil war was acted out. Hopefully, an end will soon come to the misery and bloodshed which has affected both sides of the battle-line. There is no disagreement in the House that when that end comes, Canada must and will be among the very first to make food and medical aid available.

This was indicated today in the statement by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). All parties should have been encouraged by that excellent statement. Valuable suggestions were made in the debate today. Some of them related to the role of Canairelief. It seems logical that the demonstrated resources and abilities of Canairelief should be enlisted as quickly as possible. If food is ready to be delivered, staff is on hand and distribution facilities exist, let us act to bring these Canairelief resources to the area in need as soon as this can be negotiated with the Nigerian government.

We have 24 Hercules aircraft in Canada. Each one has a trained crew and is able to carry over ten tons of relief materials. They could fly non-stop from here to Lagos. Loading procedures on these aircraft should begin tonight, each with ten tons of needed foodstuffs. The crews are available and ready. They should leave in waves of at least three a day so that within a week all these Canadian mercy ships of the air would be there. If we err on any side in this dispute—it is now no longer a dispute but a situation in which we hope a settlement will occur—then let us err on the side of generosity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Perrault: Let us do too much rather than too little. Let us show the world that Canada is interested and concerned. Let us get the planes to where they are needed, and when they are there let us use them to ferry supplies from all over Europe and Africa to Nigeria. Some people will say they may have difficulty landing, but Hercules aircraft can land on a grassy meadow. Where they land and where they are used are questions which could be countered by, who will stop them from landing? Landing strips are available. We should bestow on the situation as much Canadian generosity as possible. After that we can send them a copy of today's *Hansard*.

Some estimate that 2 million people have died in the war. In the United Nations meetings in New York in the early part of December 1, as one of the group of Canadian delegates, was told by officials of the Organization of African Unity that the figure is closer to 5 million.

Harsh words have been uttered in this House by the opponents of the government in

this and in past debates, words which suggest that Canada has been unduly legalistic in its approach to the civil war, that we have failed to act promptly to alleviate suffering, that we have failed to exercise sufficient influence within the Commonwealth to persuade Britain and others to refrain from arms shipments and, above all, that we have failed to play an effective role by refusing to inscribe the subject of Biafra and Nigeria on the agenda of the United Nations.

Some hon. Members: True.

Mr. Perrault: Some hon. members say "True". The great tragedy is that in this entire controversy many people have spoken out very eloquently without having full possession of the facts. That in itself is a tragedy. The same words have been uttered outside the House.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Some profess they cannot comprehend why Canada has not made unilateral efforts to end the civil war and bring aid to starving people. I think it is proper to consider the Canadian position in its true light and determine what Canadians can best do to help. Hon. members are aware that Canadians observers have been on the scene in Nigeria for the past 15 months and we have been assured that other observers may be sent; that Canadian supplies and aircraft are available.

The Canadian effort will continue to be a humanitarian one, as it should be. It is an unspeakable tragedy that the suffering should have endured until this time. This point was touched upon by a member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) who knows considerably more about Africa than do some of his hon. friends. Relief supplies could be in the area now but for the intransigence of Ojukwu who has stubbornly resisted the efforts of the International Red Cross to schedule daylight flights. This is the view which is held almost unanimously by representatives at the United Nations, including those of the socialist countries. Well, he has fled Biafra, reportedly aboard a Fokker Friendship aircraft together with tons of luggage, his family and his Mercedes-Benz. He is no longer a factor in the civil war.

In a debate in this House in late November it was stated that massive daylight relief flights under the IRC formula represented the best hope of relieving starvation in Biafra. Despite Nigerian assent and guarantees from the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada, Ojukwu refused to provide for his people the one kind of relief which would have saved lives.

In early December after the debate in the House I had an opportunity to meet again in New York with the Nigerians and the Biafrans, separately, in the presence of a representative of Canairelief. At the Biafran meeting, objections to the Red Cross daylight lift proposal were again voiced. What were those objections? They were that Nigerian planes might bomb Uli during or immediately following Red Cross flights, despite assurances that this would not happen.

The Biafran representatives in New York and Washington were questioned with respect to other types of aid. These are the questions they were asked, "Would you accept an air drop?" The answer was, "We would not. We are afraid the parcels would damage our huts; we have lost so many huts in this war." The exchange continued, "But, surely, that is a remarkable reply. Would it not be possible to designate a drop area and fly food and medical supplies into that area?" The answer was, "No, we are afraid our people would be killed or injured by the falling food cannisters." Only after the incredible nature of these replies had been questioned was it suggested to us that perhaps—just perhaps—aid by helicopter might be accepted.

A few days later, on December 15, in order to meet Biafran objections to daylight aid, the Nigerian government removed all possible doubt about military action interfering with International Red Cross shipments under the ICRC agreement. Nevertheless, there was still no affirmative answer from Ojukwu and no suggestion that the Red Cross plan might proceed on a test basis. Yet Ojukwu is lauded by some as a saviour of his people, a great emancipator.

As the hon. member for Red Deer suggested, perhaps it is time to question some of his motives. Indeed, that time may be more than overdue. Many who are deeply sympathetic to the Ibo people have reached the conclusion that several months ago General Ojukwu and certain of his advisers made a cold-blooded decision to reject daylight flights in favour of the night-time cover provided by the gallant people of Canairelief. He must have known full well, when making this decision, that in order to obtain greater shipments of arms many lives would have to be sacrificed. He, at

least, was prepared to make that sacrifice. But his family was safe. When we talk about this tragedy resting on the conscience of the Canadian people, I suggest to the House that most of it must lie on his conscience. He must assume responsibility for the deaths of thousands of women and children.

The starving faces of Ibo youngsters haunt all Canadians. We have to ask ourselves whether we have done enough for the Ibos and will do enough for them during the next two weeks. Are the Biafrans all Ibos? Nigeria was a nation made up of over 250 ethnic and language groups. There was only one tribe that was Ibo. When Ojukwu unilaterally declared Biafra independent, he did so on behalf of hundreds of thousands of non-Ibos in eastern Nigeria who were offered no plebiscite or vote in regard to that decision.

The faces of little children that haunt the conscience of the world, the faces of little children which were paraded on the lecture platforms across Canada during recent weeks and days, include as well the tragic faces of thousands from other tribes and language groups who were never asked whether they wanted to be liberated by Ojukwu. Yet he declared liberation in their name.

Ironically, Mr. Speaker as Ojukwu filed in recent hours he left Biafra to a non-Ibo, Major Philip Effiong of the Efik tribe, a man who surrendered at four o'clock this afternoon and stated, as the minister told us earlier, that now that those opposed to a peaceful resolution of the dispute had left, perhaps a peaceful solution could be arranged.

All of us are concerned about the possibility of genocide. There are some in Canada who have said that the Nigerian federal government and its troops cannot be trusted. All of us must hope that genocide will not occur. Significantly, although the Ibo massacres of 1966 undeniably took place, since then the Ibo people in federal Nigeria have existed peacefully. Before the surrender yesterday, 2 million Ibos lived within the enclave. There were 7 million outside the enclave, in federal Nigeria. Our observers have reported no bloodshed in the Ibo areas, and let us hope that this situation continues.

In a civil war, where there are perhaps more shades of grey than black and white, there is also bitterness—as our friend from Red Deer has suggested—about alleged Ibo complicity in murders associated with the overthrow of the federal government before 1966. Let those who claim that they want to bring fair minds to bear on this dispute, even those who have been lecturing Canadians in recent weeks about their responsibilities, some of whom are perhaps in the gallery tonight, take this factor into consideration. When we are attempting to develop a feeling of trust and confidence on both sides, let us not distort the facts.

The idea of an expanded observer team is a good one. Every Canadian initiative must be undertaken to urge restraint and moderation so that rehabilitation can proceed. I understand that news dispatches have been broadcast to the world to the effect that the federal government of Nigeria is welcoming additional observers from other nations. The government has been criticized for failing to raise the question of the Nigerian civil war at the United Nations. I served there for three months and it was an interesting experience. These criticisms ignore the fact that months ago Canada discussed this very possibility with the Secretary General of the United Nations. This is to the credit of our Secretary of State for External Affairs and is another fact that has been glossed over by the eloquent critics of this government, who should have spent more time getting the facts and less time on the lecture platforms.

The Secretary General reflected the general United Nations view that such action would do more harm than good. Many of the 126 nations at the United Nations are deeply committed to humanitarian causes. Yet significantly not one of them moved to inscribe the Nigerian civil war on the agenda. Not even one of the four black nations that recognized Biafra undertook the initiative called for by Biafra to ask the United Nations to take action. Why was this? It was because any attempted initiative would come crashing down to defeat and frustration.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Some have said, quite incorrectly, that because of its inability to inscribe the Nigerian civil war on the UN agenda this government is racist. That charge is nonsense whether it comes from Nova Scotia, British Columbia or any other province of this country. You might as well charge the other 125 members of the United Nations, including every black country in the UN, with racism. I resent that kind of statement made in the context of Canada.

It is said that Canadians unilaterally should have convened a meeting, a conference or a peace session to arrange a settlement. This is part of the popular mythology about Biafra-Nigeria. Canadians have been urged to bring about some sort of peace conference or understanding between the factions. People who say this really exist in dismal ignorance. If before their eloquent speeches they had consulted with the black nations of Africa, they would have found out how anxious they are to have white intervention.

The hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), who is a sincere, dedicated young man, says we are entering a new world. That is exactly what they told us at the United Nations. But the world of 1970 is different from the paternalistic pre-war days. Non-whites in other parts of the world have come to resent white interference whether or not it is well motivated or even well-justified. A new generation of capable African leaders say to us. "Keep out. This is an African dispute and Africans will resolve African problems." They say they need no do-gooding, white paternalists. This may be hard news but it is the news of new Africa. They welcome Canadian initiatives to feed the hungry but they say they will not tolerate outside interference in their political problems from any quarter.

I ask hon. members how much outside interference they would be prepared to tolerate in the internal problems of Canada. These may be hard words for those motivated by a sincere desire to impose on others their white humanitarianism, but it is a fact which Canadians in the realm of international relations have come to know all too well. Anyone serving abroad knows that these are the facts of the changing world referred to by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville.

It is in the face of these tough realities that Canada has acted in the Nigerian civil war. Now that it has concluded, our efforts must again proceed in the face of these realities. Our efforts should come through recognized and established channels. This may not be very dramatic or as dramatic as Canadian planes flying through Nigerian and Biafran flak, unilaterally dropping aid to these people, but those who fought on either side of this struggle have to be helped and we must find channels which can and will bring aid to all of them. We must find non-political initiatives which will not give rise to hostility and resentment, which in turn might serve to retard our humanitarian efforts. We want efforts which will result in the maximum amount of aid being provided.

Many things could be said in a situation of this kind which would get headlines in the newspapers and make a great story, but which might effectively cut off aid to the people who need it most. Happily, at this time when aid must be brought to the starving of the Biafran region, Canada enjoys good working relations with the International Committee of the Red Cross and with other nations which have worked with us toward a common goal, such as the Scandinavian countries and the Nigerian federal government. This is an important consideration at this time.

I conclude with this thought: Co-operation is the key; Canadian co-operation with effective international agencies, co-operation with the government of Nigeria and co-operation to assure that the people who have suffered so much will be the recipients of the aid that Canadians in all parties are so anxious to bestow.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak again about the terrible tragedy that has been occurring for many months in the territory known as Nigeria-Biafra I find myself following the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault). When he began his remarks he seemed to be making eminently more sense than often in the past with regard to this subject, but he reverted to type and added a primarily irrelevant comment.

When the suggestion was made earlier today that we might have an emergency debate, I was somewhat reluctant about the idea in the belief that the situation was so confused that little by way of worth-while debate on the subject could be achieved. As events have transpired this afternoon and this evening in the House, I think it has become abundantly apparent that this debate of all the many discussions we have had in this House may indeed be the most important in terms of the possibility of what Canada can do.

The minister suggested to us that we should not be too surprised that we have not completed plans and have not yet made arrangements for transport facilities, and that there are still a number of questions to be resolved before relief can be resumed. If members on this side of the House express concern—and I

think the concern, fear or even scepticism which exists is not only on one side of the House—it is because we have spent far too many months waiting for the government to take action. If we are concerned this evening and talk about action being taken not in a matter of months, weeks or even days but in a matter of hours, this is not terribly surprising if one recognizes some of what I consider to be the universally accepted facts of the case.

Each war, each human conflict has its own particular marks or characteristics. Without doubt, throughout the piece and surely for over 15 months the most pronounced characteristic of the conflict in Nigeria has been the fact that millions of civilians have literally been starving or have starved to death. Are our people simply to wait in the hope that somehow the situation will either go away or by itself be resolved? Anyone who has taken any time either to visit the area or study the facts of the matter realizes this is not likely to happen. When grim predictions are made that within the course of a few days literally millions more could starve to death, it is not hysterical or inaccurate to make that comment.

We know people have literally been living the most threadbare kind of existence, sustained one might almost imagine by hope itself. If the kind of confused chaos which is recounted by those recently on the scene is at all accurate, one can think, apart altogether from the physiological aspect of the situation, about the psychological uncertainty which must be almost productive of death itself.

The minister has asked for time. There are too many millions in east Africa today who do not have that time. Unless this government is prepared to act, not tomorrow morning but tonight, then whether we like it or not we will be suffering the kind of recriminations that far too often people have experienced in this century because of the failure to act and respond to the urgent need that has been laid before them. The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour expressed that kind of urgency when he talked about the movement of the Hercules aircraft. However, I think he should have said that all of them should have been moved on the first day.

Mr. Perrault: As many as could be.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): We know there are 15 aircraft available now. They have crews. There is food. Within the space of a few hours they could be activated and directed to a suitable landing point. I know that the officials of Canairelief have sent a telegram to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) suggesting that tomorrow, if given permission, the consortium of planes now available at Sao Tomé, with the food stocks available, could land some 500 tons, enough to sustain life during this interim period until more satisfactory and permanent arrangements can be made.

It seems to me not only eminently sensible but necessary that the government act now. If the Secretary of State for External Affairs is concerned about our undue haste, I say that we hasten because of the situation and we can do no other. All of us are alarmed because it has taken such an interminably long period of time for the government to respond to each and every request on each and every opportunity.

Whether or not, as some members have suggested, it was more than circumstantial that agreement was reached last Friday to finance relief agencies supplying the Biafran people just at the moment when hostilities were coming to a conclusion, may never be known. The fact of the matter is that long before this government was installed in office and ever since it has been in office, members on this side of the House, indeed on all sides, have urged the government to take action. There is little, if any, evidence of the action it took.

What action can we point to that the government has taken? It is not a happy picture. We can talk about the foodstuffs deposited in Fernando Po, Dahomey and Lagos, but when we talk about the food supplies delivered to the starving millions we talk about ten or eleven flights, some 200 tons at most. But when we talk about the efforts made by the Canadian people through volunteer organizations, through Canairelief, we are talking about 11,000 tons and over 660 flights. This may not have been much in terms of those who did suffer and die unnecessarily, but it was hundreds and hundreds of times better than the government was able to do while it hid so often behind the failure to get accurate communication.

I am not at all buoyed up by the indication which the Secretary of State for External Affairs has given us this evening, that he has had word from the officials in Lagos. It does not make me feel particularly proud to wonder how effective these communications have been. The government must have realized how ineffective communications have been when it continually sent special representatives to Lagos to try to devise an effective means of communication. It is not only futile but stupid for us this evening to discuss past events, discuss who was responsible for what fault, or where we should lay blame. Surely our concern at this point is to make sure that the relief supplies are effectively delivered.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, this debate can be the most important one we have had. In fact, it can make all the questions raised in this House, all the special debates we have had and all the inquiries of the parliamentary committee valid if the government realizes this evening that on this matter there is no time to wait, and that action must be taken now.

In discussing with Canairelief officials this afternoon the situation in the area known as Biafra, in terms of the relief supplies available there, one of them scratched his head and said there were a few bags of salt left—and this, Mr. Speaker, for a physically deprived people of whom 2 million have already starved to death and of whom another 2 million or 3 million could starve to death perhaps within a week.

Are we prepared to see that final accounting of this tragedy? Are we prepared to see a figure, not only of the 2 million deaths that have already taken place but of an additional 2 or 3 million deaths that could take place soon? I do not believe that any member of this House, including the Secretary of State for External Affairs, wants to see that occur. I believe the minister has indicated this by the fact that he has been present throughout the debate this evening and by his willingness to make sure that all available channels are used. But I say to the minister that we must do more than we have done in the past. We have not the luxury that the government seemingly thought it could enjoy throughout this tragedy that of waiting until all the "i's" were dotted and all the "t's" crossed, because if we wait any longer we will only see very many more graves.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Does he claim that the Canadian government did not do as much as Canairelief, etc. for it is confirmed that the situation of Canairelief is such today that it will probably no longer be able to serve humanitarian ends, that is transport food and medical supplies to Nigeria?

Would the hon. member want the Canadian government to find itself in a similar situation when the war is over, and be unable to help the Nigerian people?

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I am very grateful for that question because I think it points up the sterility of our situation in regard to the whole issue. The United States government has done that, and they actually sold planes at scrap value so that the whole operation could work. Had we had the courage of that government over the past year we could now view with pride our actions to alleviate unnecessary suffering.

We are now pressing for the most reasonable kind of request possible. The food is there; the facilities are there. We know there are some diplomatic niceties to be observed, some political lobbying and other time-consuming activities that will do nothing but threaten the hopes and lives of people living this threadbare existence in Nigeria.

I would urge, as do all members here tonight, that the government not wait until tomorrow to take the kind of action requested of the Prime Minister by Canairelief, in consultation with other governments such as the United States and Great Britain. If necessary, transportation facilities could be placed under a management group acceptable to the officials in Lagos. Surely to God we do not have to sit and watch another period go by involving all kinds of legalisms that result only in a sterility of action and unnecessary death for millions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: As it is now 10.30 p.m., and pursuant to the special order adopted earlier today, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings.

[*English*]

MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—BIAFRA—REFERENCE OF GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE PLANS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to the special order adopted earlier this day, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) moves:

That the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence be instructed to take under consideration immediately the plans of the government to give assistance to the victims of the Nigerian Biafran conflict; that the committee exercise continuing surveillance over the efforts of the Canadian government in this respect; and report with all possible speed to this House as to the adequacy of the measures proposed and recommend any further measures it considers appropriate.

Motion agreed to.

At 10.32 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to special order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, January 13, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. BURTON—ADEQUACY OF ANSWERS TO ORDER PAPER QUESTIONS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege concerning answers to questions placed on the Order Paper. On October 23 I placed on the Order Paper a series of questions, Nos. 256 and 259 to 264 inclusive, asking for information about the designation of areas under the Regional Development Incentives Act. My questions concerned all provinces except the three maritime provinces which were completely included in designated areas. My first question with respect to each province was: "What criteria were used by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the selection of designated areas for the province...". The answer provided to each question was: "Weighted measures of rates of economic growth (employment, income and population) and of potential for secondary industry"—a clear case of bureaucratic gobbledegook.

I then placed a motion for papers on the Order Paper asking for a copy of all correspondence between the government of Canada and each of the provinces regarding the selection of designated regions under the new Regional Development Incentives Act. The answer I received was that correspondence was exchanged only with the province of Alberta. This correspondence was subsequently tabled in the House of Commons and provided information on the views of both the government of Canada and the government of Alberta with respect to the designation of areas in that province. This was then followed by a series of questions in which I asked for information about the specific proposals placed before the government of each province by the government of Canada and the views of the provinces concerning these proposals. The standard answer submitted to each of these questions was that "the details of such consultations are confidential matters."

My question of privilege is that there has been a systematic attempt to evade the provision of information to which this House is entitled. Legislation passed by this House provided for consultations to take place with the provinces and now members are denied access to information on these consultations. We are told we have no right to know.

Furthermore, I submit that there is a conflict between the answer provided to questions 577 to 583 inclusive, and 596 to 598 inclusive, which indicated that the details of such consultations are confidential matters while the government had already provided full information on consultations with one province in response to motion for papers No. 140 concerning correspondence exchanged between the government of Canada and the government of Alberta. If it is possible to provide information on one province, how can the government hide behind confidentiality with respect to other provinces?

If Your Honour thinks there is a question of privilege I am prepared to move a motion to refer this matter to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections for further consideration.

Mr. Speaker: I thank the hon. member for having given the Chair the notice required under the Standing Orders. It has given me an opportunity to look into the complaint which has been made by the hon. member for Regina East. I have reached the conclusion, after giving the matter serious thought, that although there might be a grievance on the part of the hon. member, in the circumstances to which he has alluded I cannot find that there is a question of privilege. I think I should refer the hon. member to citation 181 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, among other citations, which provides that in circumstances such as those mentioned by the hon. member for Regina East there cannot be a ruling that there is a legitimate question of privilege requiring the referral of the matter to a committee. In the circumstances I cannot put to the House the motion to which the hon. member referred a moment ago.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUSPENSION OF COPPER PRICE AND BANK INTEREST INCREASES

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as part of the national effort to curb inflation the Prices and Incomes Commission is working to secure the support of the business community and professional groups for a program aimed at limiting price increases and charges for services. If meaningful progress can be made in this direction, this initial step will be followed by efforts to restrain increases in wages, salaries and other cost elements that affect prices. This will help to restore a balance between total money incomes and the total quantity of goods and services produced in the economy.

• (2:10 p.m.)

It is important that major discretionary price changes in the Canadian market should be avoided while these discussions are taking place. Such price increases, even if planned well in advance, could easily be interpreted as being made in order to avoid the scrutiny which would follow the adoption of a program of price restraint.

With this in mind, the government has requested the copper producers and the railways to suspend the price changes announced around the turn of the year and they have agreed to do so. On behalf of the government, I have also had discussions with representatives of the two banks which had announced increases in their interest rates on instalment loans for consumers; they also have agreed to meet the government's request to suspend these increases.

I want to make it very clear that the government will adopt the same attitude toward any similar proposals to raise prices between now and March 1.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very obvious that if the Prices and Incomes Commission is to have any real chance of persuading the country to adopt a program of voluntary restraints, this kind of holding operation is essential. The mystery has been why the government did not realize this long ago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Stanfield: The Prices and Incomes Commission would have had a better chance to succeed if some of the other increases in prices of important commodities that were allowed to take place had been put off at least temporarily. The fact that they were not has made the task of the commission that much more difficult. I think the reason is that the government did not in its heart really believe in the importance of a program of restraints. The Minister of Finance, in his interim budgetary statement, was very quick to dismiss them at that time as having already failed. I hope the government now realizes that if this program is to succeed it must give the program its active support. I hope the government realizes the importance of this program succeeding at this time.

While a program of fiscal restraint and tight money may be perfectly satisfactory to the government and while the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance may be prepared to tighten the screws further, the rate of unemployment contemplated by the Prime Minister is not acceptable to the country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I hope this statement by the minister indicates that the government has finally stopped pooh-poohing such efforts and intends to support them. The government must recognize that any program of restraint must be phrased in specific terms. It must be comprehensive and not just related to part of the economy. This should not be too difficult since the Prices and Incomes Commission is talking about something temporary of about a year's duration.

It is late in the day for the government to be acting, but I am glad to see that those approached have co-operated. I think other industries would also have co-operated and thereby have made the task much simpler. The policy of the government to date has been one of deliberately creating unemployment in order to control inflation. It has not worked. It is not acceptable. I hope the minister's announcement today means that the government is finally getting down to a serious, effective and acceptable anti-inflationary program.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, on December 10 last, as recorded at page 1814 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Finance what the government intended to do about the proposal of the copper industry to implement a further

increase in the price of copper. The minister said he would take the question as notice. I want to say that action has been a long time coming and now it is here it seems to be totally unsatisfactory.

In the first place, there is no roll-back in price. The price of copper on January 1, 1969 was 45 cents a pound. Even foregoing the latest price increase it will now be 57 cents a pound, or a very substantial increase of approximately 26⅔ per cent. The company that has been a leader in making these increases is not a poor company. Between 1967 and 1968 its profits increased by 20 per cent and preliminary figures show a substantial increase in its profits for 1969. As a matter of fact, this company has been able to get away with four increases. It has cancelled the last one, but it has had four increases in the price of copper within the last year. Meanwhile the government has sat idly by and done nothing. Now the hon. gentleman comes along and says he has persuaded them to forgo this last increase but only for a two-month period.

During the question period I shall want to get from the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce information as to the price which is being paid for this two-month moratorium. According to a story in the *Globe and Mail* this morning, it is being granted by the copper companies in exchange for easing the new tough controls on copper shipments. I think the government will have to make it clear whether or not there has been any *quid pro quo* attached in persuading this industry, which has experienced the highest profits in its history, merely to forgo an additional and unjustified price increase for a period of two months.

With reference to the agreement by which the banks will forgo a proposed additional increase in interest rates on consumer loans, I think the government ought to be ashamed that it has taken so long to step into the picture. Most of us in this House can remember when the predecessor of the present Minister of Finance was assuring hon. members that by taking the ceiling on interest rates out of the Bank Act we would see lower interest rates at the consumer level. But even discounting the proposed increase, interest rates on most consumer loans have doubled.

The result for the banks has, of course, been phenomenal. Preliminary figures show that in 1969 the banks increased their profits by 26½ per cent and increased their combined assets by 15 per cent. Surely the government will have to do something much more effective than getting a two-month moratorium on unjustified and unwarranted proposed price increases. Surely the time has come when the government ought to allow and organize public inquiries into these price increases.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister has done something. He has managed to forestall two price increases—one in copper and one in interest rates. But what about the increase in the price of steel which will lead to increases in prices of almost every other commodity used in Canada? What about the increase in the price of oil, the increases in the price of automobiles? The Minister of Consumer Affairs pleaded with the auto industry not to implement them, but they were implemented despite his pleas and protests. Surely the public ought to know whether the financial position of these companies makes it necessary for them to increase their prices or whether they are merely taking advantage of an inflationary psychology to pick the pockets of the public.

What the minister has done here is not to roll back prices. He has allowed price increases both for the copper industry and other industries and he has permitted the banks to make increased profits. He has done so without lifting a finger. All he is doing now is to say: Boys, you are pushing things too far. It is like catching somebody who has picked your pocket, taken $100, and then he gives you back 25 cents for carfare to get home.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance will no doubt again hit the headlines in the papers. He has actually stated today in the House his intention to fight inflation with outdated, inefficient methods, i.e. by useless statements and programs. As a matter of fact, the minister knows perfectly well, as we also do, that after the Christmas and New Year holiday season prices are more liable to drop than to

rise. If the minister wants to see this for himself, let him come with me along the commercial streets of Ottawa, Hull or any other Canadian city and see the special sales now on in every line of business, with some stores offering 40 or even 50 per cent off their regular prices.

But the minister says that in order to stop inflation it is necessary to ask the Prices and Incomes Commission to get the support of the business world. Indeed the businessmen did not wait for the recommendations of the Minister of Finance or of the Prices and Incomes Commission to put goods on sale at reduced prices.

Mr. Speaker, it is not by saying that the minister has asked two banks not to raise their interest rates, as they wanted to do, that we shall manage to curb inflation or restore the economic balance or, as the minister said in his statement, that his intervention or that of the Prices and Incomes Commission will help to restore a balance between total money incomes and the total quantity of goods and services produced in the economy.

Mr. Speaker, the minister is deliberately misleading the entire Canadian population. He must think that hon. members are ignoramuses because never in the history of Canada have total money incomes been sufficient to buy the total quantity of goods and services produced in the economy. That is why consumers are forced to mortgage their income for three or four years ahead of time in order to buy products which are already one, two or even ten years old. And the minister states that, on the whole, balance between the purchasing power and available goods will be restored. What a misleading statement!

Mr. Speaker, why do the minister and the government tolerate, for example, that a province such as Quebec to finance Quebec Hydro should have to go and borrow $50 million in the United States at an interest rate of 10 per cent for a period of 25 years? As a matter of fact, in 25 years the province of Quebec will have paid $125 million in interests on a $50 million loan, which is in fact a net loan of only $45 million since the brokers will get a $5 million commission on the transaction.

Mr. Speaker, that is the cause of inflation in Canada. It is the entire system which must be revamped. I understand that the minister's statement will get the headlines, but truth nonetheless has its rights. We must admit that our system is obsolete even if tolerated by an irresponsible government.

[Mr. Caouette.]

ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE BOARD

TABLING OF ANNUAL REPORT

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, could we revert to motions for a few seconds?

Mr. Speaker: Does the house agree to revert to motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker. I should like to table in both official languages the annual report of the Adjustment Assistance Board.

[*English*]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

GRAIN

ALLEGED INADEQUATE PLAN TO UTILIZE THUNDER BAY TERMINAL SPACE

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), 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 inexcusable situation involving some 70 million bushels of space in the grain terminals at Thunder Bay, and the wholly inadequate plan for filling this space by mid-April, when such terminal capacity can and must be utilized before the end of February to allow a two-bushel quota to be provided at affected shipping points many weeks sooner than will be the case under present plans; and the urgent need for the government to require the railways to begin immediately to deliver up to 1,000 carloads per day to these terminals to alleviate the worsening farm income crisis in the prairie provinces and the very serious repercussions this crisis is having on the economy and on the employment situation in all of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member knows, in determining whether the House should be adjourned under the provisions of Standing Order 26 as suggested by the hon. member, the Chair must have regard to a number of factors, including the probability of the matter being brought before the House within a reasonable time by other means. It would appear that there will be such opportunities for

debate in the days and weeks ahead. With this in mind I must rule that the hon. member's motion cannot be put to the House at this time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—PROVISION OF RELIEF—INCREASE IN OBSERVERS—ADMISSION OF BIAFRANS TO CANADA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the importance of the time factor in connection with starvation difficulties in Nigeria I should like to ask whether the government of Nigeria at Lagos has given the go-ahead on programs to provide relief from outside the country to the starving and whether the government of Nigeria has as yet given any indication whether or not it is prepared to allow an increase in the number of international observers in the country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is of the greatest importance to the House that members be fully informed as to progress in these matters. Would it be possible for the Secretary of State for External Affairs or his Parliamentary Secretary to appear before the House to give us this information in view of the grave importance of each day that passes?

Mr. Trudeau: It is always possible, Mr. Speaker, but yesterday the House set up a parliamentary committee in order to exercise this kind of discretion.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence to indicate to the House and to the Canadian people in general whether he would be prepared to authorize the diversion of HMCS *Bonaventure* from exercises to the relief of Nigeria by utilizing its capacity to carry food, drugs, medical supplies and portable hospitals and, if necessary, for the purpose of evacuation?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): As indicated by the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon at three o'clock there is to be a meeting of the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence at which time I believe some suggestions will be forthcoming. I can say that the Department of National Defence has all sorts of contingency plans. If there is a suggestion to divert the *Bonaventure* and it is accepted by the government, the minister would, of course, divert the *Bonaventure* and put it into service.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary which I should like to direct to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Is the government of Canada prepared to adopt an open-door attitude towards Biafrans who might wish to come to this country which would give them treatment comparable with that previously offered to Czechoslovakians?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows, Canada in the past has adopted in the case of Czechoslovakia and Hungary a very generous attitude. The situation has not developed in Biafra to the point where we can develop the same attitude. The matter is under very careful scrutiny at the moment.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary to the minister. Can he assure the House and the people of Canada that in the event there is a mass exodus the government will look with sympathy upon all applications?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that the question has hypothetical overtones and asked in this way perhaps it should not be received.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Prime Minister with regard to earlier questions. In view of the continuing difficulties in terms of resuming some form of relief operation in the area formerly known as Biafra, has the Prime Minister taken any step directly or through his personal representative to see if the difficulties can be overcome quickly so that some form of arrangement may be set up in order that relief supplies may be distributed in the areas where they are drastically needed at the moment?

Mr. Trudeau: I repeat that this afternoon the committee will be dealing with this question. The Secretary of State for External Affairs will be appearing before that commit-

tee at 3.30 and can be questioned in detail. But our information is that at present there are no particular difficulties about which we are in a position to do anything. The roads are open and the supplies are there. It is a matter of finding enough available trucks to transport supplies into the more remote areas. The Canadian government has offered money to the Lagos government to be used for the purchase of such trucks. We have observers there on the front. We have two military observers who are in a position to report to the Canadian government when they find themselves able to do so. At this stage we are doing everything we can.

Mr. Alexander: On a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Broadview.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Prime Minister. In view of the need for an experienced man on the Canadian observer team in Biafra, would he consider the appointment of Mr. Stanley Burke to the Canadian observer team?

Mr. Trudeau: We have already appointed a team of people who are leaving tonight or tomorrow as soon as commercial flights are available to get over there.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: We have asked General Wrinch—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Hamilton West.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, the question I asked earlier of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration may have been hypothetical but because of the importance of the matter I hope the minister will be allowed to reply. I was seeking information about whether the government would give equal treatment to Biafrans who may seek refuge in Canada to that accorded to people from several European nations under similar situations of duress.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my hon. friend that the situation is not exactly on all fours with the other countries he has in mind and to which I earlier referred. Obviously we are concerned about the situation. I am in very close consultation with the Department of External Affairs on this matter. But the situation has not developed to the point where it is possible for the government to reach a decision. Until the situation has developed to that point I think it would be unwise to make a decision based on conjecture.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. The Prime Minister just mentioned that the very necessary observer team is waiting for commercial aircraft to become available. Would he consider sending the Jetstar if it is available?

Mr. Trudeau: It would have to refuel in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member—

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I bought the plane for the government and I know it can make the flight with the proper stops on the way.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

Mr. Trudeau: I do not think it would have to stop if the hon. member went along and breathed into the tank.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—CONTINGENCY RESPECTING AGREEMENT TO SUSPEND COPPER PRICE INCREASE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of Finance arising out of the statement he made on motions. Is the agreement by the copper producers to forgo until March 1 the further increase in the prices which they had proposed contingent on any agreement by the government to abate the directives which it issued requiring the companies to increase the amounts of copper available for use in Canada this year?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in respect of the allocation of copper to the Canadian market, as my friend knows the Canadian market is supplied at a much lower price than the world price of

copper. As a matter of fact, the 57-cent price that the copper companies have agreed to continue compares with the London metals exchange price of last week, that is the world price of 82 cents a pound, and is also substantially higher than the United States domestic price.

The matter of the quantities required for Canadian consumption comes under the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I would ask him to refer to this matter although I believe the understanding was that there would be adequate copper available. However, I leave it to the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the policy of the government has been and is still to satisfy the normal legitimate requirements of Canadian users. Even in normal times what is legitimate is a relative concept. The concept is even more relative now in view of the fact that we now have three prices, the Canadian price, frozen for the next two months, the United States price and the London Metals Exchange price. At a lower price a copper user can develop new requirements. So in normal times it is difficult to assess what is legitimate and it will be even more difficult now.

A few weeks ago, after my previous announcement on copper, my department assessed the legitimate demand of Canadian user manufacturers and has now re-assessed it. There is a difference between the two assessments. I shall not deny that. Quantities will be provided to copper users on the basis of historical levels.

It seems to us at the moment that everybody must make a sacrifice. Producers are making one and the users must make one too.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, do I understand that the directives which were issued to the various copper producers setting forth the higher amount of copper which they must retain for domestic consumption have now been revised downward and that this is part of the price the government is paying for getting a two-month moratorium on the proposed price increase? Do I take it that the minister's answer is yes?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, you might look at it that way; you might look at it another way too. The users who might have been expected to pay 66 cents or more, will now get their copper at 57 cents for a period of time. We have here a difficult distribution of advantages and disadvantages, and it is being done in the fairest way.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. Would he advise the House whether there is any significance or any *quid pro quo* with regard to the date of March 1? Is the roll-back, or the maintenance of present prices by the copper companies, tied in with a promise of the release from these quota restrictions as of March 1, and does the same thing apply to the banks in question?

Mr. Benson: What we have asked these people to do is to suspend any increases until we have a chance to see the results of the meeting which the Prices and Incomes Commission is trying to arrange. We expect it to be held in February, as will the meeting of first ministers at which inflation will be discussed. We are hopeful that out of the conference which the Prices and Incomes Commission is trying to arrange a formula will be developed which will be applied with respect to any proposed changes in prices.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Témiscamingue wish to put a supplementary question?

Mr. Caouette: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance.

The Noranda Company announced, two weeks ago, a 9 cent increase in the price of copper, from 57 cents to 66 cents a pound. Now, under the steps taken by the minister, will Noranda mine be selling copper at 57 cents a pound or has the company been authorized to increase its price to 66 cents?

[*English*]

Mr. Benson: The agreement is that there will be a suspension of the price increase and that prices will not be increased in the period from January 1 to March 1. I might say that this does involve a roll-back in price because the price was increased on January 1. The matter is to be reconsidered in March. There is no authorization to increase the price at that time, but this matter will be considered

in view of the results of the conference of the Prices and Incomes Commission and that of the first ministers.

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): I have a further supplementary question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. What action has the minister decided to take on the request for a further embargo on the shipment of scrap copper, which would be an extension of the present embargo on shipments of this commodity?

Mr. Pepin: Scrap is on the control list. There is to be a meeting with these people tomorrow in the department on a number of issues. But I might add that the administration of these measures will be difficult, of course, because producers will quite legitimately want to maximize their advantage and so will users. There will be administrative difficulties, but my department is equipped to do the best possible job in trying circumstances—

Mr. Harkness: I have a further supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I should like to suggest to hon. members that we should soon move on to another subject. I hope there will not be too many further supplementary questions. I will allow the hon. member for Calgary Centre to put his question, followed by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Harkness: So I take it from what the minister said that we can expect some information tomorrow or the next day on the decision taken. My further supplementary question is: what is the reason for excluding British Columbia copper producers from the government's request not to increase the price of copper for two months?

Mr. Pepin: This again is part of the complexity.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pepin: Part of the complexity is that we only have control over certain forms of copper and not over unrefined copper such as the concentrates in British Columbia. Some people in the copper industry make the point that some companies are asked to make greater sacrifices than others and that is not an unfair comment.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): My further supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. It arises out of the last paragraph in his statement. Can it be taken from that paragraph that anyone who dares raise his price between now and March 1 will be expected to roll it back or to maintain his present price if he is tempted to raise it?

Mr. Benson: What is meant is that the government urges people in the interim, before the conference which we hope will take place and the meeting of the first ministers, that is, before March 1, not to make major price changes. Of course we do not have the power to order people to roll back prices, but we urge them not to increase prices in the hope that the conference will be successful and that guidelines will be developed.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED INVITATION TO PRIME MINISTER TO VISIT COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Could he tell us whether it is true that he intends to visit Communist China next spring, and more specifically in May, following an invitation that he reportedly has received from Peking?

[*English*]

GRAIN

ACCEPTANCE OF DEFERRED DELIVERY PERMITS

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): I should like to direct my question to the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of the fact that close to two-thirds of all delivery points were unable to accept a five-bushel quota in the last crop year ending July 31, can the minister advise the House when these points can expect acceptance of their deferred delivery permits?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The simple answer is, of course, as soon as space is available since deferred delivery permits are in the hands of the farmers and therefore, along with unit quotas, are a first entitlement when space opens up. Of course the objective of the Wheat Board has been generally to allow space to be opened for unit quotas as well as deferred delivery points before opening bushel quotas, but the Wheat Board decided to open bushel

quotas where space is clearly available and still attempt to assure space where unit quotas and deferred deliveries remain to be made.

Mr. Stewart (Marquette): I have a supplementary question for the minister. Could he tell the House why in Manitoba there were twice as many CPR as CNR delivery points that were unable to accept a five-bushel quota in the last crop year?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The supplementary question is clearly argumentative.

UTILIZATION OF LAKEHEAD TERMINAL SPACE

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, which I should like to direct to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of his statements in recent days concerning the schedule of unloading at Lakehead terminals, will the minister say whether or not the government will consider requesting the Wheat Board and the Canadian railways to increase their unloading capacity up to 1,000 carloads a day in order to fill that space earlier than was originally planned?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): No, Mr. Speaker. The plan which has been drawn up with regard to the shipping of grain to the Lakehead has been carefully arranged to ensure that the Lakehead space will in fact be full before the opening of navigation. It is important not only to have a fairly steady flow to the Lakehead from the point of view of the best use of facilities but also to ensure a fairly steady flow toward the end of the period as we fill the space because immediately after navigation opens we will be expecting the railroads and terminals to unload well over 1,000 cars per day.

APPOINTMENT OF LAKEHEAD MOVEMENT CO-ORDINATOR

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): I have a supplementary question for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of the fact that the minister has recently arranged for the appointment of a co-ordinator for the handling of grain at the west coast terminals, is he now prepared to appoint a similar co-ordinator to expedite the movement of grain at the Lakehead?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): We are giving consideration to the Lakehead terminals' operation, and of course the logic which led to the appointment of a co-ordinator at the terminals in Vancouver is even stronger in the case of the Lakehead. We are working toward the objective of appointing such a co-ordinator prior to the opening of navigation.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): In view of the fact that for months members of the opposition have been suggesting the appointment of a freight car controller, a suggestion which has always been resisted by the government, when did the minister finally come to the sensible conclusion, in so far as British Columbia is concerned, that it should have a controller?

Mr. Lang: I was curious to find out whether the right hon. gentleman would react to the appointment by saying it is a good thing which he had suggested or by saying it is a bad thing and insufficient. I am glad to see that he welcomes it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the type of nonsense that has placed the western farmers in the position in which they find themselves today.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Has the right hon. gentleman a supplementary question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have been trying to get an answer from the minister. I ask the minister: when was it that his mental operations finally brought him to the conclusion that action should be taken which should have been taken six months ago?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Baldwin: After he picked up Thatcher's permit book.

HOUSING

1970 CONSTRUCTION TARGET FOR HOMES FOR ELDERLY AND THOSE ON LOW INCOMES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of housing. In view of the fact that last year the federal government gave direct assistance under the National Housing Act for the construction of some 20,000 dwellings for elderly and low income people with families, could the minister say what the target is for 1970?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): An increase over that figure—

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the information sought by the hon. member should normally be given by way of a general statement on motions.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL PARKS

FORILLON—PROSPECTION RIGHTS GRANTED TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. Georges-C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Have the Quebec provincial authorities informed the minister or the federal government that prospection rights had been granted to private enterprise a few days before the signature of the agreement between both governments on the creation of the Forillon park?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indians Affairs and Northern Development): No, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

TAXATION

REQUEST FOR POSTPONEMENT OF DATES FOR FILING AND PRESENTATION OF BRIEFS ON WHITE PAPER

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I was going to direct this question of the Minister of Finance so he could relay it to the chairman of the Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee, but as the chairman is here maybe I can put my question directly to him. Would he consider suggesting to the committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs that the date of January 19, 1970, for notification of intention to present briefs on the white paper on taxation, and the date of March 1, 1970, for actual presentation of such briefs, might be delayed somewhat to enable many important organizations to prepare their briefs properly for presentation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has made a submission which he has to assume will be taken into account.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVITATION TO PRESIDENT OF FRANCE TO VISIT OTTAWA

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Prime Minister.

[Mr. Andras.]

Could he indicate whether on behalf of the Canadian government he extended an official invitation to the President of France, Mr. Pompidou, to visit Ottawa at the time of his coming trip to Washington?

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

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Does the Prime Minister intend to extend such an invitation on the occasion of this trip or at any other time?

Mr. Trudeau: At this very moment, Mr. Speaker, I have no such intention.

[*English*]

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

INQUIRY AS TO ACTION BASED ON THIRD REPORT OF COMMISSION

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister take the first opportunity on motions to outline to the House what action the government intends to take, either legislative or otherwise, on the recommendations contained in the third volume of recommendations issued by the Bilingualism and Biculturalism Commission?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Perhaps in due course, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question. Is it not a fact that the government has simply poured $9 million down the drain for propaganda purposes inasmuch as the government obviously intends to take no action on this report whatsoever?

PUBLIC SERVICE

DELAY IN ISSUING RETROACTIVE PAY CHEQUES

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question either to the President of the Treasury Board or to the Minister of Supply and Services. Can we be informed what the present situation is with respect to the retroactive pay cheques for federal public servants?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I spent an hour and a half at the Central Pay Office this morning—

Mr. Baldwin: Did you get it?

Mr. Richardson: I did not write any cheques myself but I am pleased to say that the Central Pay Office is current with respect to collective agreements and that the backlog with respect to other pay changes is being reduced substantially each day.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that we had the same answer some weeks ago about the situation being current, would the minister tell us why it is that so many federal civil servants have not received their cheques and are even going as far as taking their cases to court?

Mr. Richardson: Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the Central Pay Office. As the Central Pay Office is at the end of the pipeline it can only process the cheques and issue them after it has received the documentation or necessary information from other sources.

Mr. Baldwin: Okay, Bud, it is your turn now. You ducked the first one.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I now have a supplementary question for the President of the Treasury Board. Since he must be farther ahead in the pipeline, can he tell us when this matter is going to be cleared up?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, it is hard to say when no delays in the pay service will ever be encountered. We hope this will be the case but it is unlikely it will ever come about, perhaps in the next millenium. In the meantime, as the minister has indicated a very large effort is being put forth and substantial progress is being made in clearing up what was a great backlog.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister. In view of the uncertainty arising from the two statements that have been made, why is it that there are so many civil servants entitled to retroactive pay who have not received it and in fact, have been denied it? I ask him also if, with regard to the actions that have been taken in the Exchequer Court, the government intends to settle those in a manner favourable to the plaintiffs?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the right hon. gentleman, as a famous lawyer, would not expect me to answer that question.

Mr. Hees: Or any other.

Mr. Drury: I have had some training as a lawyer, though rather brief—

An hon. Member: Very brief.

Mr. Drury: —but he can understand, perhaps better than I, why I should not answer that question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate that the right hon. gentleman has a supplementary question but I have to appeal to hon. members again to give an opportunity to other hon. members who are waiting anxiously for a chance to ask questions.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Since when did it become difficult or impossible for a government to say whether it was going to do justice to its employees?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board if he can tell the House how many civil servants are waiting for back pay? Several dozen, several hundred or several thousand?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, we have been engaged in a series of rounds of collective bargaining. The first round is virtually complete and some 72 separate agreements have been concluded. We are in the process of negotiating another 23. This is going on and agreements are being signed almost every week. In the course of each signing a new pay situation arises so that although, as the minister has indicated, we have been successful in meeting the adjustments in pay respecting agreements concluded some time ago, a new set of pay adjustments arises virtually every week.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, months ago the Minister of Supply and Services told the House that things were current and people were being paid. We now find out through representations from the Professional Institute and the Public Service Alliance that there are suits against the government and that there are hundreds of people waiting as long as six months for the back pay granted to them—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Orlikow: My question of privilege is that I submit the minister misrepresented the facts to me and to other members of the House.

An hon. Member: Discrimination.

Another hon. Member: You should have gone skin-diving too.

STATUS OF NEGOTIATIONS INVOLVING AIRPORT FIREMEN

Mr. C. Terrence Murphy (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is also directed to the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the fact that some 1,500 or more firemen employed at federal airports across the country have been working without a collective agreement for more than 14 months and are now considering wildcat strike action, can the minister assure the House—

An hon. Member: Good for them.

Mr. Murphy: —that everything possible is being done by representatives of the Treasury Board to finalize the negotiations with representatives of the Public Service Alliance or to have the matter in dispute submitted to arbitration?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I can give the assurance that the Treasury Board is making every effort to bring these negotiations to a conclusion. The choice of proceeding to arbitration is, of course, an option open to the employees. It is an option which at any time they are free to exercise. It is exercised at their option. This is not, indeed, an indication of impatience and frustration on the part of the government.

Mr. Murphy: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister advise the House whether it is open to the representatives of Treasury Board, as well as of the Public Service Alliance, to have the matter in dispute submitted to arbitration so that a decision may be arrived at more quickly?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think that question is in order.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

ACTION RESPECTING ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Ask him, anyway.

Mr. MacInnis: Is the government going to take any action to stop the discrimination carried on by the Crown corporation, Devco, which has been referred to by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion?

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

TIME OF RELEASE OF PRICE INDEX FIGURES BY BUREAU OF STATISTICS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Can he advise the House why it is that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, which comes directly under his control, has suddenly changed the time of making available figures relating to the consumer price index from eight o'clock in the morning, as has been customary, to 2.30 p.m. in the afternoon, half an hour after the House begins sitting?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: Has the government that little confidence in its programs?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that the question might be raised at ten o'clock.

Mr. Hees: Obviously very embarrassing figures are coming out. Is that how badly your programs are working, Ben?

Mr. Greene: You are not even up at eight o'clock.

Mr. Hees: Yes, I am. I have half my day's work done by eight o'clock.

Mr. Trudeau: That's one hour.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

NATIONAL CAPITAL

REQUEST FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Having in mind the current controversy between the city of Ottawa and the National Capital Commission, would the Prime Minister give consideration to implementing the decision of the previous Parliament and

encourage the establishment of a committee of Parliament to deal with all matters pertaining to the national capital?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might answer this question. I would be prepared to take that matter into consideration again, bearing in mind the present heavy committee studies of many questions and the opportunity of studying other questions, including this one, on the estimates within a month's time.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): A supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the unappreciative attitude of the city of Ottawa with regard to the importance of federal civil servants to the economy of Ottawa, will the Prime Minister give serious consideration to decentralizing federal civil servants by moving government departments to the west and to the maritime provinces in order to give those areas a shot in the arm, so to speak?

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

FINANCIAL POSITION FOLLOWING INCREASED RATES

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Postmaster General.

Could he say whether the steps taken last year about postal rates have succeeded in putting his department on a profit-earning basis?

[*English*]

POLLUTION

ACTION RESPECTING CONTAMINATION OF SASKATCHEWAN RIVER BY MERCURY

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Have his departmental officials yet pinpointed the source of the mercury contamination in the Saskatchewan River? If so, what action is the minister planning with regard to the guilty parties?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we suspect that the source of the mercury pollution is among several plants in the Saskatoon area. Our engineers and biologists are already in these plants at the present time.

POST OFFICE

REFERENCE TO PARLIAMENT OF ESTABLISHMENT OF CROWN CORPORATION

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. and gracious Postmaster General. It is prompted by the announcement of the appointment of a general manager for the Ontario region of the Post Office Department whose job is declared to be the implementation of recommendations of the latest Kates, Peat and Marwick task force report. Can the minister advise if he contemplates even a fleeting reference to Parliament before he establishes his Crown corporation?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

REPRESENTATIONS FROM FRENCH IMMIGRANTS TO QUEBEC DESIRING TO MOVE TO ALBERTA

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Would the Minister say whether he has received further representations from large numbers of dissatisfied French immigrants, presently settled in Quebec and wishing to move to Alberta?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have had representations from them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question.

Could the Minister say whether he intends to convey to the House the written representations that he received?

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter and an accompanying statement. I believe I replied to it yesterday. I have no objection to tabling the correspondence later if that is desired.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and make a suggestion. Would the

minister advise these people that the vacant land in Alberta that is being talked about is non-existent?

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the minister is tabling that information would he also table information with respect to the amount paid to the displaced Cape Breton miners who went west to British Columbia or Alberta?

AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—RECONSIDERATION OF DECISION TO REDUCE SUPPORT

Mr. R. E. McKinley (Huron): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the dairy producers' widespread dissatisfaction with the government's proposal to cut $10 million from the next dairy year's allotment and the dissatisfaction expressed by many hon. members, including government supporters—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly ask his question and not make a statement.

Mr. McKinley: I am about to ask my question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the minister to review this decision with a view to allotting the same amount of money to the dairy program next year as was allotted to it this year?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether the question as asked is in order. The hon. member has made a representation and a submission, and the matter must be considered in that light.

HOUSING

ONTARIO—ACTION TO OFFSET FREEZE ON CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the minister in charge of housing. In view of the considerable drop in housing starts in the Toronto region last year and in view of the announcement by the Minister of Trade and Development of Ontario that there is to be a freeze on public, student and senior citizens' housing, what steps does the government propose to take in order to meet its program?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The answer to that question, I suggest to the hon. member, ought normally to be given to the House by way of a statement on motions.

INDUSTRY

POSITION OF FAIREY OF CANADA CONTRACTS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. Could he indicate whether National Defence contracts awarded to Fairey of Canada have been taken away from the company and awarded to other contractors?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the information on these contracts immediately at hand but I will be glad to obtain it.

• (3:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS

The House resumed, from Monday, November 10, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford 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 read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, this matter was before the House on November 10 of last year, at which time a number of hon. members participated in the debate. Since then hon. members have received many submissions concerning the ramifications of Bill C-4. I presume hon. members have had an opportunity of examining the various clauses of this bill. This is not, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if we could have some order in the chamber?

Mr. Peters: This is not the first bill which has sought certain disclosures on the part of corporations. If hon. members will reflect, several years ago we passed a bill for the disclosure of certain information by companies and labour unions in Canada. Surprising-

ly enough, there was considerable objection at that time by the companies concerned to disclosing this information. When we review the situation, we find that very little use has been made of the information sought at that time and there has been very little comment about the information that was disclosed.

The unions were willing to participate, although some of the companies did so reluctantly. Not much use has been made by either the public or the corporations of the information obtained by the disclosures of the trade unions or the corporations.

This particular bill, Mr. Speaker, has great potential. It has a potential for re-establishing a much more modern and up-to-date Companies Act which would allow for the orderly operation of corporate business in Canada. It asks for considerable information. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) indicated this was a snooping bill. Unless the minister goes further than he has, that is exactly what this bill is going to be. It will snoop out a lot of information, but nothing will happen to that information.

The industrial sector in Canada is expanding very rapidly. Our corporate wealth has grown greatly. We in Canada have been able to develop industrially more rapidly than most countries, and possibly more uniformly. We have now reached the stage where we have a great corporate structure which almost supersedes government in the operation of our nation.

Several ministers were asked about the price of copper today. It was indicated that an arrangement had been made whereby a two-month stay on price increases would be retained. The decision was arrived at in spite of the great difficulty in deciding whether this applied to all the domestic producers in Canada, whether the copper consumers in Canada were all affected and how it would apply to the general public. This is an indication that our corporate structure in Canada has reached a level where it has more influence on the average person's life than has the federal government or the combination of the eleven governments which govern this country.

If the International Nickel Company decides it does not want to have a contract with its employees and pushes the situation until a strike develops, then the dispute between the mine workers in Sudbury, Falconbridge and the International Nickel Company of (Canada) is not necessarily related to labour relations. As history has shown, this dispute provides an opportunity for a large corporation with international monetary control over a total industry to decide whether to have a price increase. The labour relations situation was set up in such a way that the Corporation would have the support of the community and of the workers in that industry in helping it to obtain an increase.

I made a statement in this House that this was the reason for the International Nickel Company strike and that before there would be a settlement there would be a large international increase in the price of nickel. This has now taken place. What control did the government have over the nickel we could buy or the commodities we could purchase? they had absolutely no control. They could ask, beg or take action. The only action they could take was the implementation of legislation such as is before us today, legislation with some teeth in it.

The minister is asking for all kinds of disclosures. He is asking us to look into the intricate dealings of corporations and companies. He has said we should look into them to the extent of knowing whether a shareholder is getting a fair shake from his company. The other day I was looking at some figures. I noticed that a company with a multi-million dollar investment, and stock running between $50 and $60, was paying a 71 cent dividend. I strongly suggest that a person having stock in that company, knowing the volume of business that company was doing and the expansion it has experienced,—would wonder why he was receiving a 71 cent dividend on a $50 share. It just would not seem reasonable.

In my opinion, the shareholder would have absolutely no say in any investment that company might make. He may not even be told what other subsidiary industries were being purchased with money that would normally be used for participating share dividends. It is for this kind of protection the minister is asking, and I am glad the government is finally interested in it. I have said that we have developed a very sound and stable industrial structure. The corporate structure in our country has not caused great difficulty by over-expansion, bankruptcies and the other unfortunate events that occur in many countries. At the same time we really have not had any control over this development. It has been stable from the point of view of the companies. The minister is now saying it will have to be fair as far as the shareholders are concerned.

I have been interested in a number of the problems of shareholders such as proxy votes; how they are arrived at; the legitimacy of companies using proxy votes which are left over after everyone has indicated who will be attending the shareholders meeting. I am interested in the takeovers that have occurred and the inability of the average shareholder to decide whether a takeover is in his interest or what the financial purpose of the takeover is in terms of this interest. I am not speaking of the interest of the companies because that is well looked after. It has almost become a third dimension in the economic way of life of the Canadian people. The minister is to be congratulated for his interest in the shareholder. I feel, however, that he has missed the real role of government in demanding the disclosures, that is the role that the government itself will play not only on behalf of the shareholders but on behalf of the Canadian public.

• (3:20 p.m.)

One of the problems involves our inability, as shareholders in Canadian corporations to keep these corporations Canadian owned. When Canadian corporations are investing in trust companies, investment companies or making other forms of investment, we should be advised whether they are investing in Canada or investing in foreign owned corporations. It is interesting to note that Canadians have invested more money in the United States than United States investors have put into Canadian corporations in the last ten years. This would indicate there is some reluctance on the part of the investing public in Canada to share in the development of Canadian corporations or to acknowledge they have a role to play in that development.

It is 34 years since this act has been before us for major revision. Ten years ago, when four or five people were running the branch there was not much need for an 80-page act to enable them to deal with this operation, which was very small, inefficient, ineffectual. In Canada only a very small part of our corporate development has been brought about through use of the letters patent procedure. Most of the incorporation necessary has been done through special acts of Parliament. Over a period of years several members of this party—latterly, quite a number of us—have become interested in this incorporation procedure particularly as it affects finance companies, trust companies and insurance companies. The minister is now proposing to turn over to the companies branch authority to set up trust companies, finance companies and insurance companies by legislation.

Many of us are concerned about this policy. We are not opposed to companies being set up by letters patent. What we are opposed to is the absence of proper machinery to ensure a number of safeguards along lines already adopted in the banking field and in the insurance field generally. No agency has been established with power to determine whether a new finance company, for example, is needed, what role it would play and whether it would be Canadian owned. No account is being taken of the investment program or policies of such a company. What the government is saying amounts only to this: Because a fuss has been made in the House about foreign ownership by a limited number of hon. members, these matters will be taken out of parliamentary jurisdiction under the special acts and placed under general legislation. As I have said, we have no particular objection to that. Indeed, we have recommended such a course on a number of occasions. Surely, though, the government must provide some kind of machinery to satisfy some of the criticism which has been raised by the general public with relation to the finance companies, in particular.

Over the years it has been interesting to hear members of Parliament argue that it is necessary for Parliament to control the Canadian banking structure. For years members of the Social Credit party have contended that all banking should be in the hands of the Bank of Canada and that the Bank of Canada should be controlled by the government. Most of us agree that the Bank of Canada should play a dominant role in the banking structure and all of us, I believe, acknowledge that all banking in Canada should be Canadian-controlled—that only 10 per cent of any banking institution may be owned by foreign interests. Yet we have allowed the proliferation of loan companies, trust companies and insurance companies without any such reservations until thousands of these institutions are in operation in Canada today.

What has been done about these institutions? Over the years complaints have been made by members of Parliament on all sides that the loan and trust companies were charging exorbitant interest rates, up to 28 per cent a year. They pointed out what a terrible thing this was when the banks could only charge 6 per cent. What happened? Did

Parliament reduce the interest rate which could be charged by the trust and loan companies, bring them to the level of the banks at 6 per cent? No. The decision was made to remove the ceiling from the rate chargeable by the banks and allow the banks to catch up with the loan companies. We have not stopped that process yet.

It is my opinion that authority to incorporate a trust company or a loan company is as good as a licence to print money. We have seen representatives of such companies come back to Parliament after as little as three years and ask for amendments to their charters allowing for capital increases from $5 million to $20 million. As I say, incorporation amounts to a licence to print money. The capital expansion some of these companies have been able to achieve in a short period is fantastic.

The minister has indicated he is concerned about this. He is concerned, all right—concerned to the extent that these companies must report along with everybody else. But does he take into account the fact that they occupy a different position from other corporations inasmuch as they play a large role in setting the pattern of the daily lives of many of our citizens? These are the companies which have offices down the street identified by little signs offering immediate loans. A former member of Parliament called them friendly people to do business with. Many of the workers and farmers of this country drop in from time to time, and are charged exorbitant interest rates. Is the minister interested in this aspect? Is he interested in controlling the trust and loan companies? I am not sure. I would think he is not. There is no doubt the minister intends to accumulate information. But what use does he intend to make of it?

If there is any field in which the federal government can take credit for having done a good job over the years it is in the field of insurance. A number of inspectors of insurance have done excellent work in this area. The last two inspectors, in particular, have done an excellent job. I believe they would tell the minister they do not have the power to deal with the aspects of this problem to which I referred a few moments ago—indeed, that such power should only be exercised jointly by Parliament and the inspector of insurance. On a number of occasions the inspector has told the committee that he did not wish to take responsibility for deciding whether or not a particular type of insurance company should be authorized to do business in a new field without Parliament having some say in the matter.

Today, without any provision having been made in the legislation to enable the inspector of insurance to take on the responsibility of others, it is proposed to turn over the insurance field to a branch of the minister's department. I would point out that this is not without interest to some who are outside the Canadian investment sphere, people who know that a licence to issue insurance in Canada is a valuable asset, one which has been eagerly sought by foreign-owned corporations.

The minister has admitted to some extent that there is a difference, in the need for disclosure of the operations of a large corporation as opposed to those of small industries. I think he would agree that when a company reaches the size of the Canadian Pacific Railway there is need for public disclosure very similar to that which arises in the case of large public corporations. Air Canada is required to make certain disclosures since it is a crown corporation. I am sure the minister would agree that since CP Air is in the same field of transportation any disclosures made by that corporation, even though it is privately owned, exercise the same kind of influence on the Canadian public as disclosures made by a public corporation.

• (3:30 p.m.)

So, I think there is this kind of class to which I have referred, a class to which I am becoming more and more sympathetic. I have talked to farmers who find themselves having to incorporate for various reasons under Canadian law, and the amount of work they have to do in supplying information to the government almost demands the services of a full time accountant. Although the total amount of money involved is very small, the same cannot be said for the number of government agencies that are demanding information from our farmers.

My brother tells me that every month he is asked to fill in a form for his two hired men for unemployment insurance purposes. Every month he has to send in his contribution for these two employees. He has told me that he would be quite happy to make a blanket payment either at the first of the year or at the end of the year and have the government do the bookkeeping, but he has been told this is not possible. He also thinks that the Canada Pension Plan contributions should be paid by

way of a lump sum to the government, which would relieve him of monthly bookkeeping on behalf of the government.

It is these kind of inquiries that I think adversely affect some of the very small companies that incorporate for other reasons, companies whose influence upon the pricing of Canadian commodities is nil. Although this information might be of assistance to some, demands for information are becoming oppressive in number and people are becoming disillusioned because either they cannot understand the demands or meet the demands made upon them. Unless these demands do serve some purpose, surely we as legislators must give some consideration to the problems encountered by this particular class of people.

Over the past few years the New Democratic Party has been as concerned as anybody about the problem the minister is attempting to solve by the introduction of Bill C-4. We decided that any review of prices and profits must be a public review, and as a result of the review the general public must be placed in a position to take some action.

The other day we had a report from the minister's department on Imperial Oil, and this information has been made public to a certain extent. An investigation of Imperial Oil was made in Sudbury which revealed that Imperial Oil is not really a Canadian company, as many of us thought, but is owned by Standard Oil of New Jersey. This company owns oil wells, oil leases and oil exploration companies. It controls the largest oil pipe line in Canada, as well as a large number of oil refining facilities. It owns a large amount of real estate in such towns as Sudbury.

Instead of selling gasoline to the retailers at the wholesale price in the Sudbury area, this company sold them gasoline on a consignment basis and received payment on delivery to the retailers' tanks. So what it amounts to is that we have Imperial Oil—Standard Oil of New Jersey—supplying Canadian produced gasoline to consumers in Sudbury, charging them 4, 5 or 6 cents more than the price in other areas, and at the same time telling the small branch operators that unless they play ball they will be out of business in a few days since they are but consignees of the company.

What has the minister's department done about this situation? This information is available to the minister. We have stated that this information should be publicized; that this kind of hearing should be held in public so that the general public are made fully aware of the facts. I think everyone in Sudbury should be made aware that by buying Imperial Oil products they are, in effect, cutting the throats of the small operators further down the road who are pseudo-entrepreneurs in the buying and selling of gasoline for automobiles.

I should like to know whether we have set up machinery that will make available to the public the fact that Imperial Oil treat their operators as hired hands that sell gasoline on a consignment basis. I think if we are going to influence prices and tackle the problem of price increases in Canada, we shall have to do much more than we have.

The article that I read did not indicate whether any fine had been imposed on Imperial Oil. I presume none was. If you really wanted to make Imperial Oil pay a fine that would hurt, you would have to levy a fine of $100 million, perhaps $500 million, I do not know. I often wonder why we do not levy a fine that is commensurate with the profit that has been made by what we would consider to be an unfair practice. All we do is charge something like $25,000, a sum that would not even pay the liquor bill of the officers of Standard Oil of New Jersey, let alone be a deterrent.

Although I am sure the type of disclosure for which we are asking will remedy some situations, we have not tackled the subject in which the general public is interested, namely the establishment of the sort of agency that has been set up in the United States to control mergers and monopolies. We have not passed such legislation in Canada, but people in the United States believe that to some extent they are now protected by legislation against monopolies. The Canadian people are not so protected. They are not even protected in cases where the monopolies are U.S. controlled and owned.

We have been fighting in private members' hour mainly against the proliferation of insurance companies and the broadening of their operations. We have been interested in how trust companies should develop their operations, what kind of policy an investment company should adopt, and so on. On several occasions when we dealt with these companies directly we were able to commit them to exercise a certain amount of Canadian preference; even though the parent company in the U.S. might put up all the money, they would sell at least 50 per cent control in the company to members of the Canadian public after a specified period of time.

This commitment was guaranteed by the legislation, which usually provided that the directors of the company would normally be resident in Canada; that their avowed purpose would be to establish a Canadian arm that was separate from the parent corporation in the United States. For example, we were able to do this in the case of United Accumulative Fund Distributors and two other companies. I would suggest that the amount of investment being made in Canada is indicative of the fact that Canada, as far as corporations are concerned, is a good place to do business.

• (3:40 p.m.)

If we put on some restrictions we may find we have not established a method of buying Canada back but we will slow down the rate of takeover of our economy by United States corporations. We will also establish incentives to Canadians to buy into industries which they know are Canadian and will expand in Canada. This will give them an opportunity to advance and progress.

It seems to me the minister has gone part way by this piece of legislation in correcting a number of faults that have existed in the company's branch legislation. Certainly, in my opinion this branch has not enjoyed a good history in Canada. It has not done any of the things being done in other countries by similar legislative bodies to protect national identity. It has done nothing to prohibit mergers and takeovers, and as a result the public interest has not been served. This branch has not been able to supervise companies which suffer financial difficulties. As a result, shareholders and those interested are not made aware of those problems which could have been solved had a Canadian securities commission been in existence. Such a commission might have done some of the work the minister I am sure considers will now be done by the company's branch.

Perhaps this will be the case when the minister brings forward the legislation on which he is now working. The minister has gone part way in rectifying some of the mistakes of the past. I only wish he would indicate that he is as concerned as some of us have been about the legislation he is now removing from our books, and that by doing so Canadian identity will be improved. Perhaps he will make an effort similar to that of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) as indicated by his white paper. In this way, Canadians will not only be encouraged to buy into Canadian corporations but into companies outside Canada. Foreign investors should be penalized if they do not establish structures that will eventually, under the terms of their letters patent, become totally Canadian owned. The trouble Canada has found itself in—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Peters: I was going to conclude by saying that the only difference between the legislation of other countries and Canadian legislation is that the main theme in other countries is the development of nationally owned corporations. In most cases they have legislation restricting the voting stock to nationals holding more than 50 per cent of the stock. In Canada we have not yet taken that step. Until we do we will not be happy when reading on the financial pages of our major newspapers about foreign takeovers of major industries. We will not be happy about figures published in respect of the control of major industries in Canada by foreign owners without any indication of an opportunity in the future for Canadians to control these companies.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, this is an opportune time for the introduction of this bill. There are two things involved. First, we have reform of our taxation procedures as embodied in the white paper on taxation. This is very important to corporate structures as well as to the wide distribution of shares, profits and so on. If we have a faulty corporate structure, then the ideas expressed in the white paper on tax reform will not work. There is a great demand and need at the present time for reform of our laws regarding corporate structures. It seems that most of the people who want reform do not want change. This creates a great difficulty. We have thousands of experts who are knowledgeable in the old ways of doing things. No one is quite sure what the new way will be. Consequently, the old order has loyal friends and the new order has lukewarm friends at best.

It has been said that the minister has not gone far enough. I am sure he would like to go a lot further, but the minister has already gone further than his advisers have suggested. Like all presidents of corporations, I am

sure the ministers are advised by experts. They suggest the minister should not go too far because the business community is very powerful and it should not be encouraged to move to southern climates. The bill itself is an indication that the minister will go a lot further. I suggest he could have gone further now but I am pleased that he has gone as far as he has.

Let us review the corporate image. I agree with hon. gentlemen opposite, especially those in the N.D.P., that most people picture a corporation as an individual who is corpulent, wearing a top hat, tuxedo and bow tie, and having dollar signs instead of eyes and ears. It is surprising how many Canadians have given personalities to corporations.

The corporate structure is the only feasible or workable method of participating in enterprise as it has developed in the world up to this point. This is a continuation of the English business community which created a personality without personal characteristics for corporations. In this way, people can invest money with limited liability. A corporation is nothing more than a group of investors who have limited their liability and act as an individual. It is for this reason the United States has become extremely powerful. This corporate structure has made great nations in this world. The lack of a corporate structure has been the nemesis of many nations. I have in mind France, particularly. It has never adopted the corporate structure method. The United States, England, Canada and Germany, to a great extent, as well as Japan, have accepted this system. It is still a good system, and I dare anyone to suggest something different which would accomplish the same thing.

There is a presumption that a corporation has a conscience. The late hon. Mr. Winters said that a corporation was expected to act as a good Canadian citizen. Of course, it is impossible for a corporation to act at all. For this reason, the conduct of corporations must be regulated to a great extent. Because a corporation has no conscience, it will make the last dollar wherever it can and it does not care how it makes it. That is taken for granted because a corporation has no ethics, no morals or personality. We recognize that corporations must be controlled and regulated, yet allowed to function within these regulations. We cannot presume that corporations are going to behave in any one way. They will behave in accord with their purpose, and that is to make money through a limited corporate structure.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I should like to deal with the item of information. There has been a great deal of repercussion from this provision. I am sure the minister has had a great kick-back on the question of information, the financial information. I agree with this bill entirely. Whether the company be private or public, I cannot see the reason that it should hold certain parts of its activities secret. It deals under a public licence. It limits its liability under public law. If the officers of the company want secrecy, they can work entirely as individuals and be liable for everything they are worth. If they do not take advantage of the corporate structure, then they do not have to inform anyone. But I do not think they should give us the argument that certain information is very valuable to them and that they do not want their competitors to know about it. This is nonsense. The telephone books are full of the names of espionage agencies which will tell anyone the real worth of a company or person despite the credit ratings that are published and despite the financial statements.

There are many worth-while industrial espionage agencies which will give the financial standing as well as information concerning the habits, good and bad, of the directors of a company. Any information which would possibly be of value is open to scrutiny. If, indeed, information were secret, we would not have all these successful agencies which supply this information and make a good deal of money doing so. I do not believe there is a good argument that companies and corporations, private and public, which depend upon the law for certain protection should try to take advantage of another phase of the law by saying they do not have to give certain information. I can see no justification for that. I believe it is an argument concerning secrecy, and the argument that secrecy must be maintained because of competition is nonsense.

The minister has attempted to deal with the second phase of corporation law, that having to do with insider trading. This, of course, is one of the faults in our corporate structure. If we intend that our tax reform measures are to be successful, if we intend that our corporations are to grow and if we intend that the Canadian public should invest in shares of

these corporate structures, we must make sure the shareholders are given an even break. They are not given an even break today under the Canadian corporate structure. As has been pointed out by Professor John Porter in one case, and Mrs. Marjorie Keller recently, about 85 per cent of all our large corporations are controlled by a limited number of people, indeed 180 families at the moment. We have the tightest establishment in the world. Mind you, there is an establishment in Germany which is a family establishment. The Germans have a consaguinal family system which includes uncles, aunts, cousins and so on. If Mr. Krupp wanted to pass the business on to a member of the family, he had 413 heirs whom he considered to be family. Out of the 413 there would probably be one who would be able. In Canada, however, we think of the family as a conjugal matter and therefore consisting of sons and daughters. This limits us very much.

I have no particular quarrel with the establishment, provided it has ability and is fluid; but it is not. Our establishment does not depend on ability or success. Indeed, many members of the so-called élite—not so-called because it is actual—have not been successful. But they have been pure. Purity is the most important part of our establishment. You may never have a divorce. Once you have had one you are finished in the establishment. You may fail in business. I know one who has been bankrupt three times and is back in business. You must have a family which goes back at least 400 years. I recall discussing this matter. E. P. Taylor was never quite a member of the establishment because his father was a brewer. That was not far enough. You must go back at least four generations, and that makes you acceptable.

There is also an establishment in the United States, but it is fluid. If you are successful, you are in; if you are not successful, you are out. This is not the case in Canada. There is no new blood flowing into the corporate structures. This is what we are dealing with in respect of insider trading. The minister has tried to regulate this. There is an assumption that all transactions take place on the stock exchange. For instance, it is assumed that if I were to buy shares I would buy them there. But, no, control of shares is decided in clubs. It is not even polite to own your own shares. You say to Joe, a friend of yours, "You take about 7,000 of these shares and hold them for me and I will do the same for you." This is done in Toronto in three clubs. There is the National Club and the York Club. Perhaps it is not done in the York Club because it is not polite to discuss business there.

Unless there is included in this bill, either directly or indirectly, a rule to restrict insider trading, even the friendly arrangement, we will not get very far. I think it is necessary to have some control, at least in the form of information, so that Canadians who are investing in Canadian companies will know that their investments are not going to go down the drain merely because the people at the top want to make a quick buck on a share transaction. I think the emphasis should be on a good, productive investment and not on a quick gain. The history of Canadians especially—and it is not their fault but that of our corporate structures—reveals that they would rather invest in penny mining stock, even though they know that 99 cents on the dollar will go into bridle path post roads and promotion rather than the development of the property. They should put their money in a good investment which would produce over a time. This is not the Canadian way because our Canadian structure does not guarantee this.

Then, we come to the question of proxies.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman leaves the point of insider trading I wonder whether he would answer a question.

Mr. Otto: Yes.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): In view of the fact that all listing in respect of insider trading would have to be done in Ottawa, and in view of the hon. member's strictures concerning Toronto, would he contemplate that the scene of operations be transferred to the Rideau Club?

Mr. Otto: No. The hon. gentleman did not quite understand what I said. I said that I agree with the purpose of the bill, but if it merely deals with the recorded transfer of shares it is of no value because there are the unrecorded transfers. It would be the gentleman's agreement made at the Rideau Club. That club is not that effective in this business. Let us say at the National Club. This is what we must control. This has been done in other legislation by the inclusion of the words "directly or indirectly". If the department has any evidence that a corporation is controlled by a certain individual, they can assume he has control and let him prove he has not.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Getting back to proxies, I think the proxy vote is one of the bad elements of our corporate structure. Anyone who has had anything to do with corporations as a shareholder will know that he will receive a proxy from the directors and be asked to sign it. In this way, he will allow someone else who will attend the meeting to vote for a certain director. What is not prohibited by the act, and what we do not all know, is that the present directors of the company, the people who now control the corporation, can send out proxies at the cost of the corporation. First of all, they know who the shareholders are and they have their addresses. They send out proxies at the company's expense, and it is almost certain that they will be re-elected because if a stranger to the board of directors disagreed with the choice of directors and wanted a new board of directors, first he would have to get the list of shareholders. This bill certainly improves the situation by providing only 20 days during which directors may be elected, and any shareholder can get a list of shareholders. This is a new provision.

If I wanted a new and efficient board of directors to be appointed, I would have to obtain the list of shareholders and at my own expense send them the proxies. My chances of getting the directors I wanted elected would not be good, whereas the existing board of directors can send the proxies out at the company's expense and it is certain that they will be re-elected.

Then, we have this fatherly distribution of directorships. Not long ago, a late senator gave 12 directorships to his son as a wedding present. It is difficult to comprehend how this can be done, but this is what happened in all likelihood. The senator said to a friend: "Look, my friend, my son, Jim, is getting married and I would like to do something for him. How about putting him on the board of your company?" His friend said: "All right. I have known Jim since he was knee high to a grasshopper". Of course, Jim has never been in the business, and in fact he had hardly been through law school, but on his wedding day he receives 12 directorships. That was a nice present.

A director does not receive a large salary because he only gets $500 a year. One wonders at the eagerness of people to become directors of companies, but there is a side benefit in being one. A director decides the time when the next distribution of shares will take place and who is to subscribe to them. Someone has to write: "I, John Doe, will take 100,000 shares at $10 a share". He does not even have to invest a nickel because the shares are not yet issued. So, he puts down his name and has the right to get a certain number of shares as a director. Then, he can sell the rights to those shares. When the directors meet they ask whether everyone has disposed of the rights to their shares, and everyone agrees. The shares are then issued. So, although they have not invested a nickel, they make a lot of money for themselves. That is the great plum in being a director.

There is a good reason behind the U.S. law which requires that 50 per cent of the directors come from within the corporation, that is people who make their living from the company. These are production managers, advertising managers and distribution vice-presidents. They are the people who make their living from the company and who want to make sure that the company functions. In our case only one man, the president, makes his bread and butter from the company, and 90 per cent of the directors are not at all interested in the corporate structure. Therefore, when we talk about proxies it would be a good idea for the minister—and I urge it upon him—to add a provision to the act that if the present directors or any shareholders send out proxies, they will be paid for by themselves. In the alternative, anyone who puts up a list of directors can send out proxies at the cost of the corporation. But you cannot have it both ways because it will not work. You will have a succession of the same directors over and over again and you will continue to have the same problem which exists today, that of an inefficient corporate structure.

In conclusion, I would like to congratulate the minister for presenting this bill. I think it is long overdue. I am sure he is aware of the failings of our corporate establishment, and I trust he will be able to continue to amend this act as quickly as possible in order to make our corporations workable and profitable, thus putting an end to the constant belittling of our corporate image. There is no reason for it. In this modern world we can only act under a corporate system, and if we keep lashing at our corporations because of faulty regulations, which are not their fault, we will not be doing our country any good. But if we word our regulations in such a way as not to give leeway to corporations to do something which Canadians believe should not be done, then we will solve the problem raised by an hon. member who said that

Canadians would rather put their money into U.S. investments than Canadian. I would do the same, and I would advise all hon. members to do so also because under the U.S. corporate structure shareholders are protected. They are assured that the best people direct the companies, that the Federal Securities Exchange Commission will protect their investment, and also that they do not have to depend on a limited number of self-perpetuating directors to run their companies.

If they invest in a Canadian company, they will be almost 100 per cent certain that it will be a family company using their money and that they will have absolutely no control over the conduct of that company.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) I think that the course which this debate has taken indicates that a much better method should have been adopted for dealing with this issue rather than the one that has been taken here. Obviously what the hon. member for York East and the hon. member for Timiskaming were saying, and to which there was agreement from at least one member, was that there were defects, that there had been irregularities, that there probably have been frauds and abuses of the corporate structure. It is essential, therefore, that there should be some means of dealing with this situation. But the divergence of opinion shows that in doing as he has done, the minister, together with his colleagues, the minor gods brooding on the top of Mount Olympus in the shadow of the major god, has handed down his divine judgment on just how we should deal with these problems. This way of acting has not made it possible for the House to discuss this matter thoroughly, and this is an essential condition for the passage of good legislation.

Surely, the legislative process might have been involved to bring about the appointment of a committee, with the fullest possible terms of reference, before the bill was actually introduced. Such a committee would have provided an opportunity for debate and discussion with people from all areas of our society who were involved and concerned in this matter, including the corporate people themselves and their representatives. So if it were established, as it should have been some time ago, this committee might have brought to the House and to the government its views, after a wide open discussion and national debate which I think is essential, and recommended the terms of a statute. I think this is a procedure which could be adopted far more often. We hear a lot of rumblings today about the parliamentary system, its value and benefit. In my humble opinion, we do not seek the opportunity to make the best use of this system, and I think this is a typical illustration.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It might well be that in such a committee we would find divergencies. I might find myself parting company with the hon. member for York East in certain of his views, although he seems to have an adequate knowledge of the corporate structure. I might find myself in distinct opposition to the hon. member for Timiskaming. However, the public would have had an opportunity to peer through the plate glass window—of Parliament and watch the formulation of proposals. The whole parliamentary system would have been involved.

The minister, anticipating objection to this particular measure in the form it has taken, has attempted, in the way that honourable and learned members who belong to the same profession as he and I, to rebut anticipated objections. At page 706 of *Hansard,* in the course of a lengthy preliminary statement, the minister is reported as follows:

> I can hardly believe that in this day and age they—

And, here he means people who would object to the proposals

> —want the government of the land to stand beyond the reach of the criticism of the citizens; that they want to allow the government of the land to take decisions that affect us all on the basis of information not available to the public.

The minister may correct me, but it seems to me he has the opportunity to have the last say, at least at this stage of the proceedings. He may assert that there are other statements in his speech which go beyond that but I think that here he is anticipating the objections which may be taken. I submit that this is a weak, insipid and illogical basis on which to rest legislation which gives such great authority to this government.

If the minister were to some extent honest about this he would admit that he is a young and ambitious minister. I have nothing against youth and ambition. I only wish I could have youth back without ambition! The minister and his ambitious departmental establishment seek to add to their already substantial power. He is a member of a gov-

ernment which has already obtained great authority and which seeks to make itself an even more powerful government. This bill, together with several companion measures dealing with financial institutions, indicate the power the government seeks. The Investment Companies Act, which is still to come forward, was taken to pieces in the other place the last time it was presented. According to my information, the government intends to bring it back, basically in its original form,—I cannot accept the minister shaking his head at this time—in the belief that having passed it through this House, the senate will be compelled to accept it as a bill which has been passed by this body.

In my opinion, these measures all form part of a rather devious scheme of the government which would potentially have the effect of intimidating corporations both large and small, compelling them to fall in line with whatever the government may wish from time to time.

Let me make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that there is no doubt, as I said before, that there is ample room, ample need and a requirement for the improvement of the corporations Act and many of the other statutes which govern the incorporation and operation of other corporate bodies under federal jurisdiction.

But the over-all effect of this bill is to place in the hands of a government of partisan politicians authoritarian rights which I am convinced can be and will be exercised from time to time for political purposes. Of course, there have been instances in the past of improprieties and wrongs committed which resulted in losses to individual shareholders and I suppose this will happen again. There has been fraud, inadequate information and failure to take action at the appropriate time to prevent such losses. But I submit that it would be possible to cure these instances of company iniquity by other means, and it was not essential for this government to seize to itself the powers they have sought to swell themselves up to the proportions of Big Brother, peering, poking or threatening to do the things I have mentioned.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and others have talked solemnly about the right to privacy. What a farce this contention is now revealed to be in the light of the various corporate statutes which this government is seeking to have amended at this session. What we have is big government becoming

[Mr. Baldwin.]

ever bigger, with more employees, more bureaucracy and the everswelling establishment.

As I sit back and watch the operations of this government I can only say, "God help the poor individual". There will be little place left for him in our society by the time the present administration is finished with its various proposals. In every session we find more and more of the rights and freedoms of individuals being circumscribed. It would be bad enough even if this were a government which was doing something to bring about the just society, what my friend from Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) would probably call the red herring which was dangled before some of the electors of Canada. The situation would be bad enough, even if it were a government trying to do something about the ever-increasing problems of rapid urbanization and all its ancillary problems, a government really making some substantial effort to tackle the environmental problem of pollution and all the other problems and difficulties facing our society today. Even if it were trying to do something, making some effort, I would still be unhappy. But I am even more concerned about giving these powers to a government which is doing nothing. I say that we are in danger of giving a great deal more power to a government which obviously seeks to exercise that power for the sake of power alone.

In proof of this, Mr. Speaker, I could list some of the bills which are on the order paper. If they were relative I could quote the clauses in the bills which the government has cited as part of their legislative fare for this session. However, it would take too much time and in any event I would probably be out of order. I shall reserve that pleasure for another day, Mr. Speaker.

At page 709 of *Hansard*, in a speech dealing with a question of the investigative rights being taken by the government or at least by an emanation of the government, the minister says that since 1950 the department has received only 11 formal requests for inspection. In other words, there have been only 11 requests for inspection over a period of 20 years. The minister went on to say that there had been a number of informal complaints but he did not indicate whether these informal complaints had any substance to them and ended up by saying, "that the inspection was useful in showing that suspicions of irregularities or misconduct were groundless and baseless."

For some reason or other, Mr. Speaker, despite what the minister mentions in his own speech, there is obviously a very limited need for the kind of investigative opportunity he seeks to obtain. Nevertheless, the procedures must be altered to allow the minister and other government people almost unlimited opportunities for these fishing expeditions.

In my view there is no doubt that the proposals would give the government an opportunity to harass and destroy corporations which might have angered or annoyed the government, a government of partisan politicians. This is a situation we should be very careful about, particularly in the light of the record of this particular administration.

My hon. colleague from Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) has dealt with a number of provisions of the legislation. I want to limit my specific discussion now to clause 11 which gives almost unlimited power and right of investigation.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The *Financial Times* is certainly not a periodical which can be said to be unfriendly to this government, but they have taken a look at this situation. In the editions of November 10, 17 and 24 there are statements and editorials which bear clearly and succinctly on the point I am making. My friends on the other side of the House and others may say that this particular publication speaks for business. Probably it does, but there is nothing wrong in having a publication which speaks for businessmen. Most of us are, or at some time have been, in business. Most people are in some form of business and many who are not would like to be in business—except if they have read the white paper on taxation. Merely because a man is a businessman that does not mean that he is free from the bad habits to which other individuals may be subject. There are defects in societies as well as in individuals, and corporations are composed of businessmen who are individuals. Those individuals are all subject to the frailties of human nature. When those individuals are combined together, their combined frailties can sometimes create more danger and havoc than would be possible for any ordinary individual.

I do not think we should assume that merely because a person is carrying on a business or merely because a corporation is carrying on a business, that that person or corporation is thereby to be condemned automatically and subjected to unwarranted and unjustified investigation and interference. That should not be permitted unless a prima facie case can be made.

May I now read from the editorial of the *Financial Times* of November 10, which reads in part:

> The federal government's bill to revise The Canada Corporations Act has been lying around since last May and will soon be coming up for examination by a committee of the House of Commons. It needs a drastic overhaul. In its present form it is intolerable not only to business but to every Canadian with a concern for civil liberties....
>
> Some of the most objectionable proposals are outlined in the report on page 3, and we hope they will be widely studied. Many of them can be met with quite simple amendments, but there are two fundamental flaws in the draft sponsored by Mr. Basford as Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.
>
> The first is the almost unrestricted power Mr. Basford wants for himself and the bureaucrats of the combines branch who report to him. Without any outside check beyond the approval of the government-appointed Restrictive Trade Practices Commission, Mr. Basford (or any ambitious politician who may succeed him) is authorized to 'investigate' any company whom he may choose to suspect of doing something wrong or damaging the interest of even one shareholder.
>
> 'To investigate' means to provide a team of bureaucrats with legal sanction to enter any premises, seize, examine and copy any documents it wants; examine any witnesses it likes under oath; search, prod and probe as long as it wishes for anything it may hope to discover....
>
> To give such powers as this to a minister and his bureaucracy smacks of a totalitarian regime, not a democracy. In the hands of an unscrupulous government they could be used to threaten, harass or destroy any company which happened to incur a minister's displeasure. It is unthinkable that Parliament should accept them in their present form.
>
> The second thing basically wrong with Mr. Basford's bill is that it virtually invites any shareholder to harass and disrupt any company at the expense of all the other shareholders without risk to himself. It is a charter of irresponsibility for every nut and crank who enjoys making a nuisance of himself....
>
> The federal bill seems to have been drafted on the assumption that every unhappy shareholder is being victimized and that every company director is a criminal. It ain't necessarily so. And the danger of the assumption is that honest men will be deterred from becoming directors rather than face so many almost impossible duties under the threat of going to jail.
>
> The Corporations Act needs revising. The purpose behind the revision is right. But the end can never justify the means Mr. Basford is proposing.

A good case can be made for allowing a powerful investigative function to be exercised, not by government, but by the courts or a division of the courts with jurisdiction to

deal with problems of this kind. I know that the courts are also subject to the frailties of human nature. But the judicial process is still sound and there is a court of appeal. With the introduction of provisions involving a limitation on costs it may be possible for those who have legitimate grievances to have these matters examined. I do not think it is beyond the ingenuity of the minister and his officials to draft proposals which are acceptable, so that real and potential irregularities which may occur will be subject to examination. That examination should not be conducted under the provisions of this bill; neither should this government be given the powers it is seeking in the bill. My remarks would apply to any government, but particularly to this one.

Mr. Otto: Will the hon. member permit a question. The editorial the hon. member read stated, I think, that civil liberties are being denied to corporations, or will be denied if this bill passes. Does the hon. member support the theory that a corporation is entitled to civil liberties, or does he say that individuals only are entitled to civil liberties?

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, clearly, in the first instance, the answer is that a corporation is composed of individuals. I meant to make that point clear. I do not deny that there is a right to investigate, but I object to the way the government is proposing to do it. We should not put so much power into the hands of government and government officials. That is my primary objection. There is a good case no doubt for relief and reform, but I object to the end result the passage of this bill will entail. Perhaps this government will be replaced by another, who knows. Who knows what the situation in this respect may be in the next year or the next decade. All too often we have seen the tragic example of governments saying to their people, "We are only adopting these powers in theory; we may never use them, and we will certainly never abuse them."

All too often we find that governments break their promises. At the same time I say that if more care and thought had been exercised, and proper attention paid to due processes of law, it would have been possible for the government to bring in appropriate amendments. I agree with hon. members who have spoken before; we could have had a completely new corporations act. That could have been the subject of examination by committee. The Committee could start *ab initio,* bring forward proposals for legislation based on needs, requirements, knowledge and experiences of the past, and thereby introduce a bill which would deal with the problems which have been mentioned. In such new bill I think it might be possible to devise a simple and inexpensive procedure to bring these matters before the judiciary. It might be possible to have investigations conducted by independent bodies which would work completely outside the ambit of government interference. It could be a quasi-judicial body. In any event, I do not like the powers suggested in the bill to be in the hands of a minister or at the disposal of a government.

It has become apparent in the last year or two that a significant characteristic of this government is that it seeks to take unto itself powers which should be exercised by bodies such as the courts, which have an independence which is absolutely essential if we are to secure the free, independent and non-political evaluation of certain matters. Such an evaluation is required in order to preserve a proper balance in our society where we have the mixture of the executive, legislative and judicial functions.

If, on the other hand, it appears that the courts might not have the capacity, either because of lack of facilities or overloads of work, to make these inquiries and investigations, I think it would have been preferable if we had established tribunals which would have the same degree of independence as the courts. The members of these tribunals would have the same amount of freedom as is exercised by the judiciary—freedom resulting from the terms of their appointment and tenure of office.

• (4:30 p.m.)

In saying this, I am by no means downgrading the effectiveness and the usefulness of the Restrictive Trade Practices Commission. I think these people do a very fine job, particularly having in mind the limited nature of the terms of reference given to them under the constitutional limitation which, to some extent, plagues the federal administration.

I repeat that I am becoming more and more alarmed at the trend of the government of the right hon. gentleman and his friends to arrogate to themselves, to take into their own hands, the strength and the power to unduly dominate our society. The whole thing smacks too much of a star-chamber procedure. The bill provides that there can be an ex-parte power given to direct an investigation.

The inspectors are appointed ex-parte and the order for the examination of a person is

made ex-parte. A person being examined is not, as of right, entitled to counsel, as I understand the bill. In any case, counsel would not be of much assistance since the powers granted to the Commission are so broad that a witness cannot refuse to answer any question, even if it might tend to incriminate him. This is a power which our courts are loathe to grant to the prosecution, even in criminal cases of the most serious nature. An inspector appointed by the commissioner is granted the widest conceivable powers of search. It is incredible that in a country where the rule of law is supposedly respected such an inquisition should be permitted. If such powers were granted to magistrates under the Criminal Code there would be an immediate outcry, even if such powers were used for the purpose of detecting the commission of extremely serious criminal offences.

I call attention to proposed section 112D which provides for the payment of the cost of investigation. It is surely against the principles of natural justice that in all circumstances a person should pay for the investigation of his own affairs in preparation for possible prosecution, whether or not he is convicted of an offence at a later date. What about the possibility of the power being used for improper purposes? Some individual or group might propose that an investigation be held. Having conducted the investigation it might then be found there was no need at all for the investigation and, as a matter of fact, it was brought about only for the purpose of harassment. Surely, under such circumstances, provision should be made and the cost of such an investigation should be paid by the instigator. This would include the Crown. This, of course, shows the one-sided nature of this type of investigation when such power is placed in the hands of this government.

In my view, it would have been much more practical to have appointed an all-party committee of this House with the widest possible terms of reference, with power to inquire fully into this problem and propose legislation after having given an opportunity for all interested persons to appear and make their point of view known.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, John Kenneth Galbraith in his book "The New Industrial State" points out that since the turn of the century North American business has moved steadily from being an accretion of small business enterprise to the development of large and powerful corporations. He points out that these corporations have now become multinational in scope and that they have developed what are commonly called conglomerates that have moved into different fields of industry. They have established vertical integration. They control a product from its raw state right through to the marketing and, in some cases, the retailing of the product.

He points out that many of these gigantic corporations have incomes which exceed the budgets of some smaller nations, that they control their source of supply, that they are able to generate their own capital; they are able to virtually set their own prices and by vast advertising campaigns to largely control the buying patterns of the public. In his book Galbraith establishes the fact that on the North American continent we have now developed what he calls a corporate oligopoly with a huge technostructure that has a life of its own and that is virtually a state within a state.

He quite properly points out that in spite of all the indignation that may be generated about this development, no one in their right senses thinks that we can ever go back to the small businessman and the free enterprise economy of the nineteenth century. With mass production techniques and industrial rationalization, with a large pool of trained manpower and the research which is essential for modern industry, these gigantic corporations will continue to operate and it is needless to talk about breaking them up, as was talked about many years ago in the United States when the Sherman anti-trust laws and other legislation was passed. We must now devote our attention to ensuring that these large corporate bodies are made responsible to the public interest in one form or another. That certainly ought to be the purpose of the legislation which is now before the House.

I understand it is some 34 years since this Corporations Act was amended to any great degree. I think it is a great pity that when it does come before the House it is not going to cover a wider scope than is envisaged in the bill. The bill does propose some steps which will certainly improve the situation.

The point I want to make this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is that a Corporations Act ought to do more than concern itself with mere corporation housekeeping. It ought to be concerned with more than merely providing for increased information and increased protection for the investor. This legislation ought also to concern itself with protecting Canada's

national sovereignty and with diminishing the increased takeover of the Canadian economy by foreign investors. It is serious enough when a country is controlled by a corporate elite, that is a negation of true democracy, but when a country is controlled by a corporate elite outside its own borders, its capacity to resolve the situation is tremendously reduced. No country is truly free when the development of its economy is controlled by foreign investment. Our political democracy is curtailed when a corporate elite controls the economy of our nation. But when a foreign corporate elite has a nation in its grip we have lost any chance of building genuine social democracy and even political democracy itself is in jeopardy.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We in the New Democratic Party believe that the issue of Canadian economic and political independence is now and will continue to be the central issue of this decade. We do not think this issue can be evaded much longer. The constant drift to continentalism of past and present Liberal governments threatens to paralyze our efforts to establish a distinctive national identity in Canada. The escalating foreign control and take-over of our economy has reached alarming proportions and continues virtually unimpeded. As a result, Canada's options for the future are being increasingly closed off.

The Liberal government itself recognized this growing menace to Canadian independence. This is why under the administration of the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson they set up a royal commission which has come to be called the Watkins Commission. That commission, consisting of some of the ablest economists in Canada, brought in its report. I shall not take the time of the House by going over the various recommendations; some of my hon. friends may do so in the course of the debate. The interesting thing is that although this report has been in the hands of the government for several years, and though it has been discussed in the press all over the country, no statement has yet been made by the government as to what it proposes to do about the recommendations—which of them it considers impracticable and which of them it considers acceptable and deserving of implementation. No statement at all has been forthcoming.

In the meantime, the situation which caused the commission to be set up has grown immeasurably more serious. The Watkins Commission pointed out that Canada was the only country in the world which allowed so much of its economy to be owned by investors outside its borders. It pointed out that some two-thirds of our economy was under foreign control. Since that time the rate of takeover has accelerated in an alarming way. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) tabled an answer to a question by my hon. friend the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) a short time ago showing that since 1963 some 606 corporations coming under federal jurisdiction had been bought out by foreign corporations. This is to say nothing, of course, of the hundreds of companies coming under provincial jurisdiction which have also been bought out. Many of them are major companies, long established firms which have done business in Canada and which have now been brought under the direct control of foreign corporations.

The Watkins Commission pointed out that no other industrialized nation in the world has permitted such blatant takeovers of its economy as did Canada. Nearly all the industrialized nations have imposed restrictions upon economic takeovers. Most of the countries of Europe, Great Britain and the United States itself, have imposed restrictions, in some cases severe in nature. Japan, a country which has received a great deal of United States investment since the end of the second world war, passed legislation two years ago restricting foreign investment in any industry to 49 per cent and in the case of certain key industries such as transportation and steel production, to 20 per cent. In banking, finance and the communications media no foreign investment at all is permitted.

I would point out to those who get nervous when we discuss this subject in case we might frighten off United States capital, that the Americans, who have tremendous investments in Japan, did not pack up their bags and go home. They accepted the situation, recognizing that the Japanese were justified in drawing the line and saying they could not allow their entire economy and the decision-making power of the nation to be vested in people from another country.

The Canadian government has taken no such action. We took action on the question of the banks only after one bank had been taken over. We took no action with respect to finance companies until Merrill, Lynch and Associates took over Royal Securities. We have taken no other action with respect to the

acquisition of Canadian corporations by foreign investors. The Canadian government has done nothing, either because it has been cowed into submission or because it is convinced that economic absorption is inevitable. Whether the reason is cowardice or indifference I suggest the result is the same; the result is that in Canada we shall lose not only the control of our economy but eventually even the control of our decision-making power unless we stop this steady erosion of our sovereignty, this diminution of our independence.

If history teaches us anything at all, Mr. Speaker, it is that political control always follows economic control. We had an example of this not many years ago. We know that legislation was introduced by a Liberal government to make two United States periodicals, *Time* and *Reader's Digest,* virtually and legally Canadian corporations in order that they might get the benefits of being Canadian publications. The Minister of Finance at that time, Mr. Walter Gordon, has since stated publicly that pressure was brought to bear upon him and upon the government by the government in Washington which had obligations to Mr. Henry Luce and to other powerful figures in the United States. Economic control always lays the basis for political control. Once a country loses its power to make economic decisions, increasingly it loses its power to make decisions with respect to an independent foreign policy, with respect to developing its own culture and with respect to establishing its own national identity.

• (4:50 p.m.)

One of the latest signs of this which gives us concern is the talk about integration of resources in North America. I should like to refer to a meeting held in Washington by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) and Mr. Walter Hickel, Secretary of the Interior of the United States. At this meeting preliminary discussions were held with regard to an integrated energy policy for North America, and in this connection I should like to quote a report in the December 5 edition of the *Globe and Mail* of the press conference that the minister held in Washington:

> Asked whether this approach would lead to a substantial economic integration of the two countries, Mr. Greene replied: "Yes, I think it would."

The minister went on to say:

> If Canada had refused any economic integration with the United States for nationalist reasons, it would be no more than "a banana republic."

The minister must have got his facts back to front, because it is the banana republics that are the very ones that have succumbed to complete economic control and domination by outside investors. If we in this country succumb to the same kind of domination, although we may be a little more sophisticated and better off than some of the South America banana republics, the fact remains that we will become an economic colony of the United States.

Mr. Greene: But only if we have a weak government.

Mr. Woolliams: That is what we have now.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): There is no argument about that, Mr. Speaker; it seems to be agreed on both sides of the House. This is why we are worried about the question.

Then the minister, according to the report, went on to say:

> It is "sufficient" for Canada to retain political control. It is not important who gets the dividends, Wall Street or Bay Street—

Mr. Greene: That is right.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister says that is right. I want to point out that it makes a great deal of difference who gets the dividends. First of all, if the dividends are paid on Bay Street, they are taxable in Canada. The companies are subject to Canadian law and to Canadian control. They are subject to the policies of the government of Canada. On the other hand, foreign investors have taken the position that they are not subject to Canadian law but to the law of the United States or whatever country within which the parent company is located.

Much more important than that, the corporation that owns an operation in Canada has decision making power. For example, it has the power to decide whether certain materials will be developed now, or left in the ground for 25 or 50 years while the company uses up resources it owns in other parts of the world; whether our natural resources will be shipped out of the country in their raw state, providing Canada with minimal employment, or whether they will be processed here, thus developing the Canadian economy and providing employment for Canadian workers; whether the price charged the parent company will return a profit to Canada and pay taxes to Canada, or whether Canadian raw

material will be sold to the parent company in the United States at a price that realizes virtually no profit to Canada, thus depriving the Canadian government of revenue. That is the type of decision making power we are giving away as well as giving away control of our resources.

The fact of the matter is that the United States has been, and is, using our resources to expand its industry. From the point of view of the U.S. this is, of course, a perfectly proper thing to do. The United States has developed the greatest industrial complex in the world and requires more and more raw materials and more and more sources of energy. The closest source of those materials required to meet the needs of the expanding economy of the United States is Canada.

So, it is natural that the United States wants an integrated policy that will supply particularly those resources which are in short supply or almost entirely depleted. What this Parliament has to be concerned about, and particularly the minister who is piloting through this legislation, is whether or not our resources are going to be used first and foremost to develop and expand the Canadian economy, to provide jobs for Canadian workers and to raise the standard of living of the Canadian people, we being able to export the surplus commodities that we do not require. Such decision making power does not lie here in Ottawa on the treasury benches; more and more it is being delegated to the boardrooms of large corporations that are not located within the borders of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—public service, Bilingualism—use of instant translation computers in classes; the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney)—broadcasting; effect of CRTC decision respecting cablevision; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—combines; request for investigation of nickel price increases.

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

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private member's business as listed on today's order paper, namely public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

PARLIAMENTARY COMMISSIONER

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer) moved that Bill C-13, to establish the office of parliamentary commissioner, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-13 is one that I have had the privilege of presenting to the House for the last seven years. It would establish in this country at the federal level the office of ombudsman. Unfortunately, the Liberal party, which has been responsible for forming past governments, has not decided to institute such an office, in spite of the fact that four years ago a parliamentary committee that studied this bill in depth unanimously recommended to the House that a parliamentary commissioner be appointed.

In the Speech from the Throne in the 1965 session, it was stated that the government would establish an ombudsman during that session. Yet the government saw fit to take no action. Many times I asked the previous Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson, as well as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), when the government intended to go ahead and establish such an essential office. The most recent reply was that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could very well be the ombudsman for Canada. The Minister of Justice is a very fine gentleman. I think a great deal of him and know he is very efficient and able, but it just seems to me that he has not a hope in the world of ever serving the people of his country as ombudsman. I do not say that against him personally, but because the very nature of his office makes this impossible.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Let me cite an example of my experience during my years in this house. This concerns the Department of Veterans Affairs. During session after session I have had veterans of our armed forces bring legitimate gripes and complaints as they relate pension treatment to my attention. I had one just a few weeks ago which concerned a man who applied for his release, I believe in the month

of June, at which time there would be a separation or rehabilitation allowance provided him. The military forces had lost his medical file and finally located it at Kingston, although he was based at the Canadian Armed Forces base at Penhold in my constituency. It took a matter of weeks to get this medical file sent back to the place where the man was stationed and where he was to take his discharge.

In the meantime, a new regulation was passed which denied him the allowance which would normally have been his upon retiring from the force. This allowance was denied simply because his medical papers did not get back until two days after the decision had been announced that this was no longer going to be provided. Surely, this man is being discriminated against by bureaucratic regulation. I had this reconfirmed by the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) in a very definite and specific way. This man has no recourse.

I have heard some people speak critically of the office of ombudsman. I heard the Minister of Justice some time ago speak in this way. He said that we are 264 ombudsmen and we can look after the needs of people when they have complaints about the bureaucratic administration of various departments of government. This is something which is inherent in the very basic structure of government. I want to say to the Minister of Justice, who is listening at the present time, that I cannot be an ombudsman for this man because I cannot go any further. I am going to write a really tough letter to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) and the Minister of Veterans Affairs because I think this is something the government would never tolerate as far as the private sector is concerned.

Certainly, the injustice being done to this particular veteran, and I could name 20 of them from my files without any difficulty, should be looked at in light of the moral obligation of the government to this person. Because the government can hang its argument on some peg that relates to a legal definition in a piece of legislation or regulation passed by the department, this individual citizen, who has served his country faithfully and well, has absolutely no recourse and I can do nothing about it. I have nowhere to go to appeal except here, as I am appealing now in the hope that somehow I can convince the minister that he should overrule this decision.

I am not too critical of ministers because I know the load of administration they carry. Most of the replies that are written follow a pattern. I can almost repeat by rote the phrases used by the various departmental heads. These replies are actually written by the departmental heads and signed by the ministers who probably do not even know what is in them. This is why we need an ombudsman. I do not think it is good enough to just continue passing the buck when the government formally committed itself to this course in a Speech from the Throne, and when the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs which dealt with this bill five years ago, unanimously adopted it. It is high time the government took some action.

Surely, the government can take a lesson from some of the provincial governments. Alberta was the first province to establish such an office. Now, we have an ombudsman in Quebec, New Brunswick and Manitoba, and other provinces intend to establish such an office. In fact the report of the commission of inquiry conducted by Mr. Justice McRuer contains one of the most profound arguments in favour of this position. The fourth chapter of that report, which is a book in itself, made such a recommendation. The commission was in favour not only of provincial ombudsmen but even municipal ombudsmen. It is also very significant that Mr. Robarts, the premier of Ontario, has committed himself to the recommendations of Mr. Justice McRuer because of the very valid and forceful arguments he put forward.

It is very interesting also, and I bring this to the attention of the Minister of Justice, that just the other day Mr. Justice Milvain brought down a ruling relating to the office of ombudsman in Alberta. The Alberta government was of the opinion that the authority of the ombudsman did not extend to the investigation of commissions of inquiry or the recommendations of such commissions. The government said this was something that did not enter into the terms of reference of the ombudsman. The ombudsman for Alberta, Mr. McClellan, asked for a legal ruling on this because he felt his own authority and effectiveness was being hamstrung by not being able to pursue the legitimate complaints of the citizens of Alberta as they related to certain things that may come within the area of such commissions. Mr. Justice Milvain ruled in favour of the ombudsman. This ruling, given just a few days ago, is very significant.

The Minister of Justice knows very well what an ombudsman is and knows very well the need for such a position. He knows how well this has worked out in Alberta, Quebec

and other provinces. He ought to take the initiative and move on it. He should go to the Prime Minister and say, I cannot be the ombudsman for Canada. I cannot serve the Canadian people adequately or effectively in this position. I know that members of Parliament, while they can do a great deal of work in relation to investigating and correcting the grievances citizens may have regarding the administration, cannot do certain things and we need an ombudsman.

I am reminiscent of the last election when so much was said about the just society. The Minister of Justice ought to say to the Prime Minister that one of the most effective ways of bringing about this just society would be by giving the Canadian people an ombudsman who could look after their grievances.

I know very well the ombudsman for New Zealand, Sir Guy Powles. He has often said to me that one of the greatest benefits of his office is derived not so much from the fact that he investigates and recommends to the government and its various departments, but from the fact that he is there. This has a salutary effect upon government officials who tend to forget about individual needs. They are dealing with rulings and regulations and tend to look at cases from a legal point of view rather than from moral responsibility. The fact that an ombudsman is present has a very wholesome effect on the attitude of senior civil servants. On the other hand, it has a very wholesome effect on the general population because people who feel the government is injust in its tax policies or various decisions that affect them know they have a man to whom they can appeal without spending $30,000 on an appeal to the Exchequer Court, for example, or without having to go to the courts when they feel they cannot afford to or when it would not really be worth the effort.

Sir Guy Powles has said publicly in his report, and I believe Mr. McClellan has reaffirmed this on several occasions, that one of the greatest advantages of the office of ombudsman or, as we call it in this bill, a parliamentary commissioner, is the fact that he is there. This is good for the populace and is good for senior civil servants. Incidentally, I think it is very helpful to the ministers of the crown. Perhaps the Minister of Justice would find himself free of many petty things he has to deal with which consume his time and perhaps prevent him from devoting his attention to things that would seem to be more important.

[Mr. Thompson.]

Thus, speaking now to the members of this House, I hope that tonight we can give second reading to this bill and refer it to the committee. Then, the Committee could hear the evidence that has been gathered since it last considered this bill favourably, evidence relating to the established practice and use of this office in the provinces.

• (5:10 p.m.)

In closing, I should like to say I believe it is very important that members of this House understand that a man who is doing a real service to the people of Canada in the area of decision making, even though not commissioned to do so and not paid for it, and even though it is not really included in his terms of reference, is the Auditor General. The Auditor General, of necessity, finds himself dealing with cases which ought to belong to the office of an ombudsman. I am grateful he is there and I am glad he does this.

An hon. Member: And they cut his staff.

Mr. Thompson: I do not understand why they cut his staff. If the office of an ombudsman is not to be established, they ought to expand his staff so that at least in the areas of taxation and financial administration the people of Canada might have some recourse.

I would commend this bill to the members of this House and to the Minister of Justice. I hope the government will do something about it.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), whom I have heard before on this very important subject, is again by the luck of the draw able at an early opportunity to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. Thompson: Lucky for whom?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): For all of us. This is an educational process. It gives me the opportunity to express some views on the concept of this avenue of remedy against administrative decisions in a modern complicated government. The hon. member did not go so far as to define what he meant by ombudsman.

Mr. Thompson: We have talked about it many times.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): As I understand it, what he is talking about is an independent person, one independent of the

executive and independent of the legislature but one who reports to the legislature.

Mr. Thompson: Responsible to parliament.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Responsible to parliament and given authority and certain statutory powers to investigate matters of governmental administration, in this case federal administration, which give rise to individual grievances on the part of the citizens of this country. In other words, his terms of reference would be to review the administration or more particularly mal-administration within the ranks of the federal public service.

At the outset I want to concede that one of the threats to individual well-being in Canada is the dwarfing of individual rights compared to the growing complexity and strength of government, whether it be at the federal or provincial level. One of the thrusts, as I have tried to state before, of the Department of Justice is to seek ways to balance the rights of the individual Canadian against his government. As the hon. member said, we are faced with a situation where government has become more remote from the average Canadian. Government has become larger, more complex, more bureaucratic and perhaps more arbitrary. Certainly, it has become less sensitive. I believe it is incumbent upon this House to review continually the avenues of appeal, of redress and of remedy against arbitrariness in the governmental structure.

I am personally very concerned about the motivation behind the hon. member's bill. I was in the United Kingdom last October where I had discussions with the law officers of the Crown, the members of the Law Reform Commission that they have in England and Wales and the members of the Scottish Law Reform Commission. I took the opportunity at that time to go to Sweden where I met the Swedish ombudsman, Alfred Bexelius, on October 2. I spent four hours with him that morning. I had lunch with him and was able to return his hospitality by inviting him to dinner. As a matter of fact, I told him he was one of the famous men of the world representing what had become a very celebrated institution. I told him that the word "ombudsman" had become as familiar to people outside Sweden as the word "smorgasbord" and that the institution which he fills and which dates back to 1809 when the new constitution of Sweden was first written was something all modern governments were looking to for guidance.

As a matter of fact, there are now three ombudsmen with equal jurisdiction in Sweden because the work available for a single ombudsman has gone beyond what he was able to handle personally. When I returned to London I spent two hours with Sir Edmund Compton, the parliamentary commissioner who is responsible to the Parliament of the United Kingdom. His office has been established since 1967. I had the opportunity to discuss the institution and efficacy of the ombudsman with the attorney general of England, with the Lord Chancellor, the Solicitor General and a good many members of Parliament. I inquired of them what their views were of the institution and how it was working within a parliamentary system based upon the British tradition.

I am quite aware that the institution has become contagious. We have in Canada three provinces which now have their own ombudsman. The hon. member for Red Deer represents Alberta and he will know that Alberta is represented by Mr. McClellan, formerly the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. New Brunswick has an ombudsman and last year the province of Quebec established the office of Protecteur du Peuple, the citizens' protector. Now, we have three ombudsmen at the provincial level. There are ombudsmen not only in Sweden but also in the other Scandinavian countries, Denmark and Finland, as well as in New Zealand and now in Hawaii.

Mr. Thompson: Might I just remind the minister that the province of Manitoba passed legislation in this regard but the appointment has not yet been made.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am half right and half wrong.

May I suggest in the comments I am going to make that there is some difficulty in accepting the precedents of other jurisdictions and that Parliament here in Ottawa ought to scrutinize the traditions under which these offices have been established in other jurisdictions to see whether they apply with equal force to Canada. In Sweden the ombudsman has almost complete jurisdiction to investigate administrative discretion. There are virtually no limits on his authority. He can review any aspect of governmental administration in the country, including military administration, ecclesiastical administration and the courts. But there are certain aspects of government in Sweden which differ substantially from our own. More importantly

there is no ministerial responsibility as we know it in Canada. The ministers of the Crown in Sweden are not responsible before the legislature for the acts or omissions of their departmental officials.

The public service in Sweden is not governed by a system of subordinate responsibility whereby a man in a lower position automatically is responsible to his superior and so on through the deputy minister to a minister, but is governed instead by statutes and laws and is responsible only to themselves on the basis of the interpretation of their powers as found in the statutes and regulations.

• (5:20 p.m.)

There being no ministerial responsibility, there is no way in which the people of Sweden can challenge maladministration on the floor of their parliament. Secondly, and this is a fundamental difference, the Swedish member of Parliament has no fundamental right to voice a grievance on behalf of his constituent or of any citizen of Sweden. He cannot challenge on the floor of his Parliament a factual situation relating to a particular grievance; he is limited to challenging the principles of the law governing that situation.

I might also suggest to the House that when we are talking about the Scandinavian countries, New Zealand and the other jurisdictions that have adopted the ombudsman idea, we are dealing with small, relatively homogenous populations. As a matter of fact, those members of the House who have had the opportunity to visit Sweden know that the Swedes are such a homegenous race that they need not speak to each other. They can sit silently over a meal, say nothing, and yet instinctively know what the other thinks.

The only country of any sizeable complexity and sizeable population that has adopted the idea—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We should try not speaking to each other here.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I want to say to the hon. member that we on this side can usually predict with a fair deal of accuracy what is going to be said by members of the NDP.

In any event, the United Kingdom is the only country of substantial population and administrative complexity that has adopted the institution. I think it is important to note that in the statute setting up the parliamentary commissioner in the United Kingdom, his jurisdiction is very limited indeed; in fact, far more limited than the jurisdiction which the hon. member for Red Deer gives his ombudsman in Bill C-13. The parliamentary commissioner in the United Kingdom has no jurisdiction whatever over the courts or over any governmental agency that is non-departmental. He has no jurisdiction over local government. As a matter of fact, there is an opinion among members of the House of Commons at Westminster to the effect that if the institution of Parliamentary Commissioner is to become properly effective, if he is to have any real effective power of redress, his jurisdiction must be extended over the municipalities. Finally, he can receive no complaint from any citizen of the United Kingdom unless it is referred to him first formally by the member of Parliament from that constituency.

Mr. Thompson: No one is suggesting that we follow Great Britain.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am suggesting to you that in the only country with any sizeable population in which that institution has been adopted extreme limitations have been put on the jurisdiction of that commissioner.

Another difficulty—I am trying to point these out as best I can—is that we are living in a federal state with a divided jurisdiction and shared responsibilities among federal and provincial governments. I will not be the first to point out that a good many of the complaints that would inevitably reach the office of any federal ombudsman would involve matters not within the federal jurisdiction but falling under the authority of the provinces and the municipalities. My friend, the hon. member for Red Deer, knows as well as I do that most Canadians really do not know whether a matter is a local one to be dealt with by municipal or town authorities or a matter involving the province or the federal government.

Mr. Thompson: That is no argument at all.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am suggesting also that in a large geographical and territorial area like Canada it would be difficult—and I think we have to anticipate this—for any federal ombudsman to be able to see the complainant personally, review the file and render his decision. I have had a chat with Mr. McClelland, Alberta's ombudsman, and he tells me that it is essential that the

volume of work never exceed what the ombudsman personally can review, that he should not operate with more than a small staff. That was echoed by the other gentlemen to whom I talked. The reason is that unless the ombudsman is personally able to review the file, and if necessary personally able to interview the complainant, then all he establishes is a second bureaucracy superimposed on the first. This is something that in a federal state, particularly a federal state with a large geographical area, we would have to be concerned with in Canada.

I also have some concern about what appeal there would be from an ombudsman's decision. The very concept of that office gives a lot of discretion, jurisdiction and omnipotence to a single man. There is no appeal from him. In the event that an ombudsman would render an adverse judgment against a citizen, to my mind any further avenue of redress would virtually be foreclosed. I remember that during the discussion of the powers of the official languages commissioner, whose powers are very similar to those of the ombudsman in Alberta, concern was expressed on the other side of the House about the powers given to the commissioner and about the fact that there was no right of appeal. Our reply was that this was not a judicial office or judicial proceeding—nor is the ombudsman—and that the commissioner's only power was the power of publicity and the power to bring the grievance to public notice and to the notice of parliament. I recall that at that time hon. members were concerned that there were no methods of appealing the commissioner's decision.

Let me look now at what the government is doing to try to remedy the situation for which the hon. member has suggested the institution of an ombudsman, what we are trying to do both by way of parliamentary redress and by way of judicial review to enhance the rights of the individual citizen against administrative decisions. First of all, we are committed to the establishment of a federal law reform commission, and I hope to be able to submit to the scrutiny of Parliament a draft of that bill in first reading within the next month. That reform commission will be charged with the review of the general terms of the criminal law and of the substantive administrative public law of this country. The throne speech also commits the government to a wide area of administrative law reform. We intend to set up a wider system of judicial review by the courts of all decisions of federal administrative boards and federal administrative tribunals. Within parliament, we have tabled in the House the report of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments, the committee on regulations under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan).

This committee examined the scope of delegated legislation, that is legislative power by regulation that has been delegated by Parliament to the Governor in Council or to individual ministers or departments. The committee report suggests ways whereby, first of all, Parliament should have more control over the nature of the enabling power in that statute which gives authority to make those regulations. I need only refer the House to the seventh recommendation of that special committee, where all enabling acts for regulation making authorities should be in accord with a number of principles. Those principles are set forth quite thoroughly on pages 90 and 91 of that report.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The committee suggests that the Minister of Justice should have the authority and should have the duty to review the scope of the enabling clauses to ensure that such clauses do not contain hidden privity provisions or do not contain a subjective element to allowing the department to avoid the review of the courts. The report speaks for itself, and I believe that if Parliament accepts and enacts the recommendations of the committee we will have gone a long way toward curing some of the ills of which my hon. friend complains.

The committee also recommends the establishment of a parliamentary scrutiny committee and that a new committee on regulations should be established. The recommendation is No. 19, which states that it should be a standing committee of the House of Commons; all regulations should stand permanently referred to it; it should strive to operate in an objective and non-partisan way; it should have a small membership to enable it to operate effectively; it should have adequate staff and should examine regulations on the basis of six criteria, four of which are as follows:

(a) Whether they are authorized by the terms of the enabling statute.

(b) Whether they appear to make some unusual or unexpected use of the powers conferred by the statute under which it is made.

(c) Whether they trespass unduly on personal rights and liberties.

(d) Whether they have complied with the provisions of the Regulations Act with respect to transmittal, certification, recording, numbering, publication or laying before Parliament.

The other two criteria are set forth. Hon. members who have had the opportunity of reading my testimony before that committee will know that I am committed to the principles of its report. I would hope that if we can achieve a more alert, more all-embracing system of parliamentary review—

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

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

An hon. Member: He is talking the bill out, so let him have more time.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will not take too much time. I thank the House for its usual indulgence. I believe that if we are able to achieve a public scrutiny of the regulation-making power and of the regulations as they are adopted in Parliament, if we are able to achieve by way of legislation a continual, non-episodic review of our laws in this country, if we are able to give the courts wider judicial review over the decisions of administrative boards and tribunals, if we are able to make legal counsel more accessible to the citizens of this country, then I believe that by way of parliamentary and judicial remedies we will have gone a good distance, or indeed the whole of the distance toward curing the ills that the hon. member is attempting to cure.

His argument is persuasive. I have had the advantage of conversations with Sir Edmund Compton and Mr. Alfred Bexelius. I admit that one of the advantages of an ombudsman is the very fact of his presence—the fact that he is there. In gaining a reputation as the people's protector, he becomes a psychological barrier to arbitrariness; he is a safety valve. People have the idea that there is someone to whom they can turn.

I believe we can succeed in improving the scrutiny of Parliament, in enhancing the role of the individual Member of Parliament in his ability to bring a grievance of the people before this chamber, in controlling the scope of the enabling power to make regulations and in widening the legal remedies of the citizen. If we find that those wider parliamentary powers of the legislature as against the executive, and thereby the administration—wider judicial powers of the citizen against administrative tribunals—fail to do that, I admit there is a case for an extralegal and extraparliamentary remedy along the lines of an ombudsman.

I want to warn the House that procedural safeguards—and this is a type of procedural safeguard from which there is no appeal, the only remedy being publicity and report to Parliament—cannot substitute for an improvement in the scrutiny of Parliament and an improvement in our public administrative law.

Chief Justice McRuer, in the fourth volume of the second report of his monumental study of civil rights in Ontario at page 1389, says that he is not convinced that the ombudsman is one of the most urgent needs in the process of democratic government in Ontario. He had a conversation with Sir Guy Powles, the New Zealand ombudsman, who says the ombudsman is not the complete answer to all the problems of the administration of justice.

This government is going to do its best to widen the scope of parliamentary and judicial review. We are going to do our best through a broadening of the committee system, through a broadening of the avenues of grievance available to the individual Member of Parliament—who, after all, is the fundamental protector of the people of Canada—to achieve what the hon. member wants achieved. That being so, Mr. Speaker, the mind of the government is not closed on the issue. I have tried to suggest what we are attempting to do. My file is still open.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief, but I feel it is my duty to support Bill C-13, sponsored by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), and entitled: "An Act to establish the Office of Parliamentary Commissioner".

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have given my place to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner); this has enabled me to get to know his arguments concerning Bill C-13.

I am surprised to note that the Minister of Justice whom I have always regarded as the protector of public rights, as the defender of citizens' rights and as the promoter of justice and equity even on behalf of the most humble people has not given his opinion on this bill while using the time allotted to him. In fact, he has told us in details of his trip to England and to other countries, thus proving to us that the trips he is making are more serious than those of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

However, that does not tell us whether the minister agrees with the principle of Bill C-13. His arguments seem to me very weak and this leads me to believe that the bill in itself is perhaps not so bad.

Among other things, I recall an argument put forth by the minister and that surprised me, coming from a man that I have always held in high esteem. He said that the function of parliamentary commissioner might not be as necessary and desirable as might be expected at the federal level, because we have, in Canada, a federal system. True, there are ten provinces, with different needs, concepts and objectives, and the federal govenment has its own jurisdiction, in accordance with the British North America Act.

The minister said that the office of parliamentary commissioner is not as necessary and desirable as it is claimed for the simple reason that the citizens do not know from whom they must seek information and that the role of this parliamentary commissioner would only be to tell them. Now, even if the parliamentary commissioner's only role were to tell the citizens where to apply to solve their problems it would be a marked and obvious improvement on the present situation.

Besides, without playing politics, I would like to tell the minister that whether they are on the government side or in the opposition all hon. members are now considered by the citizens as social workers. In fact, people come to us and ask that we help them and represent them not only in the House, which is part of our functions, but also with the civil servants of various departments.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Personally, I have kept a record of all such requests received since my election. I have compiled them and made statistical tables. However, a study of these requests reveals that more than 80 per cent of them pertain to fields of provincial jurisdiction. I do not necessarily conclude to the inefficiency of the member of the legislative assembly, but rather that people do not really know which government is involved in a given problem. They cannot be blamed for it. In fact, governments have never actually enlightened the population in this regard. Moreover, the governmental administration is constantly expanding. It has become a mammoth that can only be stirred with great difficulty in order to draw from it equity, justice and humanity.

I remember a recent television interview with the Ombudsman of Quebec. This telecast was very instructive for me because it gave me the opportunity to realize the important role such a commissioner could play at a time where the administration of our governments gets more and more complicated.

Mr. Speaker, the argumentation of the minister is inconsistent and has nothing to do with the true situation in Canada. It is precisely because the jurisdictional fields of the various governments are increasingly overlapping that people no longer know where to go, even members of parliament. If we consider the problem of social security, economic expansion, agriculture, transportation or justice, we note that the departments are overlapping at all levels of government.

As for the citizen, he does not know where to go and when he receives a negative reply he has no resort, even if the minister denies it. He can appeal a criminal or civil case to a superior court, but he cannot appeal the decision of an official. Even if the minister told me that it can be done, he knows quite well that due to the complexity of the administration and to the fact that officials generally only perform bureaucratic work and very often unfortunately forget the human aspect, it would be difficult to obtain justice.

Since the average citizen, the poor, cannot afford to start proceedings or to appeal, we must establish the office of parliamentary commissioner and on that subject, I wish to draw the minister's attention to something that recently happened in the federal capital.

A University of Ottawa professor, Mr. Raoul P. Barbe, whom the minister probably knows, recently published a manual of administrative law which is the work of a team. An expert whose political neutrality is above any suspicion says clearly that federal and provincial administrations should tend increasingly to get closer to the people under their jurisdiction. It is also said that the relationships between those who govern and those who are governed should gain in justice and fairness.

Now, if an expert agrees that the gap is widening constantly between the administrators and the administered and, being well versed in administrative law, suggests that other solutions be tried and some imagination be shown to promote the rights of the citizens, I believe that Parliament should welcome the principle of Bill C-13, even though it might disagree with some aspects of it.

I had hoped that the minister would congratulate the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) for this private member's bill, recognize the principle of the proposal and admit that Canadian citizens, whatever their race, their language, their creed, their age or their resources, should be allowed to assert their rights before the federal administration.

I think that the minister could then have confirmed my previous opinion of him. It would be to his advantage to read the bill over again and think about it seriously because, the further away the federal government gets from the people, the further away the people will get from the government. The latter will then be the first loser.

In my opinion, the Canadian people and the government have a common interest in seeing to it that everyone is given justice.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, because I should like to see this bill referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, where it can be studied much more thoroughly, I shall speak for only a few minutes. In any case, I find it is not necessary to speak at greater length; the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) knows our thoughts, after his sojourn in Sweden, and it is good to know we are understood.

I think the Minister of Justice made an excellent case today, as he has on other occasions, for law reform, for strengthening our judiciary, for improving our parliamentary system and for all those other ways he has in mind to protect the rights of individual Canadians. I think I speak for all hon. members of the House when I say that we welcome his commitment to the kind of program on which he is working. We wish him well.

I suggest to him that although an ombudsman would certainly not be a good substitute for the kind of thing he is proposing, it strikes me that it would be a real comfort to our people if they were to know that apart from Parliament, apart from the government, the opposition, the bureaucracy and the courts, there was an ombudsman, an independent authority to whom reference could be made. I recognize that the responsibility of such a person, even if he has a staff to help him deal with cases that come up, is a frightening one. But we have solved other problems of that kind. I think the greatest value of an ombudsman would stem from the realization in the minds of the Canadian people that there was an independent authority to which a person could go if he felt aggrieved and if he felt that the established institutions had not resolved that grievance for him.

I recognize that there are defects in this bill. As a matter of fact, even if passed the bill would not have much effect because there is no provision for an ombudsman's salary. The hon. member had to countenance that omission to get his bill accepted as a private member's bill. I noted that the minister did not object to that omission.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. Is the hon. member for York-North (Mr. Danson) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Danson: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I did not mean to interrupt the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), but on behalf of all members of the House may I officially welcome a member of the Conservative front benches who has been sitting here for a long time without saying a word. I am, of course, referring to the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard).

Mr. Ricard: I will make allowances for the hon. member's ignorance, Mr. Speaker.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that helpful remark has contributed to the debate, although I have not quite figured out how. As I started to say, there are defects in the bill. I indicated one of them. I think we do have to sort out the question of how far the ombudsman can go. Is his authority to be like that of the Auditor General, who can make recommendations but cannot put them into effect? Is he to have further authority? These are details that can be sorted out.

As for the proposition that things are different here from what they are in Britain, Scandinavia and New Zealand, of course we always have to tailor our arrangements to our own situation. These are details that can be gone into. Surely what the idea of an ombudsman calls for is not opposed to the line that the Minister of Justice is taking, but rather is an expansion of it. I hope the government will be willing to let this bill have a formal second reading so that it can go to the committee and there be considered further.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I regret that in the few minutes at

my disposal I shall not have time to discuss fully this important bill. Through the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) has left the House a good while ago, still I wanted to congratulate him for giving us the opportunity to study the question of establishing the office of parliamentary commissioner.

I believe that it is in 1964 only, when such a bill was introduced, that the House had the opportunity to discuss this matter and, as the hon. member who sponsored the present bill said, at that time it had been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

I believe the committee had recommended its adoption, with certain reserves. I believe that, for instance, the Canadian Bar Association and different political specialists such as Professor Rowat had also approved this project of appointing a Parliamentary Commissioner in Canada, as has been done in many other countries.

There is nothing new about this institution. I see that in the distant past they already had such a commissioner in China, a supervisor who checked the administrative decisions of the government and could have them altered. But after that, it is only in 1809 that the Scandinavian countries, Sweden particularly, tried out this institution which seems to have worked out well.

Recently, in some Canadian provinces, and in Quebec in particular, this office of ombudsman has been instituted, but we may have to wait for a little while to find out what will come out of it.

I am afraid that in spite of the impartiality of that ombudsman, his powers are not really very wide. He is merely an investigator who may draw the government's attention, or the people's attention, to certain situations, and make recommendations. But, really, he does not have any real power, except that of hearing grievances. I am wondering if this is not a weakness that might weaken the effectiveness of the measure, while there might be other means, such as administrative tribunals, as mentioned by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), to protect citizens against bureaucracy.

The case of the Scandinavian countries was mentioned; these countries, however, cover a limited area and have a unitary system; moreover, their confederative constitution differs from ours. This is also the case of New Zealand, where the constitutional system, of British origin, is similar to that of Canada in some respects.

This bill should be considered in the light of our constitutional system and, particularly, of the size of the country.

However, I agree with the hon. member when he says that the huge development of our administrative services, giving very large powers to governmental administrations, as well as the constant increase in the number of courts and agencies holding powers over the person and the property of the ordinary citizen, increase the risk of the individual's freedom and civil rights being violated.

Today, since most scientific discoveries require to be understood specialized knowledge which the average man usually lacks, hon. members are satisfied.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. 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.

At six o'clock 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 the motion of Mr. Basford 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 read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, when the debate was adjourned at five o'clock I was endeavouring to point out that our criticism of the bill which is before us arises from the fact that it fails to produce any measures which would protect our sovereignty and arrest the rapid drift toward foreign domination of our economy. I was seeking to make it clear that our objections were not based on any petty nationalism, as the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) has suggested.

Rather, we say that ownership implies the power to make decisions and that the decision-making power affecting the welfare of the people of this country, their jobs, their standard of living and their future, ought to be vested increasingly in the hands of bodies and organizations accountable and responsible to the people of Canada.

Those who are content to allow this drift toward continentalism to continue try to explain their inertia and inaction by contending that Canada cannot secure sufficient capital unless it allows these takeovers. This is one of the myths which was successfully exploded by the Watkins Commission. As a matter of fact, over the past ten years Canada has been an exporter of capital. In recent years we have been providing over $500 million a year to purchase equities in the United States, because most of the subsidiaries in Canada are wholly-owned United States subsidiaries which do not offer their shares to the Canadian public. Consequently, those who manage the investment for pension funds, insurance, mutual funds and the like find it necessary to go to the United States market to buy equities in order to balance their portfolios.

Moreover, it should be remembered that the capital which is being used to buy out Canadian companies comes largely from Canadians. Over the past ten years, only 15 per cent of the capital which is being used to take over Canadian companies has been new United States capital; the other 85 per cent is an accumulation of dividends and interest earned in Canada on previous investments. In other words, the people of Canada have supplied the capital necessary to permit the foreclosure of their own economy.

Adequate capital could be found in this country to develop the economy of Canada. Should it be necessary at any time to secure additional funds to enlarge our infrastructure, this could be done by going into the markets of the world to secure loan capital in the form of bonds and debentures where no ownership is involved. Once we pay off the interest and the principle, ownership rests entirely in Canadian hands. Surely there are sufficient savings generated by Canadian people to enable us to provide the major part, if not all of the capital we require for equity in the development of our economy. After all, during the second world war the Canadian people, rising out of a great depression, equipped nearly 1 million men and women in the armed services, built ships, tanks, guns and planes, waged a war entirely out of Canadian resources and in addition gave very large sums of money to the United Kingdom to help that country in its hour of need.

Our problem would not be capital. The area in which we would really need foreign assistance would be that of technical know-how, something which is much more difficult to secure. But this could be obtained, as Israel and other countries have done, by entering into partnership with foreign companies, allowing them to have a one-third equity, to supply the patents and in some cases to operate under management contracts. But we would retain control in Canada and keep the decision-making power in this country.

We in this party are disappointed that this legislation does not set out the steps the government intends to take to prevent a continuation of this growing takeover of the Canadian economy. We think there are steps which should be taken, some of them short term and immediate. For instance, we think there ought to be a takeover tax. A former Minister of Finance, Mr. Walter Gordon, did introduce legislation into this House providing for such a tax. Then, under pressure, he withdrew it. I am not in a position to say from whence the pressure came, but when Mr. Gordon writes his memoirs and we get another "Bird in a Gilded Cage", we shall know where it came from. Such a measure ought to be reintroduced. Many countries impose takeover taxes, and we need one in this country.

In the second place, there should be full disclosure of ownership so that we know the extent of foreign ownership of the various corporations in this country. Disclosure legislation will only be meaningful, however, if it is enforced. It will have to be better enforced than the legislation provided in the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act because in 1967, although 2,990 companies made no returns, no legal action was taken against them despite the fact that provision exists for taking such action.

Mr. Basford: Most of them are out of business.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If the minister wants to give us the facts, we shall be glad to hear him when he closes the debate. I doubt that 2,900 companies are out of business, but if it is true the minister should put that information on the record.

Third, we need legislation restricting foreign ownership particularly in key sectors of the economy. An agency ought to be set up, as was recommended in the Watkins report, to investigate these takeovers and to make sure that the subsidiaries in this country are acting as good corporate citizens. We need amendments to the Combines Investigation Act to provide that in cases where takeovers constitute mergers—which is what happens in most cases—it must be determined whether they are contrary to the public interest.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Fourth, we need a state trading corporation, as was recommended in the Watkins report. There has been a problem with U.S. subsidiaries in this country which have refused to trade with Communist countries because the parent company in the United States might be prosecuted under the U.S. Trading with the Enemy Act. These subsidiaries have taken the position that they are subject to United States law, not Canadian law. This difficulty can be obviated, in one way at least, either by establishing a state trading corporation or by giving such trading powers to the existing Canadian commercial agency.

The fifth suggestion, which we have made from time to time, is that we ought to use a floating exchange rate. At the present time we are taking hard-earned United States dollars which we have earned to help our balance of payments position, and selling them for Canadian dollars to prevent the Canadian dollar going above the pegged rate. I suggest it would be difficult to find a more asinine situation. We in this group have for a long time advocated that a floating exchange rate, even operated within certain limits, would give the government greater freedom of movement in conducting its monetary policies.

There are other long-term measures, of course, that ought to be initiated by the government. First is the establishment of the Canada Development Corporation that the Liberal government has included in the Speech from the Throne in every session since 1963. It was left out of this session's Speech from the Throne, probably because the government felt there was a limit on how long it could kid the public. In spite of this, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) keeps saying that the corporation is coming. Personally, I will believe it when I see the legislation on the order paper. We want a publicly financed and publicly controlled Canada Development Corporation that will make possible the mobilization of the savings of the Canadian people to be used for the purpose of developing Canada's resources, processing Canada's raw materials and developing and expanding Canada's economy.

The second long-term requirement is balancing our trade with imports from the United States, as well as shifting some of our purchases to countries that are prepared to trade for Canadian goods. One of our difficulties is that we are so completely dependent upon the U.S. market. As the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson said when asked whether the government would protest the United States presence in Viet Nam: When you depend on one country for 60 per cent of your trade, it is not easy to quarrel with them on a matter of this sort.

Because of our proximity to the United States and our long-standing relations with that country, the United States will always be our major customer. In all probability we will continue to be their major customer. But the steady imbalance in our payments position keeps us in a constantly inferior position in our dealings with that country.

My plea is that a young country like Canada must think in terms of centuries, not just in terms of decades. There is little value in rapid growth if the end result is economic dependency. Canada's future lies in developing secondary and tertiary industries that will provide jobs and more stable prices. For us to be a mere supplier of raw materials and energy resources is to relegate us permanently to an inferior level of economic performance. We can never have a society devoted to the greatest good for the greatest number if our economic decisions are made in a country other than Canada and in the interests of a country other than Canada. Even our political and cultural identity is being eroded. Certainly our economic sovereignty is already threatened.

We can hope some day to make corporate power responsible to the public interest of this country, but only if that power has its roots in Canada. When that corporate power is vested in another country and we have little or no control over it, increasingly we will become an economic colony of another nation. We may be better off, though even that is debatable; but we will not be a free and independent country.

We in the New Democratic Party are prepared to offer the Canadian people independence as an alternative to the paralytic continentalism which is followed by the government.

Mr. Greene: Then why didn't you support Watkins? You had your chance, but you voted him out as leader.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is, as usual, talking about something he knows nothing about. We did not vote Watkins out; he became an executive member of the New Democratic Party in Canada.

Mr. Greene: I did not see you supporting him.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister should read the resolution passed by the convention. If I had time I would read it to him, but briefly it stated that the New Democratic Party believed that Canada must assert its economic sovereignty if it is ever to build social democracy and preserve the political democracy of this country.

The choice that faces the Canadian people is whether we will begin now the long process of building economic and, incidentally, political independence, or be prepared to trade away our future for a mess of pottage. I hope before this debate concludes the responsible ministers of the government will be prepared to tell us what the government intends to do about foreign domination of Canada's economy, what action the government proposes to take on the Watkins report and what it is going to do about the increasing number of takeovers in Canada.

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

Some hon. Members: Continue.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have only a few sentences left, Mr. Speaker. I hope the government will tell us what it considers to be the point of no return. How far can foreign ownership go without our having reached the point where we cannot recover economic control? About two-thirds of our economy is now in foreign hands. When we reach 75 per cent or 80 per cent, do we then lose control of the Canadian economy? At what point does the government consider that danger signals will go up and action must be taken? In my opinion we have only a short time left. I think this decision will be made in this decade, in the 1970s. Unless we act, Canadians will have lost the power to make economic decisions regarding their future. If we make that decision, the time will have come to stop talking about "the true north, strong and free."

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? The hon. member did me the honour of quoting me in a context which actually was in reference to the sale of greater quantities of oil in the United States market than has up to now been the case. Does his party believe that Canada should not expand her United States market for crude oil because it is not in Canada's interest?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister knows perfectly well that we are not opposed to expanding our market for oil in the United States, but I might point out the minister also knows two other things: first, he knows that we are a net importer of oil, in spite of the fact that we have oil wells operating at only 35 per cent capacity. We are bringing into Canada more oil than we are shipping out. We have been trying to get information and the results of studies on whether it would be economic to ship western oil to eastern Canada rather than stopping the shipment of western Canadian oil at the Ottawa River. There is a great market for oil in Montreal and the Maritimes. We want to know, and we feel we have the right to know, the economics involved in this question. There is no reason why Canada should be a net importer of oil.

The second thing the minister knows is that when he talked to Mr. Hickel, he talked about getting more oil. Mr. Hickel said, "You want to sell oil, but there are a lot of other things we need. We need gas and we are interested in water and hydroelectric power. If you want to sell more oil, we are prepared to give you a rabbit for a horse." I am afraid that in that kind of trading the minister will come home pretty badly plucked.

Mr. Greene: For the purpose of clarity, Mr. Speaker—and I am sure my hon. friend wants the record to be clear—let me say that I am

pleased he is so clairvoyant and knows what went on between myself and Mr. Hickel in a closed room. For the purpose of making the record very clear, I take it that the hon. gentleman's party would not deem it a dimunition of that Canadian sovereignty about which he preaches so loudly if we sold a greater quantity of oil to the United States than we have in the past. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Since I have been asked a question, perhaps I might answer it. I have no objection to selling more oil to the United States, and certainly I have no objection to our selling more oil to those parts of Canada from which western Canadian oil has been excluded. I do not want to sell oil if that is to be used as an excuse for giving away the vast resources which we have, resources which the United States have depleted there and now want to ransack here.

Mr. Greene: But oil is not one of those.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think I have been extremely lenient in allowing this exchange, which I might point out, retrospectively, is quite irrelevant to the matter now before the House.

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker, just recently I was shocked to read in the newspaper that trustees for two bankrupt estates in Montreal had to apply to the Quebec Superior Court for injunctions to prevent the liquidators of the Bank of Western Canada transferring over $3 million of the bank's money to the bankrupts through a company in Nassau controlled by one of the bankrupts. The machinations by which this might have been accomplished are many and involved. The saving action, of course, must now be under the bankruptcy laws, but the near defeat of Canadian creditors to the extent of over $3 million of the Bank of Western Canada's money gives some indication of the need to tighten corporate control.

The purpose of the proposed amendments to the Canada Corporations Act is to give Canadian shareholders in closely-held companies, and all shareholders in widely-held public companies greater protection in that the company and those who control it, commonly referred to as management, are required to provide investing shareholders with much more information on which to base their decisions whether to invest in it or, if they have invested, whether to continue their support of existing management.

Under this new legislation those who have a substantial interest in the company either by way of shares, 10 per cent or more, or as officers of the company, known as insiders, must disclose all dealings with their own shares by filing with the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs what are called insider reports. Management must prepare and send to shareholders before the annual meeting detailed statements called information circulars, which presumably will have to show the benefit that any member of management may have received from the company or any subsidiary company, and describe the company's activities during the year and management's grounds for seeking re-election. These new sections also provide for some control on the solicitation of proxies, including the necessity to identify in the information circular those proposed for re-election or election as directors.

In 1967, Ontario introduced much the same protective provisions into the Ontario Corporations Act, most of which followed the New York State Act. This bill, while adopting a great deal of the Ontario legislation, has changed and enlarged some of the sections. Obviously the bill is hoped to be a Bill of Rights for investors. Certainly, some abuses will be prevented if potential manipulators know that shareholders are in a position to exercise a reasonable scrutiny of the company's affairs during the year and are informed of management's share ownership and dealings with the company prior to the annual meeting. The new provisions have certainly opened the door for scrutiny, but I suggest we should go further and turn on some lights so that shareholders may always see and understand what has gone on and the significance of it to them.

The drafters have avoided some unnecessary confusion by following much of the format of the Ontario act as to arbitrary time periods for compulsory filing and description of documents, for example, insider reports, information circulars and proxy solicitation. But although many of the sections are intended to have the same meaning, they are not identical in words. Surely, when there is uniformity of intention there should be greater uniformity of language. I suggest that the federal authorities consult their opposite numbers in Ontario to establish greater uniformity in terminology so that a shareholder who masters one set of rules will understand the other. This type of legislation, with its supporting regulations, is perhaps the most complicated and sophisticated of any Canadian

law. If we are to protect the investors we must see that they, as well as management and those who enforce the legislation, understand it.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Because the legislation is new there could be uncertainty until legal decisions have supplied interpretations. If there was greater uniformity between the federal and Ontario acts, at least where the sections are intended to accomplish the same purpose the jurisprudence under one act would be of assistance in interpreting the other, and both could gain from the New York legal decisions.

This bill, as does the Ontario act, provides that insider reports must be filed and thus be available for examination by shareholders who have the knowledge and facilities to go to the registration office to extract the information. However, there will be many shareholders who do not know the information is available, or who perhaps would find it difficult and expensive to go to the proper office to obtain it. In fact, if every shareholder did so, the burden on the registration office would be intolerable. A provision should be added to the new sections which would provide that there must be attached to or included in the information circular a summary of the insider reports that have been filed so that all shareholders are brought up to date in respect of the insider trading before the annual meeting.

Although there is provision for disclosure of actual trading by insiders, the control should reach further and provide for similar disclosure in respect of options, shares pledged to brokers or other trustees, and any other indirect interest in shares by insiders either in the main company or in any subsidiary or related company. So, also, should insiders be precluded from dealing in shares for some days before any takeover bid becomes public knowledge. Penalties and a right of civil action should be provided for any breach of these provisions.

In the large companies of today management's right to solicit proxy votes is a powerful weapon. Abuses must be guarded against or the protection which we seek to give may be circumvented. The bill may appear to be a complete legislative triumph, but it should go further. We should take advantage of the recent review, by the Supreme Court of Ontario, of the Ontario sections in respect of solicitation and voting of proxies by management and prevent what was there disclosed to be an abuse, before it happens again.

In a case in which I was personally involved as counsel, *Charlebois v. British International Finance*, the company then had control of the Bank of Western Canada, management solicited proxies and at the same time implied by the information circular that management as a whole proposed to support the old board of directors. However, although management voted the proxies which it collected in favour of the old board, one or two powerful members of management voted their own shares for, and elected directors whom they caused to be nominated at the meeting without any prior notice. This was obviously a deception on those who had given their proxies to management. It was necessary for us, in that case, to go to the courts, and after a long and expensive hearing the court found that this was constructive fraud and granted an injunction prohibiting the new board taking office.

This loophole should be plugged. It would be better if the section were enlarged to provide that if management puts forward a list of directors, they must vote for those directors or the meeting is void. If an individual member of management wishes to oppose the board which the majority of management has agreed upon, and vote his shares for another, he should be required to so inform the shareholders.

The new sections provide that if insiders or certain others associated with the company should use their special knowledge of the company's affairs for their own trading gain, they are accountable to the company in legal action which may be taken by the department. I suggest this provision would have a greater restraining effect on those who would seek to gain improperly at the expense of others if in addition a group of shareholders could commence and conduct an action either in their own names or in the name of the company for the benefit of the company and thus indirectly for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, if this appeals to the minister, the cases referred to in *Charlebois v. British International Finance (Canada) Limited*, which was reported in 1967, outlined how it can be done.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, many of the opinions and concerns that have been voiced here this afternoon and evening regarding the corporations bill, C-4, I think have been of great concern to many of us through the years. Certainly, we must acknowledge that in many areas greater control of corporate entities is necessary and desira-

ble. We heard a great deal, particularly from the leader of the New Democratic Party, about foreign ownership and the bogey of the corporate entities. There was basis, in many respects, for many of his remarks, but I hope his attitude toward foreign ownership will set a precedent when it comes to dealing with matters like international unions and labour relations which are based outside this country.

The corporations, of course, typically have been great whipping-boys in this and other countries. There is not too much sympathy for the politician who defends these companies. But we owe them a great deal in connection with our standard of living. There are in this bill a few clauses which I feel are worthy of comment and which have not been covered very extensively this afternoon and evening. The bill, of course, is a mixture of the Ontario Corporations Act, the Securities Act of 1966, the Combines Investigation Act and the U.S. Securities and Exchange Act of 1934. It is rather a conglomeration of all these statutes. Therefore, some portions of the bill can be defended on the basis of precedents.

I notice in one area of the bill, however, a tendency to bypass the directors as representatives of the shareholders and the substitution of direct intervention by the shareholders in the affairs of the company. This could lead to problems. As I believe any Member of Parliament is well aware, any large constituency contains a number of eccentric or disgruntled people who will take advantage of any opportunity afforded them to inject themselves into the affairs of an institution of which they are members. Therefore, I believe in this area we should be very careful to see there is at least some financial obligation placed upon shareholders who would initiate an investigation, so that it is done in a manner which does not warrant concern. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) this afternoon suggested that the arguments in respect of secrecy in corporate affairs were invalid because we can go to any phone book and find the names of various companies through which we can employ the financial espionage system.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I believe his remarks to be very true. But at least the person who is investigating or spying for the so-called financial espionage outfits has to pay for his investigation and the company is not liable for the costs of the investigative procedures. In the past few years investors have lost large sums of money through the action of directors and officers of certain companies. Some of the regulations in the legislation before us are aimed at correcting this. The companies which I might name as examples are Windfall, Atlantic Acceptance and Prudential Finance.

The cases involving these companies have attracted a great deal of public attention. However, when we examine the events closely we find that in the case of Windfall some of the amendments proposed in the bill before us would have prevented the situation that occurred. This would not necessarily be the case with regard to Atlantic Acceptance and Prudential Finance, because no matter what legislation we enact, the losses occasioned in many instances to the investors are due to their own greed and foolishness, and we cannot legislate against this.

We have heard about insider trading and selling short by insiders. I think that sometimes we make more of these things than is warranted. Selling short is sometimes made into a bogey procedure, while in fact it is a transaction which saves the person the trouble and expense of borrowing funds to exercise an option.

It really surprises me that when so much is said about policing corporations there is no mention of philanthropic organizations and some of our charitable organizations.

The other day a pamphlet was received in my office with regard to an investigation which was conducted, through the office of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) into several charitable and philanthropic organizations in this country. Investigations were made as to the right of the average citizen to scrutinize some of the purposes of the officers of organizations which are purporting to conduct charitable appeals. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs looked into this matter, as did the Department of National Revenue. They found that the present legislation contains some loopholes, although not much has been said about that.

We are informed that information regarding the officers of such organizations and their purposes, fund raising costs, actual expenditures for charitable purposes, etc. is confidential; it is restricted to both departments and is not open to the public. In some instances the sums involved are as high as those involved in large corporation activities. Further, we find that a non-profit organization need not have a federal charter in order to obtain a charitable registration number

which enables it to receive tax deductible gifts.

If one were to find that a group is using a charitable registration number to cover up a racket, one cannot seek a review or a revocation of the registration number. If one feels that a non-profit charter has been denied or granted unjustly, recourse can be sought only in the courts. I cannot understand why something is not also being done in this area.

A great deal is being said about corporate entities, which are the basis of our standard of living, and it is surprising that more attention is not paid to the internal workings of charitable organizations which deal in hundreds of thousands of dollars and which sometimes use up 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the funds received to cover their so-called administrative costs.

I think that something should be said about the requirement to submit a list of the shareholders of these corporations. This may be well and good, but it would also assist in takeovers by other firms, resulting in the establishment of larger conglomerates and foreign takeovers. Now it is up to the company to decide whether they wish to disclose the names of their shareholders, but if they were forced to do so, a corporation planning the takeover of a company would be able to approach the shareholders individually and make deals with them. This may have some undesirable effects.

I think a parallel could be drawn between Bill C-4, the omnibus bill on the Criminal Code and the white paper on taxation, which we were asked to accept as a package. In all three cases, in order to sell the product some attractive points were incorporated in them. I am very concerned about the purported infallibility of the department that is to administer and conduct the investigations and would legitimize any such investigations, because we are saying that one group is god-like while another group, in this case the company, is perhaps under suspicion. I think a parallel could be drawn between this bill and the white paper. We would be remiss in our duty were we to avoid comparing the corporate control that is envisaged in the bill with the control that will be possible when the white paper on taxation is implemented, because the white paper proposes to take away from small business a marked degree of control. In fact, small business may very well disappear, at least to the extent that now we know it.

[Mr. Downey.]

• (8:50 p.m.)

The white paper proposes no control of the large corporations, but almost complete government control over the smaller ones. If this bill were implemented it would be possible for the government to control the large corporations. It would in fact give the government almost complete control over the economy at the expense of the private sector. We would have shifted into the type of state where the government and the bureaucracy is all-powerful. Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say on the matter at this time. I repeat that I share these concerns with a great many hon. members.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon when the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) was speaking I was quite entertained and interested when he spoke of the family compact in Toronto. The only time I can tell an interesting story is when I talk about my relatives. The hon. member spoke about the one thing that did not exclude them from the family compact—that was failure in the business sense. It makes me think of Bob Hope who, when he spoke of the time he was attending Harvard, said that the university was so exclusive that those who failed to graduate were bums of distinction.

I suggest to the Minister of Corporate and Consumer Affairs (Mr. Basford) that he listen to the member of his own party who has some knowledge of and interest in this area. I would also suggest that the bills the minister is introducing should contain a clause insisting on better management, as United States bills in this area have done, particularly in regard to corporations. If he wants people to invest in Canadian corporations, he should make sure there is no one waiting to take them for all they are worth. This has been the case in the past, when there has been no return or a poor return—even embezzlement in some cases—because of lack of control.

As a farmer, I agree that a corporation has some advantages, such as the availability of more adequate research funds, management skills, better sales techniques, and so on. These benefits have come with this modern age and will benefit us all. It is agreed that there should be more adequate representation of the Canadian people and the Canadian investor to make sure that corporations work to the advantage of all. It has been suggested that a corporation has no heart, no soul and

no national identity in the sense of its responsibility. This has been shown to be true except when a country insists that the corporations recognize its national law. The best illustration I can think of is foreign subsidiaries of American companies operating in Canada, Canadian subsidiaries if you will, which feel more responsive to United States law than to Canadian law. I strongly suggest to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that he take a firm stand in this regard. As it is, when Big Daddy speaks, all these companies say "Yes, sir", "Yes, pa", and so on.

What is our responsibility in Canada? I would suggest to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs that he should stand up, have some gumption and make sure that Canadian law applies to Canadian companies, whether or not they are subsidiaries of foreign companies. It is time we insisted on recognition of Canadian rights in this respect. If the United States government tells an American parent corporation not to trade with Cuba, China or the moon, Canadian subsidiaries will obey this direction. I suggest this is not right. If we in Canada decide this is the situation, fine; but if we do not, these companies should obey our laws and face a fine or penalty of some kind.

I am quite concerned about the large percentage of Canadian trade with the United States. I am not suggesting trade with that country is necessarily a bad thing, but we lock ourselves in. When we look south of the border and see some of their problems in connection with race riots, one wonders if they may not have a civil war in parts of that country. I hope they do not, and I am not suggesting that they might, but it is a possibility. If they withdraw from the Viet Nam war, they may have a depression, and a depression in the United States in these circumstances means a depression in Canada.

I suggest that we encourage trade with other countries; that we try to enlarge our trade with countries like Japan, China and the European common market in order to attain a greater degree of independence. It behooves us to establish markets elsewhere, and we should set up our corporation law accordingly.

I should like to give an illustration of what might be done to encourage Canadian ownership. A Saskatchewan power corporation was established by borrowing money in the form of bonds, with interest at 5 per cent. A sinking fund was set aside to pay for the corporation over a period of 33 years. They applied the full amount of depreciation and still had several million dollars left to pour into the treasury of the Saskatchewan government. This is an indication of what could be done if we encouraged this type of set-up in Canada.

Foreign companies tend to take mining resources and do with them what they will, perhaps refining them elsewhere. The Ontario government has passed legislation calling for an indication of intent. In effect they say: You may mine here if you wish, but it must be refined here if it is mined here. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs should look very closely at the Ontario legislation. It is legislation that might be initiated all over Canada. If secondary industry were encouraged, this in turn would increase jobs and encourage the growth of capital investment here. In the long term it would benefit everybody. To the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs I would say, "Go thou and do likewise."

Recently there has been talk about Arctic sovereignty. This is just so much hot air unless we place emphasis upon who owns the Arctic. If we are going to sell it all to foreign corporations—and sometimes they act as if they own it already—what does it really matter which flag flies there? They may be glad that the Mounties keep the peace there and that the Canadian icebreakers keep the sea open for the movement of American and other foreign ships. They have the glory; they have the return on their capital investment; they have the ownership of the oil—so what is left for us except to fly the flag and break the ice? When the minister is setting up changes in the Corporations Act, I suggest that he look closely at some of these matters which affect Canadian citizens.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief remarks about this bill. I want to comment on what the leader of the New Democratic Party has said. I trust that our differences will basically be philosophical, because I have always had the highest respect for him. At this time when the NDP has been making inroads in Saskatchewan, not only in the farm areas but in the cities, the people of western Canada are worried about becoming a colonial outpost, not of the United States but of central Canada.

I think we are all getting a little tired of hearing certain Canadians say that United States investment in this country is the greatest evil that could possibly befall this nation. I ask the members of the New Democratic Party and those union leaders in this nation who support them, what would happen to our standard of living if someone pulled the plug out of the sink and allowed foreign investment to drain out of Canada? How much unemployment would be created here overnight?

We have made mistakes in the past in trying to control our corporations; we may have made mistakes that the United States avoided when it began developing its resources. But let us not worry about what happened in past years. Let us see, first, just how much United States capital is invested in Canadian industry. Again, in this context, I ask the leader of the NDP and his union supporters, how much unemployment would we have in this country if someone pulled the plug out of the sink and allowed United States foreign investment to drain away?

I wish to refer to a survey of United States investment in Canada. This is taken from the *Globe and Mail* and has been confirmed by the Toronto *Star*. When those two newspapers quote the same figures, one may place some reliance on them. I have also checked them in the Canada Year Book. What does the survey show? It shows that in 1967 there were $371 million invested in this country in mining and smelting. In 1968 there was invested in the petroleum industry $645 million in the manufacturing industry, $854 million and in other industries $259 million.

Altogether, there was invested in the mining, smelting, petroleum, manufacturing and other industries, $2,129 million. Apart from amounts invested in the manufacturing sector, there was invested in the chemical industry $166 million; in the machinery industry $132 million; in the transport equipment industry $201 million and in other manufacturing industries $356 million. In these industries alone there is invested a total amount of $2,295 million.

Let us look at these industries and at unions in Canada which are financed by unions operating across international boundaries. My remarks are not meant to be critical. We are all working together; our unions and businesses are economically interlocked. It seems to me that we can make the economy of this country function smoothly only when we work with the United States. I sympathize in part with the position the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) has adopted toward the petroleum industry, but let us look realistically at that industry. If the United States were to pull the plug from the sink tomorrow with respect to export of crude petroleum from western Canada, the tragedy that would hit the urban centres of the west would be even greater than the tragedy that has hit our wheat farmers. I do not think we in the west can stand two major collapses at the same time.

An hon. Member: What about Montreal?

Mr. Woolliams: I am aware of what is happening in Montreal and would be prepared to speak about that. The United States and Canada must work together harmoniously; that is the idea underlying our national oil policy. When the leader of the New Democratic Party was Premier of Saskatchewan he realized how necessary our national oil policy was and approved it. But let us not talk about controlling corporations, because they are operated on a global scale. These are big conglomerates and operate only partly in Canada. Canada has only about 20 million people. While we must make sure that the rights of our people are not usurped, at the same time we must realize that we need the investment of these corporations. We must all work together.

I am sure that the minister and the leader of the NDP will forgive me if I speak for a moment about the Conservative Party. When the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) was the minister responsible, he met with the United States authorities and worked out a national oil policy under which we all understood that because of transportation factors, western Canada would supply the western states with crude petroleum and our market would extend as far west as the Ottawa Valley; Venezuelan oil, financed by the United States companies, would go to the eastern market. In 1961 we hoped we could consume approximately 800,000 barrels per day as a result of export and our own domestic market.

Our idea was that we should work with the United States in evolving these oil policies. If we took the position that we would act in these matters without considering the interests of the United States, between 15 per cent and 20 per cent of the Canadian labour force would become unemployed overnight. That is why we must take a concrete look at the

existing situation before we say that foreign corporations have invested too much money in this country. It is very easy to say, "Let's take over these foreign corporations."

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Mexico in 1964 I noticed that the government there had taken over the petroleum industry. Yes, they had socialism—and what happened? The standard of living in Mexico is so low that every time you step out of a hotel at night little boys run up to you begging for pesos. I have yet to see that happening in Canada. It is true that we have problems; but no matter whether we are governed by Liberal, Conservative or even NDP governments, we must as Canadians develop Canada. I think and speak as a Canadian Member of Parliament and that is why I say we depend on foreign investment and cannot develop our resources without it. Anyone who says we can is talking sheer nonsense.

You are being an economic hypocrite if you say Canadian productivity can be maintained without the kind of foreign investment we have enjoyed, because it is obvious that it cannot. I do not know on which side of the fence the leader of the NDP stood at the convention—and all parties in this House have conventions—but I know that it was not the Canadian managers of the international conglomerates who came down against accepting the Watkins report. It was the union leaders in Canada, people like those who support me now and did before. I am talking about the United Mineworkers of America. I could name names. These people realize full well how dependant we are on foreign capital.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Let us look at what the oil industry means to Canada. I would like to be able to say to the people of Alberta that they should receive 100 per cent of the Canadian trade, but everyone knows that the cost of production in Canada, per unit, is a little more expensive than it is in the United States. We cannot even build pipelines and be in a position to compete with the foreign crude oil coming into Montreal. We have to be practical. Even if it was my lot to be Prime Minister or a cabinet minister, I still could not go into the city of Montreal and say to the people there that as of tonight they will pay 20 cents a gallon more for gasoline because it is produced in the province of Alberta. Concrete economic facts must be taken into consideration.

Canada is an anomaly in the world with regard to oil. We can currently produce 200 per cent of its consumption. We can also produce far more than our consumption of grain. Yet we have a net trade deficit in oil of over $200 million per year. The need for a new oil policy is apparent. This need has been pressed by myself and other members of my party. I am sympathetic to the fact that we cannot go into the United States with a big club and say we are 20 million people and we are going to enter their market. The United States would ignore us because they have great developments in the north.

I say to the members of the New Democratic Party that the United States can afford to send a man to the moon. They can afford to find and produce oil inshore and offshore. They can afford to do this at far more expense than buying it from Canada, and they can tell us to go to hell. These are the cold economic facts of life that must be faced. It is time we paid attention to them.

I see young people waving signs which read, "Take away American capital", "Down with American companies". These same young people will be at my desk this summer asking me as their Member of Parliament to assist them to obtain a summer job. If we close the companies and take away the investment, these Canadian students will not get summer jobs as roughnecks drilling for oil in Alberta. These are some of the facts which we have to face.

Everyone loves to wave a flag. Politicians have been waving the national flag on platforms ever since Confederation. When someone talks to me about something made in Canada, or Canadian sovereignty, because I was born in Canada and my people have been here for three generations I feel proud and can naturally become emotional. There is a time when you have to start ignoring your heart and using your head, because if we do not use our heads many Canadians will be unemployed.

I have knowledge of economics and political science. In my opinion we are facing a very serious period in North America. If the war in Viet Nam came to an end—and I hope it will—there would be a cooling-off of productivity, not only in the United States but also in Canada. No matter which government is in office, we will be faced with serious unemployment. I have stated that I do not agree with the policies of the government.

I think they are aggravating the situation. The white paper has had a serious reflection on the stock market of Canada as well as on investment needed to develop our resources and keep a high degree of employment.

The government talks about socialism. I think it is a great ideal. If we can encourage investment and keep reasonable control over the investment that comes into Canada, in order to develop our resources and increase our productivity, then jobs will be available for Canadians. There will be less taxes for the home-owners and the wage earners. Canada has changed. It is not what it was during the forties, fifties and sixties. The union man today is in the middle-income bracket. Union men are earning between $12,000 and $15,000 a year. The white paper will not help them or develop this country.

There are two points I want to make. We need foreign investment. Politicians in Canada should be very careful when they talk about foreign investment at this time. We are spending on importing crude petroleum $200 million more than we receive from exports. I agree that if this $200 million were spent in Canada for Canadian crude oil, it would have a total effect on the Canadian economy, through secondary and other industries, of approximately $700 million annually. But we must have the capital to develop the resources, the petroleum, the mines and the manufacturing industry so that we can turn them into manufactured goods. Unless we do this, we cannot have the standard of living I would like to see.

We will never have prosperity in this country by taxing the people to death and driving out foreign investment. These are two things I oppose, and I would say so from a platform in my constituency. This is the second constituency I have had the privilege to represent in the House of Commons. I think I can talk to the average man. I say to the leader of the New Democratic Party that I can go to the miners in East Coulee, where the houses are boarded-up and there are only one or two mines left, and point out the importance of foreign investment.

When the Kaiser Company came into Canada we had combined Japanese and United States investment. The coal industry took on a new life. I repeat that only through the development of our resources can the productivity of the nation increase. When this happens, the taxes can be cut for the wage

earners, small businessmen and everyone else. Surely that makes economic sense.

We must take a serious look at the situation. It is possible to win elections on what the leader of the New Democratic Party has said. I could get a crowd together and talk like he does. I think he was a good Premier. I did not agree with some of the things he did in Saskatchewan, and I told him so. I cannot believe that with his knowledge of economics, business experience and running the government of the province of Saskatchewan he believes we can chase out foreign investment and still help the labourers and unions of this country develop their resources so that we can cut taxes.

I say to members opposite, beware of the white paper. I oppose it. Don't dish it up in a capsule and tell the little man that he is going to save on taxes through the small exemption he is being offered. As soon as a Canadian tries to get out of poverty row and is earning $4,000, his taxes will be increased by an additional 9 per cent. This is no time to be playing ducks and drakes with the economy by using something like the white paper.

I told the members of the New Democratic Party who come from the farm belt that they should read to the farmers what the Carter Commission said. They should tell the farmers that the white paper will cause the ranchers and farmers to pay a capital gains tax. Every day the NDP and Progressive Conservatives question the government with reference to the grain problem. The farmers are desperate. They are ready for a change, but they should realize and appreciate that the NDP endorse not only the white paper but the driving out of foreign investment, which would give this country a depression greater than that of 1929.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I have made my point and emphasized it two or three times. It is high time some people were told the facts. I would rather be defeated in my constituency in the next election than not have made this speech, because I believe it is time the people of Canada were told some of the economic facts. A healthy oil industry means jobs not only in Alberta but throughout the manufacturing sector of the Great Lakes golden triangle; it means jobs in the manufacturing industries, jobs in the mining and smelting industries. It is only through trade that prosperity comes. Without trade, Canada will fade.

What do hon. members on my left want to see? Do they wish us to enter a period in which there is no development? Do they want us to live on the productivity we have achieved to date, despite a growing population? We lost the grain market because the United States moved into the vacuum when the International Wheat Agreement was not signed. They dumped their wheat throughout the world at fire sale prices.

Propagandists tried to tell us the present situation arose because of a world surplus. Let them look at the facts in the Canada Year Book. I say to the government: If it is due to a world surplus, why was Canada the fifth of the exporting nations in 1969, when it was the first three years ago? Get us back into first place, and the board can allocate six and seven-bushel quotas tomorrow and get the grain trade moving again. I am a Conservative who believes in development. I do not believe in laissez faire. Of course, we need some control. But when we have to listen to the economic nonsense we have listened this afternoon, I say it is time somebody stood in his place and put the record straight.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all, on rising to take part in the discussion on this bill, that I have just heard a speech by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) the logic of which seems to be that if everything in Canada were owned by the United States, everything would be fine and dandy.

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a question of privilege. I respect the intellect of the hon. member, but at no time did I make such a statement. Maybe he did not understand what I said. My contention was that foreign investment is necessary for the development of our country. I said that, and nothing more. Of course, I do not want any foreign country to take over here, but I do not want 15 or 20 per cent of our workers unemployed, as the hon. member is recommending.

Mr. Skoberg: I am proud that I was able to get the hon. member on his feet to clarify the record. If I understand him correctly, his point is that everything is good in Canada because of United States investment here. In that case I wonder why political experts, political scientists, sociologists and many others are telling us we should learn a little lesson. I shall read from Myers' Finance Review, which comes from Switzerland. I do not know the origin or the background. It reads in part as follows:

> Canada faces the most trying monetary and economic days in its history. Canada is strong with natural resources, relatively strong in gold despite some foolish policies of 30 years. Canada can survive to become, in the next two decades, the richest country in the world. It will depend upon how the Members of Parliament handle the up-coming situation.

If I understand the hon. member for Calgary North correctly, the method he would adopt to handle this situation in Canada, and perhaps in the Calgary oilfields, would be to turn over control to United States interests. The article continues:

> Canada can be saved only by every MP studying this monetary situation as he studies nothing else, and using his voice not for political popularity but for the salvation of the country.

Whether members of this House are really concerned about saving this country is something every one of them will have to go to bed and dream about. They will have to consult their consciences. I know many men engaged in the oil industry in the Calgary area and elsewhere. Does the hon. member realize that when the pipeline was put in in Alberta, United States interests were disposed to use an entirely United States labour force—Canadians were excluded from the construction of oil pipe-lines mainly because, it was said, they were not experienced. It was only through the vigilance and determination of the organized workers in Alberta and elsewhere that Canadian workers were given their rightful place. I do not agree at all with the philosophy which the hon. member for Calgary North has expounded tonight.

I am not an economist, but I am convinced that when the people of this country fill in the questionnaires which are sent them asking what they think about various Canadian issues, one of their greatest concerns relates to our national origin, our national identity, whether or not we are being taken over by foreign interests. It amazes me we should hear philosophies of the kind expressed tonight by the hon. member for Calgary North. What would become of us, he asks, if it were not for foreign capital? Surely hon. members are aware of the existence of the Canadian Development Corporation? Do hon. members not realize that the people of Canada are quite prepared to invest in this corporation if they have confidence in the government to use the resources of our country to the best advantage. The idea that

foreign capital is necessary to protect employment in Canada is a myth, and the hon. member for Calgary North is well aware of it.

Mr. Woolliams: I am not aware of it. You are saying all this.

Mr. Skoberg: The hon. member was entirely taken up with his picture of the United States, with its huge size, telling we poor 20 million people to go to hell if we do not adhere to their ideas of what we should do. I wonder whether he would be concerned if the Liberal government were to introduce regulations requiring all foreign corporations in Canada to return a fair share of their profits to the Canadian economy. I wonder whether he would say: We must not do that because the United States and other people much bigger than us will tell us to go to hell.

The philosophy embodied in his speech tonight amounts to saying to these corporations: You do not have to be good Canadians or good corporate citizens; just come in and take our resources, rape us, then go away gently because we shall not say a word. It amazes me that an hon. member should stand up and suggest Canada does not have the ability and the integrity to get along on its own but must depend almost entirely on foreign capital.

I have heard many statements on the subject of whether labour is getting more than its fair share, more than it is entitled to. I am sure the remarks the hon. member has made will indicate where he stands on many of the issues facing the Canadian worker today. Is he really concerned about employment in Canada?

To deal directly with the measure before us, Bill C-4, I suggest to the government that if it was really concerned about taking constructive action at this time, it would have added a few words to the title of the bill to make it read, "An Act to amend the Canada Corporations Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject matter of certain of those amendments and to provide for the supervision of foreign ownership and control of the Canadian economy." This is what the government should do if it is really concerned about the Canadian economy, instead of trying to lay the blame for present difficulties on areas which are not really responsible for the situation in which we now find ourselves.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

• (9:30 p.m.)

For example, the government itself has suggested that labour is not prepared to discuss voluntary restraints. I suggest that if the government started at the top of the ladder and brought an end to increased prices of all commodities in Canada, labour would collectively sit down at the table and discuss the imposition of voluntary restraints.

While we are talking about imposing voluntary restraints at this time, we are telling those on very low incomes that although prices are going up their wages cannot be increased correspondingly, and they are not to rock the boat. I shall be very interested to see how successful the government is in its talks with the business community. I hope the talks will be successful. I hope they will be so successful that business in general will roll back prices, removing any justification for pay increases.

When the minister introduced this bill on November 10 I am sure many of us agreed with some of his comments. As reported at page 703 of *Hansard*, he stated that the maintenance and strengthening of investors' confidence and investors' protection is of real concern to the government. The New Democrats have never at any time said that people are not entitled to a fair return on their investment. We have said that we must determine what constitutes a fair return on an investment. We say that people who invest money in this country are entitled to know how their money is being used. I unhesitatingly congratulate the minister for introducing Bill C-4, though many large corporations in this country have criticized the action he is taking, as set out in the terms of the bill.

One matter that causes me concern is that legislation passed by this Parliament means absolutely nothing unless regulations made pursuant thereto are enforced. Not long ago, namely on December 2, 1968, I filed a question, No. 932, which asked, among other things:

How many corporation have not filed returns under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act?

It was answered as follows:

The number of corporations not filing returns under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act is not available.

I asked another question:

What is the total number of corporations for which returns must be filed?

According to the answer, 2,990 firms failed to file returns in 1967 under the particular section of the act. I suggest that if we are not more vigilant in enforcing the requirement of Bill C-4 that returns be filed, this Parliament is wasting its time. Bills that pass this House mean very little unless the government has the fortitude to enforce their terms. I hope the minister in charge of this department will see that corporations do file returns in accordance with this bill.

The Toronto *Daily Star* of March 27, 1969, carried an article headed, "733 Companies Ignore Ottawa". The article said:

> Hundreds of Canadian companies have failed to file annual reports to the government as required by law but the government imposes no penalties on defaulters, Auditor-General Maxwell Henderson says in his annual report.
>
> Companies are required to report annually under two provisions of the Canada Corporations Act—first a copy of its financial statement and also a report about the company and its directors.
>
> As of March 31, 1968, there were 733 companies in default of filing a financial statement, including 257 which had never filed since their incorporation. In some cases, defaulting has persisted for 50 years.

I hope the minister will take a close look at the whole question of filing returns under the legislation; otherwise, as I say, we are wasting out our time passing it.

The previous speaker seemed to be particularly concerned about where the New Democrats stand on this issue. I can think of no better piece of literature to read into *Hansard* than an article that was written in December, 1969, by Wilf Hudson. This was following the NDP convention, which the previous speaker suggested resulted in a split between the two factions, which is, of course, quite inaccurate. Mr. Hudson writes:

> There was general agreement that in order for Canada to control her own destiny she must have economic control and in order to do this we must reverse the trend of foreign control. Presently our economy is determined mainly by the major investment decisions taken by large corporations.

May I digress to say we are all aware that many economists have prophesied that what happens economically in the United States will happen in Canada, too. I am sure in many cases this has been true. Mr. Hudson continues:

> This has meant to a large extent, an inefficient branch plant manufacturing industry and natural resources largely serving the U.S. market, consequently a great deal of the investment and development decisions have little reflection on the priorities and needs of Canadians.
>
> —Canadian independence and Canada's survival as a free nation have been and are the determined goals of the New Democratic Party.

I subscribe to that 100 per cent.

> Old party spokesmen are fond of decrying concern for Canadian independence as anti-American. Nothing shows more clearly how little they understand the feelings of Canadians. Anti-Americanism is as barren and negative a concept as is anti-French or anti-English or anti any other country or people. Canadians have always known this.
>
> What New Democrats seek is to make and keep Canada free to realize her full potential and greatness.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, Canada has large resources. Recently we obtained a large export order for the shipment of coal to Japan. How much better would it be to have industry on the west coast of British Columbia make use of our resources, instead of sending them out of the country to be manufactured in other countries and re-importing those products. This would be a great boost for employment in British Columbia, rather than providing employment in Japan.

Finally, Mr. Hudson said:

> —New Democrats will use all the means available in a modern economy: expansion of public investment and public ownership, government planning, investment controls, a just tax system, purposeful monetary policies freed from the restraints of a fixed exchange rate, and necessary laws to limit and regulate foreign investment and subsidiaries in Canada.

May I repeat the stand of this party. If foreign corporations invest money in Canada, they should be controlled by regulations, as are Canadian corporations, to ensure this investment accrues to the betterment of all Canadians instead of to only a few individuals.

Before the supper adjournment one member on the other side of the House put on the record what he considered to be the meaning of the word "corporation". I should like to refer to the definition of that word in the Dictionary of Sociology and Related Sciences, which I think gives its true meaning:

• (9:40 p.m.)

> A socio-economic organization composed of individuals and born of legal sanction for the purpose of manipulating property rights and other interests to the benefit of those who compose it.

It does not say, to the benefit of the people of Canada or to any other country. The definition continues:

> If the function is primarily to create and distribute profits to a relatively limited membership it is a private corporation. On the other extreme if the dominant purpose relates to politically organized general welfare it is a public corporation.

Virtually all corporations in some degree partake of both functions.

There is little doubt that the most successful method to date of aggregating capital is the private or business corporation. But it is more than a mere method of holding property. The modern business corporation has become the prevailing method of organizing economic effort.

I suggest that the main reason for some of our problems is that the modern business corporation is an organized, economic effort for the benefit of the corporation and not for the benefit of pensioners, farmers and those people who have to purchase the produce that corporations provide at prices much above their cost. The definition continues as follows:

With all of its advantages over simpler organizations in increasing production many new social changes have occurred. The tremendous growth in size is one consideration. The assets of a few business corporations even exceed the assessed valuation of some states of the U.S. This concentration and control of capital has restricted the area of competition as it existed in the earlier stages of a free-pricing economy. A further factor is the growth of two classes: a managerial class to replace the old type of entrepreneur and an absentee-ownership class. Control is thus separated from ownership.

The old-time, private entrepreneur that we knew in the past is practically non-existent. Many people who tried to become private entrepreneurs in their communities failed because the corporate structure took over completely. I am sure these people are not the ones who are really concerned about the white paper. They are the people who really made the communities in bygone days. Now our whole community, our way of life and the social atmosphere in this society are impaired to the extent that the absentee owners make the decisions in Canada, and they are not really concerned about our economy. I am sure that with the passage of Bill C-4, this situation will not be changed. Hopefully, the reporting required will mean something to the people of Canada.

Let me refer to an article that appeared in the Toronto *Star* on November 11, 1969. It states:

A nationalism sigh of relief went up from many Canadians last spring when Rothmans of Pall Mall Canada beat U.S.-owned Philip Morris, another tobacco giant, for control of Canadian Breweries Ltd.

It was a good-guys-over-the-bad-guys feeling—a "hurrah for our side" cry. Canada had rallied and driven off the foreign invaders, many seemed to feel. They were dead wrong.

It was merely the victory of a South African based company over an America one. And it was symptomatic of a new trend in foreign ownership of Canada—a rise in the non-American share of our foreign-owned industries.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

To make the record very clear, once again let me say that this party has never deliberately campaigned to belittle our neighbours to the south. We have had to look to our neighbours to the south because of their tremendous input into our corporations and into the over-all control of our economy. We are now in a position where other countries are outdoing our neighbours to the south, and the same regulations must apply to them. I hope that any thought in anyone's mind that we are criticizing the United States will not persist. We want to know the source of this investment.

Let me quote from the bottom of page 705 of *Hansard* for November 10, 1969. The minister said:

Some people say that the government has the information it needs in its files, especially in the files of the Department of National Revenue, in the files of Calura and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics; that if it does not have the required information the government has the means of getting it. The claim is made, however, that there is no need to make public the information relative to the affairs of private companies; that to do so would amount to an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

I agree with the following sentence of the minister:

Those who speak that language surely do not appreciate all the implications of their position. I can hardly believe that in this day and age they want the government of the land to stand beyond the reach of the criticism of the citizens; that they want to allow the government of the land to take decisions that affect us all on the basis of information not available to the public. The public, even the otherwise well-informed public, the analysts, the academics and commentators, cannot appreciate, discuss or criticize policy as effectively as possible because of lack of access to the same information as is available to the policymakers or to the government.

If this government and the minister are sincere in respect of that statement, I hope the minister will stand in his place and provide answers or the information requested in many Notices of Motions for the Production of Papers. These motions really ask for the information which the minister recommends should be provided. He suggests the information will be made available as a result of this bill.

It has been suggested that the provisions of this measure will make this information public, through the press, and that in this way people requiring the information will obtain it. I have in mind the small investors who now receive no information. When the time comes, I feel that the minister will not be quick to jump to his feet to provide the

information to those people who want it. Before this debate is concluded I hope the minister will indicate that he agrees wholeheartedly that everything should be made public in order that everyone concerned may know what is going on.

Earlier I referred to the questionnaire that was sent out, in all sincerity, by many members. The answers contained in the majority of the 23,000 questionnaires sent out indicated a prime concern in respect of the control of our economy by foreign investors. When this bill goes to the committee I hope the minister will extend its term, in order that there may be real supervision of foreign investment. I am sure the Canadian people believe in Canada as a whole for Canadians. That is the position many people take in respect of this situation.

The primary method this government has of giving out information is undoubtedly through the Information Canada Service about which we have heard so much. I am wondering whether the minister's department will take advantage of this method in order to give the public the information required, or whether the public will have to pay for the information. Surely somewhere along the line this service should be made available to investors. This is one way in which we can make the general public more aware of what is taking place.

Some time ago the minister said there would be one change in the House regarding bills presented to us. At page 710 of *Hansard* for November 10 he referred to the method now used to handle the Canada Corporation Act and amendments, and said:

• (9:50 p.m.)

> The pressure of other business does not always permit the setting aside of sufficient parliamentary time to consider and dispose of requests for special acts to incorporate new companies or amend the original incorporating statutes. As a result, great inconvenience can at times be caused to the companies involved because of the uncertainty of the procedure and lengthy delays which are sometimes involved. We therefore propose an alternative procedure to the special act machinery.

It has been said many times in the House that members of this party have held up bills deliberately, without any justification. I should like to put on the record a letter one of our special assistants wrote to the editor and publisher of the *Financial Post*, dated April 21, 1969. It reads as follows:

> Members of the NDP Caucus have been disturbed by your front page editorial—"Where a fix is badly needed"—March 1, 1969.
>
> The New Democrats participating in the debate during private bills hour, are pursuing motives other than simple 'harrassment' as you have stated.
>
> I draw your attention to a release dated February 22, 1969. Messrs. Peters, Howard, Gilbert, Schreyer, Harding, and Saltsman point out:
>
> In addition to opposing further U.S. encroachment into the insurance business in Canada, the NDP members object to the proliferation of insurance companies—there are already more than 1,000 of them in this country—and to the subsequent diversion of more and more savings capital into private investment rather than into the financing of social needs."

In fact, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert) referred to the deep penetration of foreign ownership in Canada and suggested that the government halt the incorporation of U.S.-owned insurance companies until it had made a full examination of this takeover problem.

When the representatives of corporations appeared before a committee of this House and gave an indication that in time the majority of their shares would be owned in Canada, there was no hesitation on the part of members of our party to let the bills go through, because it meant these companies would be Canadian-owned in time and that the policy would be made in Canada by Canadians and hopefully we would have more control over our economy.

It has never been proved that the more than 1,000 insurance companies have reduced their premiums. It has always been said that supply and demand will dictate the cost to the user, but today in any industry it would seem that the more companies there are, the more the price increases. If insurance companies were really competitive, one would wonder why premiums would not be reduced. As I have said, no one has seen this happen and I am certain no one ever will in so far as these companies are concerned.

I am sure that if the regulations the minister intends to establish in respect of Bill C-4 are adhered to, the bill will be of some assistance. But I am doubtful about this because the government has so far not seen fit to enforce other acts. However, if all this bill does is set up another bureaucracy, involving duplication of services to the detriment of the people, I cannot see any purpose in it. If this bill means that the government is concerned about making sure that it will be a law of the land and will be enforced, I will vote for the bill when it returns from the committee, provided certain amendments are made.

I hope this measure is not merely window-dressing once again and an exercise in going

to the people and saying, "We are protecting you, Mr. Small Investor". If it is, then it is merely an exercise in futility and a waste of the taxpayers' money. It would be merely a case of trying to tell the people of Canada that we are really not concerned about them, and that this legislation is window-dressing only. I wish the minister well in bringing forward this bill and hope he will live up to the proposals contained in it.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the drug bill, in a friendly way I called the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) the shadow-boxing champion of Canada. He has fairly well lived up to that title. When I look at Bill C-4 I am convinced that he should retain that title. I could also say he is the tinpot dictator of big business in Canada. He makes a great deal of noise and gets very little action from big business. Nevertheless, he beats his chest and tells them he will put them in their place, and so on.

When I heard the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) speak tonight I was prompted to suggest that he cross the floor and join the great right wing of the Liberal Party, because on most occasions he really out-rightwings the right-wingers of that party. When I heard him say he would rather be a colony of the United States than a colony of central Canada, I felt it indicated his lack of concern for Canadians.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I should like to point out that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) was here to defend himself when a previous member misinterpreted him. I think the present comment is quite wrong and misquotes what the hon. member said.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I will have an opportunity tomorrow afternoon to continue my remarks. I hope the hon. member for Calgary North will be here, because I never wish to misquote him. Therefore, may I call it ten o'clock?

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

TABLING OF AND CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order—

[Mr. Skoberg.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent of the House to revert to Routine Proceedings in order to table the first report of the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence on the matter placed before it, i.e. the question of Nigeria. Should unanimous consent be given, I also intend to recommend that the report be concurred in.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It might be redundant to point out that it was not necessary for the hon. member to rise on a point of order. I believe he could have risen at ten o'clock when the hon. member would have resumed his seat. However, I believe there is no objection to our proceeding this way. Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to present the report?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member to move concurrence in the report?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. member should be given permission to read the report before it is concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would point out that when concurrence is sought at the time the report is presented, the practice of the House is that the Clerk read the report.

Mr. Bell: You would think the House leader would know the rules by this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in tabling the first report of the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence and recommending that it be concurred in.

[*English*]

The Second Clerk Assistant:

Pursuant to its order of reference dated Monday, January 12, 1970, your Committee has the honour to present its first report.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Recognizing the natural wish of the Federal Nigerian Government to come to the aid of its own countrymen, but also having regard to the disparate emergency food and medical supply situation which the committee understands exists in parts of Nigeria, your committee urges the Canadian government to continue and strengthen its

representations to the government of Nigeria to approve and arrange for the utilization of the facilities offered by Joint Church Aid and Canairelief for the immediate delivery and distribution of the supplies available to these agencies, under the supervision of any agency or authority appointed or approved by the government of Nigeria, in the hope that such delivery may commence within the next 24 hours and continue for whatever interim period may be considered necessary by the Federal Nigerian Government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to concur in the report?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

PUBLIC SERVICE—BILINGUALISM—USE OF INSTANT TRANSLATION COMPUTERS IN CLASSES

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I asked my question nearly two months ago. Having followed it through with some research I am convinced that it is even more important than it was at the time it was first asked. I have been reading some documents from the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, and my appraisal is further reinforced. Language is tremendously important in Canada today, both symbolically and realistically. Administrative efficiency is, of course, tremendously important in our times when the apparatus of the state is so powerful and its influence so pervasive.

I have always been an advocate of bilingualism in the government structure, but how we bilingualize institutions and departments of the government through the bilingualizing of individuals is a ques ion of great importance and great delicacy. Certainly government institutions should and must be bilingual, but what of the process whereby the individuals go through what we may describe as the bilingualizing course?

It is a great and valuable asset to know two languages, but it is very difficult for many people. Indeed, one of our finest neurologists pointed out that it was almost impossible for anyone past the age of puberty to become thoroughly and fully proficient in a language other than the original one. The process of bilingual training is very hard on many people who are doing hard and important work in the service of the country. Perhaps it would be well to appraise the expenditure of time and effort and the laborious, difficult and often times, alas, unsuccessful immersion courses which many of our public servants are now taking. The sad part is that many who are immersed do not stay immersed, and this may well have deleterious effects upon their work output.

I will not dwell upon the emotional aspect of this question, the kind of thing which is stirred by the remark of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) about the running of elevators by unilingual people. But these things are involved. Nor will I dilate upon the great cost. I note a recent item which indicates that last year we spent $5,770,000 to give training to 5,000 employees of the government. So there is indeed a great cost involved. I was therefore delighted when I read the speech of that most excellent public servant, Mr. Gotlieb, Deputy Minister of the Department of Communications last fall when he spoke about the possibility of language computers which, in his words—

> —can translate French to English and English to French. And the equipment has no inhibitions about who uses it.
>
> We may soon reach the stage where telephones and television can be equipped with small, inexpensive translation computers that can instantly translate either of our official languages into the other.

I have read that one of the officials of the Department of the Secretary of State said that this happy state of affairs may be ten years away. But I wonder how far we are away from full, not to say perfect, thoroughgoing bilingualism. So the ten-year period does not upset me at all. It was once said by a great French philosopher that to govern is to foresee. I am sometimes dubious about the ability to foresee of the present government. But surely in an age where technology is so advanced and the acceleration of scientific development is still increasing, we must and should be alert to every opportunity to make the best use of modern technology for the best of national purposes.

I think that the rapid development of computerization in this field is something to which the government should give full attention as quickly as possible. I understand from financial institutions in the United States that great steps are being taken in this area.

I do not propose that we should expect miracles in a political institution, but perhaps this might be as close to a miracle solution of

an important matter as we are likely to reach. We all want full-fledged, functional bilingualism in this country. Institutions must and should be bilingual, and it must be achieved without pain to individuals and without developing a state where linguistic qualifications transcend all others. I believe the leading scientist in the government is going to reply to this question, and I would ask that urgent attention be given to this very important, potential breakthrough.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the honourable and learned gentleman has raised questions on what he describes as the "foreseeability" of the present government. This, perhaps, is indicative of the problem which he has set the computers. I would defy him, and a number of other well-known forensic experts, to translate that expression in the exact sense he intended, that is, the question of the "foreseeability" of the present government.

I think this illustrates the nature of the problem. Language, French or perhaps even more particularly English, is capable of tremendous nuances, tremendous shades of meaning, part of which is conveyed by phonetics and inflections of speech, and part of which is conveyed by different pronunciations of different words spelled in the same way.

An hon. Member: And by shrugs.

Mr. Drury: Part of the meaning is conveyed in the order in which the same words are used. As yet we have not found a computer, even the largest, capable of programming, comprehending and producing all these shades and nuances which the human brain—perhaps the world's greatest computer—has been able to achieve in a number of instances.

For some time now the National Research Council has been supporting research work at the universities of Saskatchewan and Montreal, designed to produce a reasonable and practicable system of machine-translation from English into French. The hon. gentleman is probably well aware that considerable additional work is being done in this field, particularly in the United States, in languages rather less mundane than English and French—some of the eastern European languages and some Asiatic languages—but to date no one has achieved more than a rudimentary system of translation. This, of course, has to be extensively edited by a human computer or a person trained in translation.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

I think it is rather more likely that we will reach a level of bilingualism in primary, secondary and higher education in this country which will be more widely effective and more usable than the kind of machine program indicated here. We can now and in the reasonable future will be able to do primitive work, if nothing sophisticated.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

BROADCASTING—EFFECT OF CRTC DECISION RESPECTING CABLEVISION

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, this participation in the adjournment debate arises out of my dissatisfaction with an answer given me by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) as reported at page 92 of the English edition of *Hansard* of December 17. The question was a follow-up of questioning by myself and other members, on December 4, reported at pages 1587 and 1588 of *Hansard,* concerning the ruling announced on December 3 by the Canadian Radio-Television Commission denying the use of microwave or other technical systems for the importation of television programs from United States stations to Canadian markets.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Effectively, the ruling denies access to United States television for Canadians living too far from the United States border to receive the signal off the air, either directly or via community antenna television systems. This does not affect Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Ottawa or Montreal. It does deny United States television to Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, Saskatoon, Sudbury, Halifax and St. John's. No Canadian will dispute that the Canadian broadcasting system envisaged by the Broadcasting Act is essential to our national identity. Most will dispute that geographic discrimination has a valid place in the development of that policy.

The CRTC expressed concern about enlarging United States advertising markets in Canada. That consideration is purely fatuous. The CRTC is, or should be, well aware that it is entirely within the competence of today's technology to delay the signal and edit out the bulk of the commercial content. The advertising aspects of this competition can be readily resolved. The sanctity of the idea that cablevision must transmit the signal, the whole signal, and nothing but the signal, was destroyed on June 25, 1968, when cablevision companies were required to delete the eastern

election results from United States signals distributed in Vancouver while the polls were still open there.

In reaching its decision, the CRTC determined, "The fact that through force of circumstances many U.S. stations now cover other parts of Canada ... does not justify a decision ... which would further accelerate this process." The corollary of this position is: the fact that through force of circumstances many parts of Canada are not now covered by U.S. stations justifies a decision which would perpetuate this situation.

It is with considerable trepidation that an ordinary Canadian enters into the never-never world of the professional Canadian. But I am compelled to ask, does the CRTC really feel that it is serving the national interest by creating yet another division in an already overly-divided Canada: those who should be permitted access to U.S. stations because a fact of geography prevents the CRTC from denying such access, and those who shall be denied access to U.S. stations because a fact of geography permits the CRTC to deny such access? While the question of which are the first class citizens and which the second may be open to dispute by the professional Canadians, there is no doubt in so far as those who have been denied a right on purely geographic grounds are concerned.

Section 2(b) of the Broadcasting Act reads as follows:

> —the Canadian broadcasting system should be effectively owned and controlled by Canadians so as to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada;

It is in the execution of its mandate to achieve and maintain this basic purpose—and let it be emphasized that while "safeguard" embraces the concept of maintenance, "enrich and strengthen" embrace the concept of achievement—that the CRTC must justify its decision.

If, in the process of safeguarding the cultural, political, social and economic fabric of Canada, the CRTC is right in refusing a licence permitting "the enlargement of the Canadian audience and market areas of U.S. networks or stations" then surely, in the process of enriching and strengthening the same fabric, its obligation is to reduce the same audience and market areas where it can. This will involve the simple policy of not renewing existing CATV licences as they expire, except on condition that the applicants not distribute U.S. programs. Let us not only prevent the extension of this rupture in our cultural, political, social and economic fabric; let us also mend it where we can. Let us not only preserve the fabric where it remains intact; let us patch it where it has been torn. Let us not only safeguard the pure; let us enrich and strengthen those already corrupted.

When the Secretary of State first answered questions on this subject on December 4, I felt his instincts were right. He indicated that the decision "could very well justify a statement on motions" and, again, that the CRTC's autonomy did not prevent the government giving it guidelines. This instinctive reaction was the right reaction. It was, therefore, particularly disappointing to find, on December 17, that the minister had got his instincts well under control and was relying on the letter of the law. The commission is independent, and cannot be instructed by the government.

This ruling has profound political implications. It is the government, not the CRTC, that will be held politically accountable for the decision. Surely, with the adventures of another independent body, the Company of Young Canadians, rather fresh in its memory, the government recognizes that reality.

We were pretty happy with the work of the CYC in Calgary. That opinion was not shared in Montreal, and for very good reason. As far as I know, Montreal is reasonably happy with the CRTC. That opinion is not shared in Calgary, and for very good reason. Nor is it shared in Edmonton, Regina, Saskatoon, Sudbury, Halifax and St. John's for the same good reason.

We are all awaiting with interest to see if the government will react with the same vigour to the politically unacceptable conduct of the independent commission as it did to that of the independent company, or whether it has certain geographic priorities of its own.

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has observed, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission is an independent body established under the Broadcasting Act to supervise and ensure the development of the Canadian broadcasting system, free of partisan political control. If that act should be amended, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) would welcome the suggestions of hon. members. However, the Broadcasting Act, section 23, allows the Governor in Council to set aside or refer back to the commission for reconsideration its decision to issue, amend or renew a broadcasting licence, but there is no such authority in the case of a rejection of an

application, nor was any such authority suggested by the Secretary of State on December 4.

Because of the concern expressed by the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) and others, the House has already referred the annual report of the commission to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts to give members an early opportunity to explore this decision of the commission.

I understand that arrangements have been made for the chairman of the commission to appear before the committee this Thursday. There should then be a full opportunity to question him and to consider the matter fully. I hope all interested members will take this opportunity to study the question as carefully as it deserves and give the commission the benefit of their views.

COMBINES—REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF NICKEL PRICE INCREASES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, on November 27 I asked the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) whether the anti-combines division of his department would investigate the simultaneous increases in the price of nickel announced within two days by three of the major nickel producers of this country.

My question was motivated by the very sharp increase in the price of metals produced and sold in Canada and the disastrous effect these increases will have on the government's plea to all sectors of the Canadian economy that they exercise moderation and restraint so that the galloping increase in the cost of living might be moderate.

The *Financial Times* of January 5, 1970, reported that the price of lead in 1969 increased by 27 per cent; the price of nickel increased 24 per cent; zinc, 15 per cent; tin, 12 per cent; aluminum, 7 per cent and copper, about which we had some considerable discussion this afternoon, increased by 26 per cent. This does not include the latest increase which was announced and which the government persuaded the companies to put off for two months. This will increase the price of copper by 45 per cent in one year.

• (10:20 p.m.)

What happened? On October 25 the International Nickel Company of Canada announced that nickel prices were being increased by a record 24.8 per cent. Inco's new price for electrolytic refined metal was $1.28 (U.S.) per pound, up $1.03 (U.S.) per pound. Sherritt Gordon, another of the major producers, matched Inco's 25 cents a pound increase for nickel sold in the United States and overseas but raised its Canadian price by 23 cents a pound. The next day the third large producer, Falconbridge, completed the round of nickel price increases when it raised the base price of electrolytic nickel by 25 cents (U.S.) to $1.27 (U.S.) a pound f.o.b. Thorold.

The district organization of the United Steelworkers, the union which represents all the workers employed in the mining and processing of nickel, called on the Prices and Incomes Commission to hold a public hearing, offering to demonstrate on the basis of the research done by the union's research department that the companies' profits were so substantial there was no need to increase prices as they had done.

Industries affected were quick to announce that the sharp increases would inevitably and almost immediately lead to increases in their prices. Mr. Togham, President of Chrysler Canada Limited said—and this is reported in the *Globe and Mail* of October 26—that the 25 cent price increase in the metal was bound to increase the price of cars. Similarly, Mr. O.S. Leslie, President of Atlas Steels Limited, probably the biggest domestic user of nickel, said the new price increase was certain to have an effect on the cost and price of stainless steel.

I want to put on record the financial position of the companies concerned. One can find these figures in the *Financial Post*. The net income of International Nickel in 1967 was $141 million. In 1968 it showed a modest increase to $143 million, but the total assets had grown from $115 million to $396 million; in other words, by about $275 million in one year. This is a pretty substantial increase and one which does not indicate any need on the part of this company to increase its price by 24 per cent at one time.

Sherritt Gordon's net profit in 1966 amounted to $3,760,000. In the next year it had increased to $5,392,000, and I am sure 1968 showed a further increase. The net income of the Falconbridge Corporation dropped a little in 1968 as compared with 1967, from $25 million to $23 million. But the total assets increased from $248 million to $284 million, a substantial increase and one which would indicate that this company, too,

could very well have done without an increase at the time announced.

What I am saying is simply this: the anti-combines section of the hon. gentleman's department should exercise the responsibility given to it by the law to investigate these simultaneous and identical price increases, which in my submission indicate clearly that we have here a combine in any sense of the word and one which ought to be prosecuted to the end of obtaining an order to discontinue the kind of collusion which is obvious in the price increases announced in October, 1969.

Mr. Paul Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) first raised the matter of increases in nickel prices in the House of Commons on November 27, he requested the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) to ask the combines section of his department to investigate whether there had been illegal collusion. The minister replied, as reported at page 1305 of *Hansard:*

> The director of research under the Combines Investigation Act watches specific price movements and if there is a possibility of a breach of the act he has a statutory duty to take proceedings.

As the minister has pointed out, it has been the policy in the House for the minister responsible for the Combines Investigation Act not to reveal what inquiries are under way, in accordance with section 28 of the Combines Investigation Act, until such cases are either taken to court or reported in the annual report of the director. The minister remains aware of the price increases referred to by the hon. member, as does the director, who is keeping a watch on the situation in accordance with his usual practice. Identical price increases in such industries, however, are not by themselves strong evidence of collusion. I can only add that we can continue to expect proper enforcement of the legislation.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, January 14, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. HEES—TIME OF RELEASE OF PRICE INDEX FIGURES BY BUREAU OF STATISTICS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege to set the record straight on a matter of importance affecting the integrity of the government.

Yesterday I implied, by my question about who ordered the change in time for making public the monthly cost of living figures from 8 a.m. to half an hour after the House meets, that the government was employing some nefarious means of hiding the facts in an effort to blunt a possible attack on itself.

I have examined this situation carefully in the intervening 24 hours and I find that this variation in the time of release was made at the request of the Press Gallery to give the morning papers an even break on this important news each month. I also find to my great surprise that the minister who authorized this variation is none other than the present member for Prince Edward-Hastings.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

Third report of Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs—Mr. Tolmie.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—CANADIAN ACTION FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House would like to have the latest information we have received from Lagos. First, may I report to the House that the resolution passed last evening was forwarded within an hour to our High Commissioner in Lagos and delivered by him to the Nigerian authorities.

While we have not yet received the official report of the observer team, we have had a preliminary message from Brigadier General Drewry, who returned last night from the Third Division area. Major Bristoe, who went to the First Division area, is still in the field. Brigadier General Drewry visited Aba, Ikot-Ekpene, Umuahia and Owerri. He reports that the Biafran forces are surrendering en masse and discarding their uniforms and equipment. He found no evidence of any atrocities. The physical condition of the refugees is much better than was feared, and they are being fed by the army wherever possible.

Brigadier General Drewry reports that the military authorities in the area are confident that they can cope with the refugees and prisoners of war problems in their areas of responsibility, and that the Nigerians are determined to sort out their relief problems on their own. Brigadier General Drewry's message refers, however, to the shortage of trucks which is also underlined by the report we have today received from our High Commissioner in Lagos.

The problem of delivery of food and drugs has been greatly simplified by the Biafran collapse. Road and river routes are now open and delivery distances are much shorter.

Although there is reassurance in the reports I have received, no one would wish to underestimate the gravity of the problems in the battle area and Eastern Nigeria generally.

One of these problems appears to be the shortage of trucks. We have already made money available which can be used by the Nigerians to purchase trucks locally. The government has instructed CIDA to check urgently the availability of suitable trucks in Canada and is investigating means of delivery. As the House knows, our Hercules aircraft remain on the alert, and are available for delivery purposes to Nigeria or a neighbouring country if this proves to be feasible.

The House will also be interested to learn that we are contributing $200,000 to UNICEF to support its increased program in Nigeria.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the statement made by the Secretary

of State for External Affairs was intended to give comfort, but it certainly does not do so.

• (2:10 p.m.)

It is clear that the government has received no word from the government of Nigeria with respect to the approval of any plan to provide relief through Canairelief or any other agency. Indeed, to judge from the rebuff received by the British in their attempt to make arrangements to fly in a modest amount of medical and other supplies there is every reason to believe that the government of Nigeria does not intend to accept assistance from outside. This would not be a cause for concern if there were not widespread fear of genocide and if there were confidence that the government of Nigeria was sufficiently well organized and had the capacity to bring the massive relief to these areas which is necessary immediately. Some, at least, who are familiar with the area—and I understand this view was expressed to the committee last night—doubt very much that the Nigerian authorities, including the armed forces, are in a position to make this kind of relief available.

We are confronted here with a very serious situation. This government all along has pursued a policy the only justification for which was that it would enable the government to remain on friendly terms with the government of Nigeria and thus be in a position to be helpful after hostilities ceased. This attitude prevented the government from furnishing relief to starving Nigerians on a scale which would have been possible while the fighting was going on. It looks, now, as though it will produce nothing at all by way of results. Meanwhile, as far as one can judge the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the government are sitting quietly by, sending messages to Nigeria and getting a certain amount of information from our observer team but taking no steps at all to bring home to the government of Nigeria the concern of the civilized world, not about the intentions of the government of Nigeria, which we are not entitled to assume are ill, but about its capacity and ability to prevent massive starvation, as well as our concern that the civilized world should not be prevented at this time from affording the relief which it is in a position to supply.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: This situation, in which there are masses of people in danger of starvation while outside countries are in a position to assure that this danger can be relieved if they are permitted to take action in co-operation with the constituted authorities, is surely absurd. I do not think the government is doing anything like enough to bring home to the government of Nigeria the concern felt about this situation by the people of Canada and, indeed, of the world.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: The government has evidently indicated that it is prepared to make more observers available but we have not even yet received an assurance from the minister that he or any minister of the government has urged or, indeed, insisted that the international observer team be enlarged so that it can do a proper job.

Mr. Sharp: How do you insist?

Mr. Stanfield: You do so by making representations directly—

Mr. Sharp: That is what I did.

Mr. Stanfield: —which the hon. gentleman did not do.

Mr. Sharp: Oh yes, I have.

Mr. Stanfield: Furthermore, you participate in organizing civilized opinion. Other countries are interested in this situation, and the United Nations is still in existence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: The Secretary of State for External Affairs has the responsibility. If he wants us to exercise that responsibility we shall exercise it. I say to him that the kind of complacency indicated during recent days and in his statement today is unfortunate. The hon. gentleman refers to a shortage of trucks. I pointed out on Monday—it was not just my idea; it was recognized generally—that there would be a shortage of trucks and suggested that Hercules aircraft should be made available to fly them into the area of difficulty. The Secretary of State for External Affairs cavalierly dismissed this as an impractical suggestion. Yet today, two days later, he is bringing it forward as his own idea.

I urge the government, particularly the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs, to exert pressure and influence upon the government of Nigeria, and I do this for two reasons.

Mr. Sharp: Patronize them; treat them as inferiors: that is the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: The first reason is to make certain that a tragedy does not occur. The second is to ensure that other countries, such as Canada, are permitted by the government of Nigeria to co-operate with the Nigerian people in avoiding a great tragedy. There is no sign in the statement of the minister that the government is taking the necessary measures.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, in the face of the vast, unfolding tragedy which is taking place in Nigeria I can take no comfort from the statement of the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I am glad that the message contained in the resolution unanimously passed by the House last night has been so quickly conveyed to our High Commissioner in Lagos. May I suggest that in order to underline it the government adopt a procedure which has been adopted before and send a special envoy to speak to the Nigerian head of state about this matter. We do not think that the normal diplomatic channels are adequate for the purpose of conveying the urgency of this message. Having unanimously passed the resolution we think it requires more immediate action than that available through the usual channels, which have not been too effective in the past.

We are not in the least bit reassured by the soothing words of the military observers. Often before they have issued soothing statements having had very little real opportunity for observation. The function they performed before was to blind the eyes of the people of the world to what was going on.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Brewin: Hon. members say "shame", and I say shame too. Nevertheless the fact is, whether members of the government wish to acknowledge it or not, that these observers have issued soothing reports in the past which have turned out to be without foundation.

Mr. Sharp: These are Canadians you are talking about.

Mr. Brewin: Let the government not shelter behind these people who, as I say, do not have adequate means or opportunity to observe what is going on.

Another part of the statement indicates the complacency of the government in that the minister said that the problem of food and drugs has been greatly simplified by the Biafran collapse. That is, of course, true if you look at the situation in the long term. However, the reason a committee of this House urged immediate action in regard to the supplies that are available in Sao Tomé was that the committee knew that the ultimate solution of delivering food and drugs via land routes could not come about at once and that there was an immediate need for the supplies that were available. Somehow the urgency of this message of the committee has not registered itself on the government; if it had we would not have had the kind of complacent statement we have been given today.

I want to emphasize once again that in expressing itself through the resolution presented by the committee this House has said that the only immediate answer is to use the supplies in Sao Tomé and to urge the Nigerian government to accept the offer of those personnel who can do what is required now. I believe that chaos and starvation, hardly paralleled in history, exist. I hope I am wrong in deducing from the statement of the minister that we are really having a continuation of the complacency to which we have become accustomed.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, in his statement, the minister informed us that following the resolution passed last evening concerning Canada's position on the Nigerian policy, a message was forwarded to our High Commissioner in Lagos. This is a commendable action, but it is practically the only thing to be learned from the minister's statement.

The minister states that he received reports from both Canadian observers in the field; those reports are quite at variance with those we heard last night during the session of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Last night, a representative of Canairelief actually told us that if major steps were not taken within 72 hours, most people located in the Biafran sector would die, and the statement had already been made several hours before.

It is therefore obvious today that nothing has yet been done to remedy the situation. The minister has merely forwarded to our High Commissioner in Lagos the motion passed unanimously last night. Considering

what the government is now doing, we can only admit that its policy copies much too closely that of Great Britain on the Nigerian-Biafran problem.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Laprise: We were informed last night that Britain had to order the unloading of an aircraft full of drugs which was ready to fly to Nigeria, because General Gowon refused to allow a military plane to fly over his country. Yet, when it was a matter of sending military planes to fight Biafra, General Gowon agreed, and Britain did not hesitate to send them. We were told, yesterday afternoon, that Canada is prepared at a few minutes' notice, to send by air to Nigeria, a portable hospital and that it is still awaiting General Gowon's permission.

In connection with this war which has been going on for three or four years in Nigeria, we see the wish of one tribe to annihilate another. In spite of the unconditional surrender made three or four days ago, we find that the same tribe still wants to destroy the Ibos.

I suggest, therefore, that strong measures be taken. If it is necessary to make General Gowon understand these things through force, or else if aristocracy can serve any purpose at the United Nations, it is time to see to it.

[*English*]

HARBOURS

TABLING OF REPORT ON PORT OF CHURCHILL

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, because of the interest to all hon. members and the public, and in light of the commitment I made some time ago, I have the honour to submit a report intitled "Port of Churchill—Potential for Development" in the two official languages.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INVESTIGATION OF DEATH OF SEALS

Question No. 84—**Mr. Harding:**

1. Has the Department of Fisheries and Forestry undertaken an investigation of the 3,000 to 10,000 seals which died in the Gulf of St. Lawrence last spring when they were caught in a vast oil slick near the Strait of Belle Isle and, if so, what are the results of this investigation?

2. What action is contemplated by the Department to prevent further occurrences of oil pollution?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. Yes. There was no oil slick in the Strait of Belle Isle. While a number of seals there were covered with oil in varying degree, some of these animals bore tags which were affixed about three weeks earlier off northwestern Prince Edward Island where there was an oily layer on the water at the time of tagging. This oil is presumed to have come from an accidental spill at Cape Tormentine, New Brunswick, on the night of January 30, 1969, which ran into the harbour and under the shore ice before corrective action could be taken. Some seals died from the oil pollution, but it is felt the numbers reported have been greatly exaggerated.

2. Contingency plans for nullifying the adverse effects of oil spills have been developed. There is also a growing awareness amongst users of oil of the need to prevent occurrences of this nature.

RATE OF RETURN AND EARNINGS, BELL CANADA

Question No. 119—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. For the years 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969, what was the permissible rate of return for Bell Canada under the regulation of the Canadian Transport Commission?

2. For the same years what was Bell Canada's actual earnings on the rate of return?

3. Will the Government of Canada rescind the September 29 ruling of the Canadian Transport Commission which allowed an assortment of increases of service charges?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advise as follows: 1. No regulation was made. However, by Judgment dated May 4, 1966, the Board of Transport Commissioners for Canada found the over-all rate structure of the Company to be just and reasonable at that time by reference to a permissive level of earning ranging from 6.2 per cent to 6.6 per cent on total average capitalization. By decision dated September 25, 1969, the Railway Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission decided not to fix a permissive level of earnings at this time.

2. 1966, 6.5 per cent; 1967, 6.8 per cent; 1968, 6.9 per cent; 1969, not available.

3. The matter of review and appeal of orders or decisions of the Canadian Transport Commission is governed by sections 52 and 53 of the Railway Act.

ESTIMATE RESPECTING ARCTIC SHIPPING

Question No. 140—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What is the breakdown of the one billion dollar estimate stated by the Minister of Transport if commercial shipping begins using Canada's Arctic?

2. Is the above estimate based on any comprehensive study, and if so, who are the authors of this study?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. No firm estimate was given. Figure was used to represent order of magnitude that might be involved, having regard for the possible need for a few very large icebreakers, some aids to navigation and probable extensive harbour works at various points including dredging and protection from ice. The harbour component might well be provided by private enterprise.

2. Answered by 1 above.

ROBBERY, VIOLENCE—PERSONS UNDER 25 ARRESTED

Question No. 189—**Mr. Mather:**

What percentage of persons arrested for robbery or crimes of violence are under 25 years of age?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: Information available in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, for the years 1963 to 1967, is shown in the following table.

It should be pointed out, however, that not all persons arrested by the police appear in court; some are sent to mental hospitals and some have charges dropped before appearing in court. In addition, many Juveniles appear "informally" and these cases need not be reported to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

Sources: Statistics of Criminal and Other Offences (DBS Pub. No. 85-201) Juvenile Delinquents (DBS Pub. No. 85-202).

PERSONS CHARGED AND CONVICTED FOR CRIMES AGAINST PROPERTY WITH VIOLENCE

		Persons charged	Persons convicted	Adults under 25 years of age	Percentage of persons charged were under 25	Juveniles		Percentage of children who appeared before the Court
						Appeared before the court	Found delinquent	
1963	Breaking and entering a place	8,081	7,655	5,524	68.4	4,230	3,817	90.2
	Extortion	38	32	14	36.8	17	14	82.4
	Forcible entry and detainer	53	39	14	26.4	—	—	—
	Robbery	870	763	476	54.7	32	28	87.5
	Robbery while armed	223	212	140	62.8	5	5	100.0
	Crimes against property with violence	9,265	8,701	6,168	66.6	4,284	3,864	90.2
1964	Breaking and entering a place	7,689	7,288	5,392	70.1	4,592	4,246	92.5
	Extortion	29	21	16	55.2	9	6	66.7
	Forcible entry and detainer	35	22	5	14.3	—	—	—
	Robbery	954	824	509	53.4	113	105	92.9
	Robbery while armed	271	244	143	52.8	5	4	80.0
	Crimes against property with violence	8,978	8,399	6,065	67.6	4,719	4,361	92.4
1965	Breaking and entering a place	7,351	6,950	5,091	69.3	4,521	4,037	89.3
	Extortion	36	31	20	55.6	6	6	100.0
	Forcible entry and detainer	40	22	8	20.0	—	—	—
	Robbery	941	798	469	49.9	88	80	90.9
	Robbery while armed	244	224	124	50.8	9	7	77.8
	Breaking and entering while armed	2	2	1	50.0	—	—	—
	Crimes against property with violence	8,614	8,027	5,713	66.3	4,624	4,130	89.3
1966	Breaking and entering a place	7,404	6,919	5,198	69.4	4,847	4,322	89.2
	Extortion	33	23	12	36.4	9	5	55.6
	Forcible entry and detainer	41	29	12	29.3	—	—	—
	Robbery	1,008	822	520	51.6	78	67	85.8
	Robbery while armed	190	172	88	46.3	9	9	100.0
	Crimes against property with violence	8,676	7,965	5,830	67.2	4,943	4,403	89.1
1967	Breaking and entering a place	7,749	7,165	5,330	68.8	5,309	4,775	89.9
	Extortion	37	28	15	40.5	12	12	100.0
	Forcible entry and detainer	21	16	7	33.3	5	1	20.0
	Robbery	986	827	497	50.4	106	89	84.0
	Robbery while armed	162	143	81	50.0	4	4	100.0
	Crimes against property with violence	8,955	8,179	5,930	66.2	5,436	4,881	89.8

AIRPORT NOISE ABATEMENT PROCEDURES

Question No. 197—**Mr. Goode:**

What noise abatement procedures and rules are enforced and planned by the Department of Transport at the following international airports: Vancouver, Toronto and Montreal with regard to (a) take-off and landings of commercial aircraft (b) run-ups of jet aircraft engines on standing aircraft and (c) run-ups of jet aircraft engines being repaired after removal from aircraft?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Vancouver—(a) None; (b) None; (c) None.

Toronto and Montreal—Special procedures for the abatement of aircraft noise are applicable to all turbo-jet aircraft.

(a) Runways at these airports have been assessed from the viewpoint of noise abatement and an order of preference established for their operational use. Whenever practicable and considering wind and weather conditions, the most preferential runway will be used.

At Montreal, where residential development is close to the airport, departing jet aircraft follow a noise abatement climb technique until they are 2,000 feet above ground level. This procedure is no longer in effect at Toronto where it has been determined that most aircraft can attain 2,500 feet above ground level prior to overflying residential areas.

With respect to arriving jet aircraft every effort is made to ensure that: Turns on to final approach are completed at least six miles from the runway; the use of thrust, undercarriage and flaps shall, consistent with safety, give the best possible performance with respect to noise abatement; the aircraft maintains an altitude of 2,000 feet above ground level as long as practicable before commencing final descent to the runway, and when conditions permit, the aircraft remains on or slightly above the approach slope angle as projected by the landing aids in use for the runway. (b) None. (c) None.

C.N.R. PENSIONS

Question No. 206—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1 How many retired employees of the Canadian National Railways are in receipt of pensions of less than $25.00 per month?

2. How many are in receipt of a pension of $25.00 per month?

3. How many are in receipt of pensions of (a) $25.01 to $29.99 per month (b) $30.00 to $39.99 per month (c) $40.00 to $49.99 per month (d) $50.00 to $59.99 per month (e) $60.00 to $69.99 per month (f) $70.00 to $79.99 per month (g) $80.00 to $89.99 per month (h) $90.00 to $99.99 per month (i) $100.00 to $124.99 per month; (j) $125.00 to $149.99 per month (k) $150.00 to $199.99 per month (l) $200.00 to $299.99 per month (m) $300 per month or over?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: The information shown being as of December 31st, 1968. 1. 387.

2. 2,165.

3.

Amount of Pension				Number
$		$		
25.01	to	29.99	a month	594
30.00	to	39.99	a month	1,178
40.00	to	49.99	a month	953
50.00	to	59.99	a month	874
60.00	to	69.99	a month	771
70.00	to	79.99	a month	833
80.00	to	89.99	a month	864
90.00	to	99.99	a month	1,019
100.00	to	124.99	a month	2,421
125.00	to	149.99	a month	2,260
150.00	to	199.99	a month	3,694
200.00	to	299.99	a month	4,907
300.00	and over			2,891

In a number of cases the amounts of pensions paid by Canadian National Railways do not represent the total pensions payable to employees for railway service. Pensions payable by the C.N.R. to international employees (service in both Canada and the United States) relate to their service in Canada only. Such employees also receive annuities payable under the U.S. Railroad Retirement Act or the Social Security Act for service performed in the United States. For example, in the group receiving pensions of under $25 from the C.N.R., there are sixty-three former international employees who also receive U.S. Railroad Retirement or Social Security annuities in respect of C.N.R. service rendered in the United States. The balance of this group consists of employees who elected early retirement (before age 65) with reduced basic ($25) pensions, and employees who had very short service and small contributions.

Questions

C.N.R. PENSION FUNDS

Question No. 207—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. What was the total amount of money on the books of the pension funds of the Canadian National Railways as at (a) December 31, 1964 (b) December 31, 1965 (c) December 31, 1966 (d) December 31, 1967 (e) December 31, 1968?

2. What rate of interest does the C.N.R. pay on this money?

3. What amount of interest was credited to the above noted pension funds during the year ending (a) December 31, 1964 (b) December 31, 1965 (c) December 31, 1966 (d) December 31, 1967 (e) December 31, 1968?

4. What was the total amount paid out of the above noted funds in pensions during the years ending (a) December 31, 1964 (b) December 31, 1965 (c) December 31, 1966 (d) December 31, 1967 (e) December 31, 1968?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. The total amounts of the investments, cash and other current assets on the books of the Pension Trust Funds were: As at 31 December 1964, $531,627,361; 31 December 1965, $575,887,009; 31 December 1966, $626,818,658; 31 December 1967, $684,962,758; 31 December 1968, $743,321,106.

2. The C.N.R. does not pay interest on these assets which are held separately in the Pension Trust Funds.

3. Net earnings on the investments of the Pension Trust Funds were: Year ended 31 December 1964, $23,830,471; 31 December 1965, $25,932,593; 31 December 1966, $28,763,156; 31 December 1967, $34,541,149; 31 December 1968, $39,214,027.

4. Total amounts of the pensions paid out of the Pension Trust Funds were: Year ended 31 December 1964, $32,145,649; 31 December 1965, $34,575,142; 31 December 1966, $37,595,615; 31 December 1967, $40,688,714; 31 December 1968, $46,065,616.

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—MARKET ANALYSIS BRANCH

Question No. 224—**Mr. Peters:**

1. Who are the staff members of the Market Analysis Branch of the Office of Economics in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and what are their respective salaries and classifications?

2. What specific studies have been undertaken by the Market Analysis Branch of the Office of Economics?

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

[Mr. Loiselle.]

1. Name	Classification	Salary range: $19,000-23,500 Annual Salaries $
A. M. Coll	ES5	
A. C. Kilbank	ES4	22,522
R. J. Konecny	ES3	19,781
W. L. Posthumus	ES3	19,781
J. T. B. Kingston	ES2	16,656
H. D. Henderson	ES2	14,553
J. W. Duncker	ES2	14,553
W. P. K. Collins	ES2	13,434
N. S. St. Jacques	ES1	10,946
M. K. McMullen	ES1	10,680
D. J. Ireland	ES1	9,180
C. H. Iwasaki (Miss)	ES1	9,180
R. S. Foster	S1 2	9,408
H. Scobie	S1 2	9,079
E. Modler (Miss)	CR4	6,918
E. M. Matheson (Miss)	CR4	6,918
C. R. Gervais	CR4	6,502
D. C. Duquette (Mrs.)	ST5	6,191
P. M. Sibue (Mrs.)	CR3	5,818
P. A. Chenier	CR3	5,632
J. A. Dean (Miss)	CR3	5,632
S. Noack (Miss)	ST3	4,806
B. G. Armstrong (Mrs.)	ST3	4,646

2. The resources of the branches of the Office of Economics are directed primarily to the provision of analytical background, briefing and advice required for the development and implementation of Departmental policies and programs and for dealing with particular issues requiring the attention of the Department. Thus the output of the Office consists mainly of analytical material which comprises an integral part of departmental decisions and operations and does not take the form of independent, self-contained studies in published form.

The Market Analysis Branch maintains a continuous forward-looking analysis of significant developments in major farm, forest, mineral and energy sectors, and in the principal manufacturing industries. The branch also undertakes research into the economic aspects of industrial growth and organization, into the effects of tariffs and other factors affecting Canadian industries and into the structure and trend of foreign country markets and international commodity markets.

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—GENERAL ANALYSIS BRANCH

Question No. 225—**Mr. Peters:**

1. Who are the staff members of the General Analysis Branch of the Office of Economics in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and what are their respective classifications and annual salaries?

2. What specific studies have been undertaken by the General Analysis Branch of the Office of Economics?

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

Name	Classification	Salary Range
C. Schwartz	ES5	$19,000-23,500 Annual Salaries
F. Piscopo	ES3	$ 19,781
H. Smale	ES2	18,124
D. F. McKinley	ES2	16,656
M. Brennan (Mrs.)	ES2	14,553
P. Johal	ES1	8,280
M. Carlin (Miss)	S12	9,079
D. Labelle (Mrs.)	S12	9,079
W. Maloley (Miss)	ST5	6,191
E. Love (Miss)	CR4	6,710
N. Burroughs (Mrs.)	CR3	5,632
M. Scharf (Mrs.)	CR2	4,842

2. The resources of the branches of the Office of Economics are directed primarily to the provision of analytical background, briefing and advice required for the development and implementation of departmental policies and programs and for dealing with particular issues requiring the attention of the department. Thus the output of the office consists mainly of analytical material which comprises an integral part of departmental decisions and operations and does not take the form of independent, self-contained studies in published form.

The work of the General Analysis Branch involves the continuing assessment of Canada's over-all economic and trade performance and related domestic and international developments.

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—PRODUCTIVITY BRANCH

Question No. 226—**Mr. Peters:**

1. Who are the staff members of the Productivity Branch of the Office of Economics in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and what are their respective classifications and annual salaries?

2. What specific studies have been undertaken by the Productivity Branch of the Office of Economics?

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

Name	Classification	Salary Range
I. Bernolak	ES5	$19,000-23,500 Annual Salaries
G. G. McLeod	ES4	$ 22,522
J. G. Snaauw	ES3	20,523
L. E. Drayton	ES3	20,523
G. H. O. Dines	ES3	19,039
L. E. Turner	ES3	18,294
R. C. Gilstorf	ES2	18,124
F. Mizerovsky	ES2	17,394
F. Torontow (Miss)	CR4	6,918
A. M. Connolly (Miss)	ST5	6,191
I. Smith (Mrs.)	ST5	5,632
C. Daniel (Mrs.)	ST4	5,234

2. The resources of the branches of the Office of Economics are directed primarily to the provision of analytical background, briefing and advice required for the development and implementation of departmental policies and programs and for dealing with particular issues requiring the attention of the Department. Thus the output of the office consists mainly of analytical material which comprises an integral part of Departmental decisions and operations and does not take the form of independent, self-contained studies in published form.

The work of the Productivity Branch involves the analysis of industrial productivity and the assessment of the significance of factors contributing to productivity changes and variations, such as technological progress, management performance, specialization, and size of plant including the development of measures to facilitate inter-industry, inter-firm, international and trend 'comparisons'.

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—INVESTMENT ANALYSIS BRANCH

Question No. 227—**Mr. Peters:**

1. What specific studies have been undertaken by the Investment Analysis Branch of the Office of Economics in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on programs related to foreign investment in Canada, Canadian investment abroad and the operators of international companies?

2. Who are the staff members of the Investment Analysis Branch of the Office of Economics in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and what are their respective classifications and annual salaries?

Questions

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The Investment Analysis Branch is engaged in the following specific areas of work relating to foreign investment: (a) The implementation of follow-up action to the issuance of "Some Guiding Principles of Good Corporate Behaviour" including the collection, quarterly and annually, of data from the larger foreign-owned subsidiaries in Canada on various aspects of their operations and financing. The information is useful in assessing performance of foreign-owned subsidiaries in relation to objectives set out in the guiding principles and contributes to a better understanding of their role in the Canadian economy. An initial report on the results of these surveys was published in 1967 under the title "Foreign-owned Subsidiaries in Canada". An updated report is now nearing completion; (b) The monitoring of overseas capital transfers by non-financial companies in Canada which is necessary as part of an arrangement with the United States under which Canada is exempted from U.S. regulations affecting capital flows; (c) The maintenance of an intelligence system on the ownership and structure of international concerns operating in Canada and of Canadian companies with investments abroad; (d) The examination, as required for departmental purposes, of the impact and implications of various aspects of foreign investment in Canada; (e) The review as required for departmental purposes, of foreign government actions affecting international direct investment which may have an impact on Canada.

2.

Name	Classification	Salary range
J. H. Latimer	ES5	$19,000-23,500

		Annual Salaries $
R. J. Loosmore	ES3	20,523
A. N. Polianski	ES3	19,781
N. S. Hutchinson	ES2	16,066
T. R. Vout	ES2	18,124
G. E. McKinley	ES1	12,049
G. N. Grant	ES1	11,468
G. H. Kitchen	ES1	10,140
D. J. MacRae	ES1	9,360
U. K. Feige	ES1	6,360
E. M. Mulligan	S1.5	13,461
J. B. Caluori	S1.3	10,128
W. J. Charters	S1.2	9,079
E. F. Edwards (Mrs.)	S1.2	8,420
D. J. Sibue	S1.2	9,408
J. P. Burant	CR4	6,294
L. W. Kennedy	CR4	6,294
R. O. Paquette	CR4	6,294

[Mr. Peters.]

Name	Classification	Annual Salaries $
C. S. Pearl (Mrs.)	CR4	6,294
J. E. Mason	CR3	6,191
D. M. Mantil (Mrs.)	CR2	4,543
N. W. Charron (Mrs.)	ST5	6,191
C. T. Poole (Miss)	ST4	5,234
I. Hoffman (Miss)	ST3	4,806
J. A. Mullins (Miss)	ST3	4,806

BASLE CONFERENCE "NUCLEX 69"—PROMOTION EXPENSES

Question No. 249—**Mr. Gilbert:**

What is the breakdown in the sharing of promotion expenses between (a) Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (b) Eldorado Nuclear Limited and (c) private Canadian firms, regarding the triennial Basle Conference, called Nuclex 69, this year in Switzerland?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): This exhibit was sponsored by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as part of its 1969-70 Trade Fair Program.

There were nine participants whose contributions were based on the formula employed by the Department in all such events. This requires payment of a flat fee per square foot, the same for all participants, and a higher percentage of cost depending upon the number of occasions on which the same exhibitor has participated. (i.e. 25 per cent of cost of space for 1st time exhibitors, 50 per cent of space cost for second time exhibitors, 75 per cent of cost of space for 3rd time exhibitors and 100 per cent of space cost for fourth time exhibitors.)

On this basis charges were made to: (a) Atomic Energy of Canada Limited (1st time exhibitor), $1,750.00; (b) Eldorado Nuclear Limited (2nd time exhibitor), $576.00; (c) Seven private Canadian firms (1st and 2nd time exhibitors), $2,794.50; Total $5,120.50.

In addition, contributions for an official reception were made by participants on a voluntary basis in the following amounts: (a) Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, $300; (b) Eldorado Nuclear Limited, $200; (c) Seven private Canadian firms, $659; Total $1,159.

QUALIFICATIONS OF UNEMPLOYED

Question No. 283—**Mr. Stewart (Marquette):**

1. For the years 1961, 1963, 1965 and 1968, of the total number of unemployed in Canada, how many had (a) some elementary schooling or less (b)

completed elementary schooling (c) some high school (d) completed high school (e) some university (f) University degree?

2. For the years 1961, 1963, 1965 and 1968, of the total number of unemployed in Canada, how many last worked in (a) agriculture (b) primary industries (c) manufacturing (d) construction (e) services (f) transportation and communications?

3. For the years 1961, 1963, 1965 and 1968, of the total number of unemployed in Canada, how many in their last employment were employed in the following occupations (a) managerial (b) professional and technical (c) clerical (d) sales (e) farm workers (f) fishermen, trappers and hunters (g) miners and quarrymen (h) skilled tradesmen (i) semi-skilled tradesmen (j) labourers?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1, 2 and 3. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics does not have this information for all the years requested or by each of the levels of education, the industries or occupation groups specified. However, the following tables compiled from available data may be helpful:

TABLE I

Unemployed persons, 14 years of age and over, by level of education, Canada
February 1960,(1) 1965 and 1967
(estimates in thousands)

	1967	1965	1960(1)
TOTAL	396	397	553
Some elementary school education or less(2)	141	148	242
Completed elementary school education	90	96	145
Some high school education	118	116	124
Completed high school education or more	47	37	42

(1) Excludes persons on temporary lay-off up to 30 days, estimated at 44,000 in February 1960.
(2) Includes persons with "no schooling".

Source: DBS Labour Force Survey.

TABLE II

Unemployed by industry group(1), Canada 12-month averages 1961, 1963, 1965 and 1968
(estimates in thousands)

	1968	1965	1963	1961
ALL INDUSTRIES	382	280	374	466
Primary industries(2)	38	36	51	67
Manufacturing	85	57	78	104
Construction	68	53	73	99
Transportation and other utilities(3)	31	25	35	44
Trade	44	30	42	52
Service(4)	76	53	64	68
Never worked(5)	40	26	31	32

(1) Classified by industry of last employment.
(2) Includes agriculture, forestry, fishing and trapping, and mines, quarries, oil wells.
(3) Includes transportation, storage, communication, and electric power, gas and water utilities.
(4) Includes community, business and personal service, public administration, and finance, insurance, real estate.
(5) Comprises unemployed persons who never had a full-time civilian job lasting two weeks or more.

Source: DBS Labour Force Survey.

TABLE III

Unemployed by occupation group[1], Canada 12-month averages 1961, 1963, 1965 and 1968
(estimates in thousands)

	1968	1965	1963	1961
ALL OCCUPATIONS	382	280	374	466
Office and professional[2]	66	40	55	64
Transportation	21	20	30	40
Service and recreation	40	29	35	39
Primary[3]	34	31	46	59
Craftsmen, production process and related workers	125	82	113	148
Labourers[4]	54	52	64	84
Never worked[5]	40	26	31	32

(1) Classified by occupation of last employment.
(2) Includes managerial, professional and technical, clerical, sales, and communication occupations.
(3) Includes farming, fishing, trapping, logging, and mining occupations.
(4) Includes labourers and unskilled workers not farming, fishing, logging, or mining.
(5) Comprises unemployed persons who never had a full-time civilian job lasting two weeks or more.

Source: DBS Labour Force Survey.

SALE OF HMCS "BONAVENTURE"

Question No. 342—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Has the government offered for sale the 22,000 ton aircraft carrier *HMCS Bonaventure* and, if so, what are the terms of sale and the asking price?

2. Have bids been invited from other countries on this ship?

3. Will bids from other countries on this ship be acceptable to Canada and, if not, what are the names of countries whose bids are unacceptable to Canada?

4. Will the bill of sale on the *Bonaventure* be conditional, so that it cannot be resold to any country unacceptable to the Canadian Government?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes. The terms of sale and asking price are subject to negotiation.

2. Yes.

3. Bids from foreign governments would be assessed relative to established Canadian Government policy and regulations regarding the export of military equipment.

4. Yes. Conditions of sale would include this provision.

FUNDS FOR LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSING ELIMINATION

Question No. 353—**Mr. Harkness:**

1. How much money has been made available in each of the past ten years for the purpose of eliminating level railway crossings on the Trans-Canada and other main highways?

2. How much money is it planned to be made available for this purpose during each of the coming five years?

[Mr. Pepin.]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. The records of the Canadian Transport Commission and the former Board of Transport Commissioners have not been maintained in a manner to differentiate between the Trans-Canada and other main highways, or other designated types of thoroughfares, where money has been applied from the Railway Grade Crossing Fund for the elimination of level crossings. In the past 10 years contributions from the Railway Grade Crossing Fund have been authorized in the following amounts towards the cost of construction of new grade separations and/or highway or railway diversions for the purpose of eliminating existing level highway railway crossings: 1959, $11,121,399.03; 1960, $10,084,244.96; 1961, $8,870,527.43; 1962, $10,909,940.99; 1963, $6,439,091.99; 1964, $10,672,076.28; 1965, $9,708,350.12; 1966, $13,301,414.06; 1967, $14,707,363.98; 1968, $12,859,896.51; Total $108,674,305.35.

2. The amount to be made available will be determined by the appropriation voted annually by Parliament.

SALE OF HMCS "BONAVENTURE"

Question No. 367—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Are efforts being made to sell the *HMCS Bonaventure* and on what terms?

2. What agency or agencies of the government are pursuing enquiries as to potential buyers?

3. What would be any restrictions or conditions which might be applicable to such a sale?

4. In the event of no satisfactory buyer being available, would it be proposed to scrap the *Bonaventure*?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes. The terms of sale and asking price are subject to negotiation.

2. The Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Supply and Services.

3. Apart from normal commercial conditions, bids would be assessed relative to established Canadian government policy and regulations regarding the export of military equipment.

4. Yes, after having removed all equipment of any value.

RAILWAY CAR CONSTRUCTION FOR CNR

Question No. 400—**Mr. Latulippe:**

1. Has the C.N.R. awarded an exclusive contract amounting to $10,000,000 to the National Steel Car of Montreal for the construction of railway cars?

2. Did the National Steel Car have all the cars built in Hamilton, Ontario and, if so, why was part of the work not carried out in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Following an invitation to tender sent to five firms and pursuant to the Company's policy respecting awarding of contracts an order was placed with National Steel Car Corporation, the low bidder, for the construction of 500 box cars at a total cost of approximately $10,000,000.

2. The information requested is not within the knowledge of the Railway.

SECURITY PERSONNEL, PORT OF VANCOUVER

Question No. 454—**Mr. Winch:**

1. Was a recommendation made by National Harbours Board Security Director, Donald Cassidy of Ottawa, that the security personnel in the Port of Vancouver should be changed to a dockyard police force?

2. Was the reason for this recommendation that it was felt necessary to introduce an experienced force of qualified policemen to ensure that Vancouver's reputation of having a low pilferage and damage rate was maintained and, if so, was any provision made for former personnel to receive special training in order to be accepted on the new police force?

3. Were any accepted and, if not, were they given alternative employment?

4. Was a decision made by the National Harbours Board for a similar change in Halifax and, if so (a) are former personnel being given the opportunity of training in order to qualify for the change-over (b) was the procedure similar to that followed in Vancouver and, if not, for what reason?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The National Harbours Board advises as follows: 1. Yes, as part of the reorganization of the N.H.B. Police along professional lines comparable to other major police forces in Canada.

2. Yes. Security personnel were invited to make application for employment on the new police force.

3. Yes.

4. Yes.

SASKATCHEWAN EMERGENCY MEASURES ORGANIZATION

Question No. 472—**Mr. Skoberg:**

What agreement has the Saskatchewan Emergency Measures Organization entered into with the State of Montana, U.S.A., in so far as the co-operative emergency arrangements and civil planning is concerned?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No agreement has as yet been entered into between Saskatchewan and the State of Montana concerning co-operative emergency planning arrangements.

DC-3 AIRCRAFT CRASH—ALTIMETER SETTING GIVEN BY TIMMINS AERADIO STATION

Question No. 482—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the altimeter setting given to the pilots of the DC-3 aircraft by the Aeradio Station operators at Timmins, Ontario, before it crashed on November 10, killing its crew of two?

2. Did the Aeradio Station operators at Timmins, Ontario, receive confirmation from the crew of the DC-3 that the altimeter setting information was received?

3. When was the barometric pressure recording instrument, that was used by the Aeradio Station operators at Timmins to ascertain the current altimeter setting, last checked or calibrated to prove its accuracy?

4. Was the DC-3 aircraft carrying a Radar Altimeter and, if so, was it functioning at the time of the crash?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The accident of the DC-3 aircraft at Timmins, Ontario, is under investigation and it is normal practice not to release any part of the investigation until the complete report is available.

2, 3 and 4. See 1 above.

Questions

DH-125 AIRCRAFT CRASH—INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY WABUSH GROUND PERSONNEL

Question No. 484—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the altimeter setting given to the pilots of the DH-125 jet by ground personnel at Wabush, Newfoundland, prior to its crash on November 11?

2. When was it relayed to the crew?

3. What party or what authority gave the altimeter setting to the crew?

4. When was the barometric pressure recording instrument that was used by personnel on the ground to ascertain the current altimeter setting at Wabush, last checked or calibrated to prove its accuracy?

5. Was the jet aircraft concerned carying a Radar Altimeter and, if so, was it functioning at the time of the crash?

6. What weather reporting information as to ceiling and visibility was relayed to the crew just prior to its crash?

7. What are the qualifications or what experience did the observer have who informed the crew of the jet as to weather conditions that existed at the time the aircraft made its approach?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The accident of the DH-125 at Wabush, Newfoundland, is under investigation and it is normal practice not to release any part of the investigation until the complete report is available.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. See 1 above.

PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN, SOUTH SHORE RIDING

Question No. 503—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What projects have been carried out by the federal Department of Public Works in the present fiscal year in the constituency of South Shore and what has been the cost of each project undertaken?

2. How many projects will be undertaken in the constituency of South Shore before the end of the present fiscal year that have not as yet been either started or completed and what is the estimated cost of each?

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

Location	Description	Cost
Allendale	Wharf approach repairs	$ 700.
Bayport	Wharf repair	400.
Blockhouse	Post Office-Ground improvements	2,386.
Brooklyn	Post Office-Exterior painting	200.
Carleton Village	Dredging	2,300.
Chester Basin	Construction of Post Office	47,034.
East Ironbound	Fender repair	1,000.
East Ironbound	Dredging by D.P.W. Plant	3,000.
East Port LeHebert	Haulout repairs	500.
East Port Medway	Block and tackle	90.
Gunning Cove	Breakwater repairs—floating	500.
Hunt's Point	Skidway repairs	400.
Hunt's Point	Dredging by D.P.W. Plant	6,000.
Jones Harbour	Breakwater and wharf repairs	2,500.
Kraut Point	Fender repair	3,200.
Liverpool	Dredging	4,000.
Liverpool	Federal building-Relighting	7,672.
Liverpool	Federal building-Alterations and additions to Lock Boxes	3,500.
Lockeport	Derrick repair	400.
Lockeport	Federal building-Alterations	2,000.
Lower Sandy Point	Skidway repairs	50.
Lunenburg Battery Point	Fender repair	4,800.
Lunenburg-R.R. Wharf	Fender repair	700.
Lunenburg	Federal building-Lighting Postal working area	6,757.
Mahone Bay	Federal building-Replacement of boiler	3,475.
Mill Cove	Repairs	1,000.
Mill Village	Post Office-Painting	2,668.
Milton	Post Office-Painting	200.
New Harbour	Breakwater	79,000.
Northwest Cove	Wharf repairs	27,000.
Osborne	Skid and derrick repairs	400.
Port Medway	Haulout repairs	300.

Location	Description	Cost
Port Medway	Barricade	200.
Port Mouton	Post Office—Ground improvements	1,900.
Port Mouton Head	Skidway repairs	10,000.
Riverport	Federal building—Ground improvements	4,142.
Roseway	Breakwater repairs	2,200.
Roseway	Dredging by D.P.W. Plant	8,000.
St. Catherine's River	Dredging	1,200.
Shelburne	Wharf repairs	9,000.
Shelburne	Electric repairs	7,000.
Stokes Head	Skidway repairs	50.
South Brookfield	Post Office—Painting	211.
South West Port Mouton	Haulout repairs	600.
West Berlin	Haulout repairs	150.
West Green Harbour (The Blazes)	Crib	600.
Willow Cove	Dredging	600.

2.

Location	Description
Aspotagan	Wharf repairs
Barss Corner	Post Office—Minor repairs
Bridgewater	Federal building—Minor repairs
Caledonia	Federal building—Minor repairs
Ingomar	Dredging
Little Tancook	Repairs
Little Tancook	Wave Deflector
Lockeport	Wharf lighting
Petite Riviere Bridge	Post Office—Minor repairs
Riverport	Federal building—Minor repairs
St. Catherine's River	Dredging

It is not customary to reveal estimated costs before tenders are called.

ANTI-SMOKING ADVERTISING

Question No. 536—**Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand):**

1. How often does the Department of National Health and Welfare broadcast anti-smoking advertising on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation television stations?

2. What has been the cost of such advertising per week, per month or per year?

3. What is the total cost of this program to date?

4. What steps has the Department taken to ensure that these advertisements observe the Canadian Code of Advertising Standards?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Department of National Health and Welfare does not control the number of occasions a public service announcement appears on television. Scheduling public service announcements is the concern of the broadcasting industry.

2. No cost. Public service announcements are made free of charge.

3. The cost of producing public service announcements since the inception of the program in 1967 is approximately $120,000.

4. Public Service announcements are produced in consultation with broadcast organizations and the National Film Board, all of whom subscribe to the Canadian Code of Advertising Standards.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY

Question No. 560—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. Is the Trans-Canada Highway now completed and, if not, what parts are still incomplete?

2. Are funds available under the Trans-Canada Highway Act for the construction of highways?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The Trans-Canada Highway is now completed within the terms of the Agreement, except sections at present under construction. The mileage under construction in each province: Newfoundland, 75.1 miles; Prince

Edward Island, Nil; Nova Scotia, 0.8 mile; New Brunswick, 5.3 miles; Quebec, 74.9 miles; Ontario, 37.9 miles; Manitoba, 10.0 miles; Saskatchewan, Nil (Interchange construction only); Alberta, Nil (Interchange construction only); British Columbia, 4.7 miles.

2. Funds are available for Canada's share on the designated route of the Trans-Canada Highway.

TRANS-CANADA HIGHWAY, ALGOMA

Question No. 604—**Mr. Foster:**

1. How many miles of Trans-Canada Highway are located in the Constituency of Algoma?

2. How many of these miles of highway have reached Trans-Canada specifications?

3. At what stage of construction are those miles of highway which have not reached Trans-Canada specifications?

4. What is the total cost to date of Trans-Canada Highway construction in the Constituency of Algoma?

5. How much of it was paid for by the federal government and how much by the provincial government?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. 261.6 miles.

2. 252.1 miles.

3. On 9.5 miles grading and paving are in progress.

4. The total value of work approved to date is $39.1 million.

5. The estimated amount of the Federal Government's share for this approved work is $22.8 million and the provincial share is $16.3 million. Canada's contribution to date in respect of the approved work is $20.6 million.

SAFETY STANDARDS FOR BOATS

Question No. 636—**Mr. Mather:**

1. What federal regulations are in effect establishing safety standards over boats and associated equipment?

2. Are federal funds available to encourage provinces to increase their boating safety program?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The Small Vessel Regulations, P.C. 1967-436, made under the Canada Shipping Act, set safety standards for boats and associated equipment.

2. No federal funds are available to encourage provinces to increase their boating safety programs; but provincial and municipal forces are encouraged to enforce the safety requirements by Section 707 of the Canada Shipping Act which provides in some cases for fines to be paid to provincial or municipal authorities.

[Mr. Laing.]

CANADIAN MILITIA STRENGTH

Question No. 661—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Is it the intention of the federal government to further reduce the numbers in the Canadian Militia and, if so, by what number?

2. Will any presently existing units and/or formations be disbanded on the reduction of the Canadian Militia and, if so, which ones?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, as announced on 19 December, 1969, it is intended to reduce the reserves by approximately 4,000.

2. Yes, some existing units will be disbanded, and those affected are shown in Sessional Papers 7/4 tabled in the House of Commons Friday, 19 December, 1969.

BUILDING STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING DIVISION, PUBLIC WORKS

Question No. 665—**Mr. McIntosh:**

1. Is the Building Structural Engineering Division of the Department of Public Works to be abolished, or has this already been carried out?

2. In brief, what work was carried out by this particular Division?

3. What was the annual cost of operating that Division?

4. What was the staff of the Division?

5. What are the names of the staff last employed and their professional or technical qualifications?

6. If this Division has been or is to be abolished, for what reason?

7. By what means will the work done by this Division be carried out if it has been or is to be abolished?

8. What is the estimated cost to the Department of an alternative to the work formerly done by this Division?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The function is continuing.

2. This Division provides advice on structural engineering matters to client departments; is engaged in the preparation of structural engineering design standards; represents the Department on sub-committees of the Canadian Standards Association, the Treasury Board, and the Canadian National Committee on Earthquake Engineering.

3. $74,913 for salaries at headquarters for the fiscal year 1969-70.

4. One Engineer 7, one Engineer 5, one Engineer 4, one EG-ESS 9, one EG-ESS 7.

5. The staff now employed are: W. A. Ward —Certificate of Merit—Diesel Engineering; P.Eng N.S. M.E.I.C.; P. Daunius—Lithuania—Civil Engineering & Architecture, Diploma Engineer equivalent M. Sce; C. Vilcinskas—

Lithuania—Civil Engineering—Diploma equal Master Degree; J. D. Carleton—Ireland—4 years Technological Institute—National Certificate; H. D Ewanchook—Bachelor of Science Degree—Civil Engineering, Indiana Institute of Technology (equivalent of Engineering Technician Degree).

6. The function is being carried out in a different manner.

7. By the optimum utilization of Regional capabilities.

8. Not know. The bulk will be absorbed in the Regional Office budgets.

LUNENBURG HARBOUR DREDGING SURVEY

Question No. 687—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Has the government undertaken a complete dredging survey of Lunenburg Harbour in Nova Scotia?

2. What is the extent of this survey and to what depth will dredging be carried out?

3. When does the government anticipate actual dredging operations in this harbour and what is the amount of funds allocated for this project?

Hon Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes, to the limits outlined in Part 2.

2. Areas sounded included: (a) Main approach channel from opposite Battery Point into railway wharf for a width of 600 feet. (b) Access channel from main channel westward to Lunenburg Foundry and Engineering Company Limited wharf for widths 300 to 600 feet. (c) Access channel from main channel eastward to Scotia Trawler Equipment wharf for a width of 300 feet.

It is proposed to dredge main channel for a length of 3200 feet by 200 feet and access channel to westward for a length of 2700 feet and a width of 150 feet to 21 feet below L.W.O.S.T. and access channel eastward from inner end of main channel for a length of 850 feet and a width of 100 feet to a depth of 18 feet below L.W.O.S.T.

3. Summer 1970, if necessary funds provided. An item for dredging in amount of $180,000 is being considered for inclusion in program for 1970-71.

SECOND NATIONAL PARK, P.E.I.

Question No. 690—**Mr. McQuaid:**

1. What is the agreed location of a second National Park for Prince Edward Island and how many acres of land are involved?

2. What steps are actively being taken by the federal government to acquire the required land?

3. Has a survey of the proposed site yet been made?

4. Have any of the land owners within the proposed site yet been contacted with a view to making their land available for park purposes and with what results?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Discussions have been held with the Provincial Government with regard to establishing a second National Park in the Eastern portion of the Province namely, Kings County. No firm boundaries have been determined as yet but both governments are looking for an area of approximately 8,000 acres.

2. The acquisition of land is a provincial responsibility, however, there has been active discussion respecting land acquisition between the two governments.

3. Aerial and ground reconnaissance surveys have been carried out in co-operation with Provincial Officials, but no legal surveys have been made in any special areas.

4. The Federal Government is not involved in negotiations with individual land owners as this is a provincial responsibility.

WHEAT EXPORTS

Question No. 695—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. What was the amount of wheat exported in each month during the crop year 1968-1969?

2. What was the corresponding export of wheat in the present crop year?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: 1 and 2. Exports of wheat, by month, for crop years:

	1968-69	1969-70
	bushels	
August	31,127,124	13,011,762
September	30,019,121	20,949,890
October	25,995,342	18,838,083
November	23,338,070	not yet available
December	16,061,318	
January	18,843,486	
February	24,149,343	
March	19,856,601	
April	10,278,328	
May	30,350,441	
June	24,016,288	
July	26,505,570	
Total	280,541,032	

Questions

POSTAL SERVICES—HALIFAX-EAST HANTS

Question No. 709—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What post offices have been closed down since June 25, 1968 or are proposed to be closed down in the federal Constituency of Halifax-East Hants, in each case with the cost of operation and revenue over the latest available 12-month period?

2. What substitute service was provided or will be provided in each case?

3. What are the nearest outlets to the closed post offices providing stamps and/or money orders?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications):

	1 (*c*) Cost of Operation	1 (*d*) Revenue	2. Alternate Service	3. Neighbouring Post Office*
1 (*a*) Post Offices Closed				
Rawdon, N.S.	$ 770	$321	Upper Rawdon R.R. No. 1	West Gore, N.S.
1 (*b*) *Proposed Closings*				
East Dover, N.S.	$1,200	$332	West Dover R.R. No. 1	West Dover, N.S.
Gormanville, N.S.	$2,000	$434	Kennetcook R.R. No. 2	Noel, N.S.
Latties Brook, N.S.	$1,800	$399	Upper Kennetcook R.R. No. 1	Upper Kennetcook N.S.
Noel Road, N.S.	$2,400	$800	Kennetcook R.R. No. 2	Kennetcook, N.S.
North Noel Road, N.S.	$2,000	$423	Kennetcook R.R. No. 2	Kennetcook, N.S.
Pennant, N.S.	$ 800	$141	Herring Cove R.R. No. 1	Sambro, N.S.
Portuguese Cove, N.S.	$1,600	$349	Herring Cove R.R. No. 1	Ketch Harbour, N.S.

*Stamps and money orders may also be obtained from the rural courier.

SAMBRO WHARF—LANDING OF FISHERMEN'S CATCHES

Question No. 720—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Are fishermen of Sambro able to land all their catches at the Sambro wharf, or do some have to land their catches elsewhere?

2. When was the Sambro wharf built and what was the cost?

3. What amount has been spent on repairs?

4. Was a new Sambro wharf included in Estimates since 1965 and, if so, for what reason was such not proceeded with?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes, however, as larger buyers are located at other ports, most of catch is unloaded at those ports.

2. 1935-36 at a cost of $9,080.

3. $65,000.

4. Yes, not proceeded with because of limited funds.

POST OFFICE DIRECT LINE TELEPHONE INSTALLATIONS

Question No. 733—**Mr. Coates:**

1. Has the Post Office Department installed direct line telephone service in post offices in Canada to accommodate patrons who do not speak or wish to speak the language of the clerk serving the public and, if so, how many such direct line telephones have been installed in post offices, to date, and how many will be installed when the program has been completed?

2. What has been the cost, to date, of the installation of direct line telephones in post offices and what will be the estimated final cost of the program?

3. What will be the annual charge for the service in question?

4. What post offices in Canada will have this service available?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. (a) Yes. (b) In the City of Ottawa a system known as Private Line—Intercom-Automatic Ring—One Way has been installed in 23 offices. Outside the City of Ottawa, within the National Capital Region, 15 telephone lines have been installed, three lines have been relocated and three extensions of personal telephone lines have been provided. (c) See answer to (b) above.

2. (a) In the City of Ottawa, $442.50; outside the City of Ottawa, $286.28. (b) See answer to (a) above.

3. In the City of Ottawa, $4,197.60; outside the City of Ottawa, $1,528.80.

In the City of Ottawa: Postal Station "B", Sparks and Elgin Sts.; Postal Station "C", 409 Parkdale Ave.; Postal Station "E", 99 Fourth Ave.; Postal Station "J", 285 Woodroffe Ave.; Postal Station "F", 1339 Baseline Rd.; Bells Corners Sub P.O., 28B Northside Rd.; Carling Sub Post Office, 1036 Merivale Rd.; City View Sub Post Office, 1523 Merivale Rd.; Stewarton Sub Post Office, 434 Bank St.; Sub No. 4, 350 Elgin St.; Sub No. 23, 580 Rideau St.; Sub No. 27, 260 Elgin St.; Sub No. 29, 444 Hinton St.; Sub No. 37, 1314 Wellington St.; Sub No. 38, 118 Sparks St.; Sub No. 44, 320 McArthur Rd.; Sub No. 55, Confederation Heights; Sub No. 61, 3 Croil Ave.; Sub No. 62, 1908 St. Laurent Blvd.; Sub No. 63, 354 Slater St.; Sub No. 75, 1989 Merivale Rd.; Sub No. 77, 1581 Bank St.; Sub No. 80, 1200 St. Laurent Blvd.

Outside the City of Ottawa: Alcove, P.Q.; Almonte, Ont.; Ashton, Ont.; Blossom Park, Ont.; Carp, Ont.; Chelsea, P.Q.; Cumberland, Ont.; Dunrobin, Ont.; Edwards, Ont.; Fitzroy Harbour, Ont.; Gloucester, Ont.; Hazeldean, Ont.; Hull, P.Q.; Kanata, Ont.; Kars, Ont.; Kenmore, Ont.; Kinburn, Ont.; Kirks Ferry, P.Q.; Manotick, Ont.; Metcalfe, Ont.; Navan, Ont.; North Gower, Ont.; Osgoode, Ont.; Pakenham, Ont.; Poltimore, P.Q.; Quyon, P.Q.; Ramsayville, Ont.; Richmond, Ont.; Russell, Ont.; South March, Ont.; Wakefield, P.Q.; Woodlawn, Ont.; Wyman, P.Q.

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFTS, ALBERTA, SASKATCHEWAN AND MANITOBA

Question No. 735—Mr. Mazankowski:

1. How many motor vehicle thefts were reported to the RCMP in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba during (a) the first half of 1969, 1968 and 1967 (b) the total year 1968, 1967 and 1966?

2. How many stolen vehicles were recovered in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba by the RCMP during (a) the first half of 1969, 1968 and 1967 (b) the total year 1968, 1967 and 1966?

3. How many charges of theft of motor vehicles were laid by the RCMP in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba during (a) the first half of 1969, 1968 and 1967 (b) the total year 1968, 1967 and 1966?

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

1. (a)	1969	1968	1967
Alberta	433	392	339
Saskatchewan	249	326	241
Manitoba	212	232	144
1. (b)	1968	1967	1966
Alberta	771	663	476
Saskatchewan	546	464	441
Manitoba	459	383	302

Questions

2. (a)	1969	1968	1967
Alberta	327	347	267
Saskatchewan	253	256	171
Manitoba	146	171	112
2. (b)	1968	1967	1966
Alberta	768	653	465
Saskatchewan	541	453	432
Manitoba	448	374	300
3. (a)	1969	1968	1967
Alberta	130	140	113
Saskatchewan	107	125	85
Manitoba	106	108	60
3. (b)	1968	1967	*1966
Alberta	320	297	189
Saskatchewan	266	211	190
Manitoba	251	190	131

*Data for last nine months only available.

CHARGES OF TRAFFICKING IN "SPEED"

Question No. 737—Mr. Mazankowski:

How many charges of trafficking in "Speed" were laid by the RCMP, in Canada, in the first half of 1969 and for the year 1968?

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

1969 (First half), 48; 1969, 64.

Note: "Speed" or Methamphetamine is not segregated from other controlled drugs, i.e. Barbiturates and Amphetamines.

BREAKING AND ENTERING, ALBERTA, SASKATCHEWAN AND MANITOBA

Question No. 738—Mr. Mazankowski:

1. How many cases of breaking and entering were reported by the RCMP in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba during (a) the first half of 1969, 1968 and 1967 (b) the total year 1968, 1967 and 1966?

2. How many charges were laid in connection with the above in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba during (a) the first half of 1969, 1968 and 1967 (b) the total year 1968, 1967 and 1966?

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

1.(a)	1969	1968	1967
Alberta	1588	1403	1173
Saskatchewan	1210	1444	1089
Manitoba	1119	1070	823
1.(b)	1968	1967	*1966
Alberta	3004	2517	1841
Saskatchewan	3258	2756	1855
Manitoba	2401	1940	1468
2.(a)	1969	1968	1967
Alberta	288	314	275
Saskatchewan	281	311	233
Manitoba	295	265	213

	Questions		
2.(b)	1968	1967	*1966
Alberta	619	573	376
Saskatchewan	653	586	393
Manitoba	615	543	355

*Data for last 9 months only available.

MARIJUANA AND HASHISH TRAFFICKING CHARGES

Question No. 739—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

How many charges of trafficking in marijuana and hashish were laid by the RCMP, in Canada, in the first half of 1969 and for the year 1968?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1969, first half, 423 charges; 1968, 544 charges.

DIVORCE RATE

Question No. 740—**Mr. Mather:**

1. In 1958, what was the Canadian divorce rate per 100 marriages?

2. In 1968, what was the same rate?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports that: 1. In 1958, the Canadian divorce rate per 100 marriages was 4.8.

2. In 1968, the Canadian divorce rate per 100 marriages was 6.2.

Note: Both these figures exclude Yukon and Northwest Territories for which data are not available for 1958. If Yukon and Northwest Territories are included for 1968, the divorce rate per 100 marriages would be 6.3.

REPAIRS TO SAULNIERVILLE WHARF

Question No. 756—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. When were the first estimates for repairs to the Saulnierville wharf brought before Parliament and voted upon?

2. For how many years has money been allocated for this project?

3. What are the reasons for not having this project approved?

4. To where have the monies allocated for this project been diverted?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. 1968-69 Estimates.

2. Two years.

3. It was found necessary to allocate funds to other marine works with higher priorities.

4. Answered in Part 3.

WATER POLLUTION—CHARGES LAID UNDER MIGRATORY BIRDS CONVENTION ACT

Question No. 758—**Mr. Harding:**

1. For the years 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 to date, how many charges were laid against individuals or companies by persons in the department responsible for the enforcement of the Migratory Birds Convention Act and Regulations regarding violations of the Act and Regulations dealing with pollution of waters?

2. How many of the above charges resulted in (a) convictions (b) dismissal of the charges (c) withdrawal of the charges?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. None.

2. N/A.

COST OF PURPLE CHAIRS, FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE ROOM

Question No. 765—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. What was the total cost of the purple chairs purchased for the 1969 Federal-Provincial Conference, used by the Prime Minister and the Premiers sitting at the conference table?

2. Were these chairs purchased directly by the government, or were competitive bids obtained prior to their purchase?

3. If bids were called, what are the names and addresses of the companies invited to tender, the amounts of their bid, and the name of the successful bidder?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The cost of the purple chairs purchased for the Canadian Government Conference Centre which were used at the 1969 Federal-Provincial Conference by the Prime Minister and Premiers sitting at the conference table was $105.50 each for a total cost of $2,637.50.

2. The chairs were purchased directly by the Government from the manufacturing firm of Henderson Furniture Limited, St. Lambert, Que. Other capable firms were approached and their chairs reviewed, however, delivery requirement could not be met.

3. Not applicable.

VALCARTIER ARMED FORCES BASE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Question No. 768—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What projects are included in development plans for the Canadian Armed Forces base at Valcartier and, what is the expected total cost?

2. Are a ski chalet and golf course included in the development plan, and, if so, what is the estimated cost?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. The overall development plan for the Canadian Forces Base Valcartier will not be completed before spring 1970, and it is not possible at this time to identify and cost specific projects. The first phase of this program, to provide

vehicle and operational equipment support facilities and related accommodation for 5e Groupe de Combat, has been started and is expected to cost up to $4.7 million.

2. No. These facilities are part of a recreational development program being financed from non-public funds.

ARMED FORCES ADVERTISING FOR RECRUITS

Question No. 782—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. What has been the total cost of the advertising for recruits for the Canadian Armed Forces since the first of July 1969 to date?

2. As a result of said advertising campaign, how many recruits have been secured since the said date?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Accounting records are based on a complete fiscal year and as a result it is not possible to isolate costs from July 1, 1966, to November 30, 1969. However, expenditures in each fiscal year are as follows: 1966-67, $841,000; 1967-68, $665,500; 1968-69, $515,000; 1969-70 (Estimated), $886,500.

2. Since 1 July, 1966, recruiting statistics show that approximately one out of every four applicants have been accepted for training as men and one out of every six applicants for officer training for a total enrolment up to 30 November, 1969, of 5,281 officers and 28,859 men.

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENTS AND DISCHARGES

Question No. 783—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

How many members of the Canadian Armed Forces have (a) retired voluntarily (b) been discharged by reason of health (c) been compulsorily removed, month by month, since the 1st of January?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence):

	(a) Voluntary				(b)	(c) Compulsory							
1969	4A	4B	4C	Total	Medical	1	2	5A	5C	5D	5E	0	Total
January	136	163	216	515	91	11	9	179	30	152	7	25	413
February	112	153	193	458	66	5	10	144	30	188	7	17	401
March	112	182	220	514	74	7	10	151	28	176	14	17	403
April	68	126	261	455	69	3	5	106	28	182	11	5	340
May	71	107	372	550	65	2	9	103	18	214	17	8	371
June	41	102	393	536	68	4	5	90	19	297	9	13	437
July	38	102	324	464	74	7	3	93	29	276	8	19	435
August	40	108	213	361	64	1	5	105	44	258	8	17	438
September	41	112	613	766	65	1	7	104	61	240	5	14	432
October	100	131	450	681	90	5	5	123	38	256	11	26	464
November	111	112	423	646	81	3	8	142	32	231	9	16	441

NOTE: December release figures will not be available until 20 January, 1970.

DEFINITIONS—Voluntary— 4A—Voluntarily retired entitled to pension.
4B—Did not re-engage.
4C—Voluntary release—no pension entitlement.

Compulsory—1—Misconduct.
2—Unsatisfactory service.
5A—Compulsory retirement age.
5C—Completed service for which required.
5D—Unsuitable for further service.
5E—Irregular enrolment.
Other—Deaths and miscellaneous releases.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

GOVERNMENT BODIES OUTSIDE OTTAWA-HULL AREA

Question No. 19—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What federal government departments, Crown corporations and agencies have their head offices located outside the Ottawa-Hull area?

2. For each of the above departments, Crown corporations and agencies, what is the number of employees as of the last government fiscal year?

Return tabled.

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY RESEARCH STUDIES

Question No. 34—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. For the fiscal years 1968-69 and 1969-70, what specific research studies have been undertaken by

the Economic Service Branch of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry?

2. Who are the individuals involved in these studies and when is it anticipated that these studies will be completed?

Return tabled.

ARRANGEMENTS FOR TRANSLATING DOCUMENTS

Question No. 43—**Mr. Benjamin:**

1. What arrangements are made for the translation of white papers, task force studies and Royal Commission Reports?

2. Are they translated by the department in question or by a special group?

3. If a special translation bureau exists, what is its manpower at present, and is it fully staffed?

4. Can any approximate measure be given of the capabilities of this group in terms of output?

5. How many pages are there in each and how many man-hours were required for the translation on Security (Public Version) (b) Report of Woods Task Force on Labour Relations (c) Report of Woods Task Force on Veterans' Affairs (d) Report of the Task Force on Sports (e) The White Paper on Veterans' Affairs (f) The White Paper on Indian Policy (g) The Task Force on Housing and Urban Development?

6. What was the elapsed time required for the translation of each of the above? (i.e. How many days was the document in translator's hands?)

Return tabled.

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT—EARLY RELEASE

Question No. 105—**Mr. Rose:**

1. How many students employed by the federal government during the past summer were released prior to their original understanding of their terms of employment?

2. How were these students notified and how many days notice were given to these students?

Return tabled.

SUBSTITUTES FOR DDT

Question No. 470—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Has the government any plans for lowering the cost of DDT substitutes to farmers and farm organizations and, if so, what are the details of such plans?

2. How many suitable substitutes for DDT are available as insecticides?

3. What are the names of these substitutes?

4. Are these substitutes readily available in Canada?

5. What are the costs per appropriate commercial unit for each of these substitutes?

6. How does the cost of these substitutes compare with the present cost of DDT?

7. Are any or all of the substitutes for DDT as effective as DDT for insecticide purposes if used in the same quantities as DDT?

[Mr. Howard (Skeena).]

8. If the answer to part 7 above, in whole or in part, is in the negative, what quantities of DDT substitutes must be used to produce the same satisfactory effect as DDT?

9. Are any substitutes for DDT effective against the corn ear worm and, if so, what is the name of the substitute or substitutes, and in what quantity as compared to DDT must such substitutes be used, and what is the comparative price of such substitute or substitutes as related to DDT?

Return tabled.

PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS, SOUTH WESTERN NOVA

Question No. 562—**Mr. Comeau:**

1. What projects have been carried out by the federal Department of Public Works in the present fiscal year in the Constituency of South Western Nova and what has been the cost of each project undertaken?

2. How many projects will be undertaken in the Constituency of South Western Nova before the end of the present fiscal year that have not as yet been either started or completed and what is the estimated cost of each?

Return tabled.

GRAIN EXPORTS BY PORTS

Question No. 698—**Mr. Korchinski:**

What amounts of (a) wheat (b) other grains have been exported from each of the Canadian ports in the past three years to date?

Return tabled.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 39, 56, 279 and 283 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE INVOLVING INDIANS

Motion No. 39—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the correspondence between the Prime Minister of Canada and the North American Indian Unity Conference regarding an investigation of the administration of justice by police and the courts involving Canadian Indians.

Motion agreed to.

OIL POLLUTION

Motion No. 56—**Mr. Thomson:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the studies on the environmental effects of oil

pollution in Canada by Professor R. E. Warner of Memorial University and sponsored by the Fisheries Board of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

RESEARCH BRANCH STUDIES, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Motion No. 279—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all available research studies undertaken by the Research Branch of the Department of Manpower and Immigration mentioned in answer to Question Number 1 as reported in *Hansard* of November 24, 1969.

Motion agreed to.

NEW JERSEY GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME PLAN

Motion No. 283—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of any descriptive material concerning the New Jersey guaranteed annual income plan obtained by officials of the Department of National Health and Welfare, as indicated on page 1260 of *Hansard* for November 26, 1969, and of any notes prepared on the basis of the conversations referred to on the same page.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 29, 160, 200, 210, 212, 230, 231, 255, 280 and 294?

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

[*English*]

SOCIAL WELFARE LEGISLATION

Motion No. 29—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Willard reports and reviews on social welfare legislation in Canada.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, motion No. 29 and motion No. 160, both in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), may most conveniently be dealt with together.

The report of the special committee referred to in motion 160 deals with costs and benefits involved in the whole of the social security system, including the issue of pensions of retired civil servants. The Willard Report, referred to in motion 29, deals with the entire field of social welfare. These reports form the basis of reappraisals of government policy in their respective areas. As such, they are part of the internal function of government and their release is not in the public interest. In view of this perhaps the hon. member would agree to withdraw motions Nos. 29 and 160.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): First, Mr. Speaker, may I raise a point of order. I am not willing that the two be dealt with at the same time. I think Your Honour will see they are different matters. It so happens I am prepared to agree to the request that has been made in respect of one but not the other. I suggest they be called separately.

Mr. Speaker: The motion called now is No. 29 which is the motion before the House.

Mr. Walker: Is it agreed that motion No. 29 be withdrawn?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): No.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

RETIRED PUBLIC SERVANTS' PENSIONS

Motion No. 160—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the special committee on increasing the pensions of retired public servants referred to by the President of the Treasury Board in his speech on May 8, 1969, to the Canadian Pension Conference, and noted in *Hansard* on May 16, 1969, at page 8782.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): I have just read the answer to motion No. 160, and I wonder if the hon. member will agree to withdraw it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that it was within my rights to ask that these motions be dealt with separately. I was not willing to withdraw the other motion. In this case the announcement made on December 19 that something will be done about the pensions of retired civil servants is worth a million times more getting a copy of this report. Therefore I am happy to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Motions for Papers

SUMMER JOBS FOR STUDENTS

Motion No. 200—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the plan of the Special Task Force to study the question of summer jobs for students as stated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his address to the Canadian Vocational Association on May 23, 1969.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Motion stands.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Motion No. 210—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Strathmere Associates on a survey of community development projects in all ten provinces, the Northwest and Yukon Territories understaken in the fiscal year 1965-66 for the Privy Council Office, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Again we have the problem of double motions, Nos. 210 and 212. The reports requested by motions Nos. 210 and 212 were intended for use—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I respectfully suggest to the Parliamentary Secretary that perhaps it would be better if these motions were dealt with separately because at the present time there is only one motion before the House, motion No. 210. It does cause confusion when a reply is made on two motions when only one is before the House.

Mr. Walker: I see my efforts to save time had the reverse effect. In connection with motion No. 210, the report requested by the motion was intended for use only by government officials and is not in a form suitable for other than internal use. The firms acted collectively as a staff extension of the special planning secretariat, supplying an expertise that was not available internally at that time. For these reasons, perhaps the hon. member will agree to withdraw motion No. 210.

Mr. Skoberg: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

INFORMATION MEDIA AND WAR ON POVERTY

Motion No. 212—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Heward, Newman and Associates and Julian, Hebert and Associates, Montreal, regarding information media relative to the war on poverty updertaken in the year 1967-68, for the Privy Council Office, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): The report requested by motion No. 212 was intended for use only by government officials and is not in a form suitable for other than internal use. The firms acted collectively as a staff extension of the special planning secretariat, supplying an expertise that was not available internally at that time. For these reasons perhaps the hon. member will agree to withdraw motion No. 212.

Mr. Skoberg: I would like to call for a vote on this motion.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

MANPOWER MOBILITY PROGRAM—STUDY OF THOSE RECEIVING GRANTS

Motion No. 230—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Kates, Peat and Marwick, Company, a study of persons and families who have moved and received grants under the Manpower Mobility Program, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration, in the fiscal year 1967-68, as mentioned in Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is asking for the copy of a report prepared for the department by a private firm of business consultants. The report deals with confidential matters of exclusive interest to the department and, consequently, I regret being unable to table them. I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: I call for a vote.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION—DESIGN OF MANAGEMENT-INFORMATION SYSTEM

Motion No. 231—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Operations Research

Industries, a study and recommendation on the design of a management-information system supporting the departmental planning, programming and budgeting system, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration in the fiscal year 1967-68, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, for the same reasons the answer is the same.

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: I call for a vote.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

REPORT ON UNIVERSITY RESEARCH LABORATORIES

Motion No. 255—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Report of the findings of the survey team which, under the direction of Dr. H. C. Rowsell, inspected university research laboratories across the country earlier this year and made an assessment of the conditions surrounding the use of animals for experimental purposes.

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Health and Welfare wishes to advise the hon. member that although the Canadian Council on Animal Care receives support from the National Research Council and the Medical Research Council, it is a totally independent body and is not in any sense an agency of the government. Furthermore, the report prepared by the Canadian Council on Animal Care is confidential.

For these reasons, my minister regrets that he is unable to produce the information requested and asks the hon. member to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. MacInnis: I am afraid I cannot agree that the taxpayers do not have the right to receive this report.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION RESTRAINT GUIDELINES

Motion No. 280—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, memoranda, etc., between the Prices and Incomes Commission and the Government of Canada in which the Commission suggested guide-lines for restraint that the federal government might follow referred to by the Prime Minister as reported in *Hansard* of November 25, 1969 on page 1201.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission that exploratory consultations between the Prices and Incomes Commission and governments have been held on a confidential basis. The commission does not believe that it would be in the public interest to divulge the contents of any written material concerning these consultations at this time. In view of this I ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion.

Mr. Saltsman: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Motion transferred for debate.

CONSUMER COUNCIL FUNCTIONS

Motion No. 294—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and members of the Consumer Council of Canada regarding the functions of the Council, as mentioned by the Minister and reported in *Hansard* of December 3, 1969.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the correspondence which was exchanged between myself and the members of the Consumer Council of Canada regarding the functions of the council and which is mentioned in this motion is of a confidential nature and therefore it would not be in the public interest to release it.

Mr. Lewis: Is the council a secret body?

Mr. Basford: No, it is not.

Mrs. MacInnis: In view of the fact that about half of the report has already been made public, I would now like to see the other half.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—CANADIAN ACTION FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in view of the fact that a request has been made to Nigeria with regard to Canairelief and Joint Church Aid transport and inasmuch I judge from his statement that no response was received by the government of Canada, whether he proposes to take any further steps with regard to this matter, or does he intend to sit by and await a response from the government of Nigeria?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): We have been in touch with the Nigerian authorities and we have made our offers of assistance known. We have made representations that food on Sao Tomé should be made available as quickly as possible if this food is required by the Nigerian authorities. So far the results of the representations we have made and that have been made by other governments confirm what I have said earlier in the House, that it is very doubtful whether Canairelief and Joint Church Aid will be acceptable instruments for this purpose. The question of how the supplies can be moved is one on which we are awaiting word from the Nigerian authorities. We are ready to provide any assistance we can. I should add, however, that one of the real difficulties that we have is represented by the attitude taken by the Leader of the Opposition in the statement he made today. He represents the superior and condescending attitude that is taken by some with regard to the Nigerian authorities.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, if it gives the Secretary of State for External Affairs any relief in his predicament to attack me, that is all right.

Mr. Sharp: It is not I but you who are attacking.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Stanfield: I am attacking and I will continue to attack until the minister does something.

Mr. Hees: Sock it to him.

Mr. Stanfield: I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether any consideration has been given, for example, to sending a personal message from the Prime Minister of this country or to flying a special representative of the Prime Minister directly to Lagos to bring home to the Nigerian government the very genuine concern of the people of this country in this matter?

Mr. Sharp: The Prime Minister is today sending a message to General Gowon on a number of subjects, including this subject.

Mr. Hees: By regular mail?

Mr. Sharp: And the attitude of the Leader of the Opposition toward these matters, whereby he is attempting to preach to the Nigerian government regarding their responsibilities, is not acceptable.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I am sure—

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): You should take some lessons from Paul Martin. He is a good guy.

Mr. Hees: He sounded better, anyway.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs has to find some scapegoat for his failure. I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, with all his claque behind him, whether, in view of the urgency of the situation, if there is no early response—and I mean a response in a matter of hours—from the government of Nigeria, he is giving any consideration to seeking the cooperation of the Secretary General of the United Nations, not from the point of view of imposing anything on the government of Nigeria but from the point of view of bringing home to that government the well-based concern about what may happen, and this not through any deliberate intent on the part of the government of Nigeria? Has the Secretary of State for External Affairs taken any initiative in this connection?

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the deep concern of members of all parties in this House, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs undertake that as soon as any message is received from the Nigerian authorities, in response to the resolution passed unanimously by this House, he will convey it to the House just as quickly as possible?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I share the very deep concern of all members of the House and I undertake to see that any response is conveyed immediately to the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Can he tell the House whether the Canadian government intends to protest against the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations who has condemned the secession of Biafra?

Mr. Laniel: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Dumont: If I may rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker, I believe the minister did not get it.

I would ask the minister to tell us if, in his opinion, the Secretary General of the United Nations can establish the boundaries of a country?

Mr. Speaker: I do not think that the question as asked should be allowed.

[*English*]

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of reports that the war zone has been closed to outsiders, has the minister assured himself that this interdiction does not apply to the observer force and, if he has not, will he do so soon?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I received the same message this morning about the closing of this area, and it is one of the problems I hope to be able to discuss with our High Commissioner and through him with the observers.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérald Laniel (Beauharnois): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

In view of the difficulties relating to the use of available food and medical supplies, would the minister consider the suggestion that General Wrinch, a member of the special team sent to Lagos and national commissioner of the Red Cross, who is due to leave tonight at eight o'clock, be instructed to negotiate with the Nigerian government the accreditation of some international agency, such as the Red Cross for example, to take care of the transportation and distribution of food and medical supplies, given precisely the functions that he holds within the Red Cross?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the House will remember that in the first statement the government made on this subject we urged that all international efforts should be co-ordinated through the International Red Cross. I would hope that Canairelief and other organizations will now co-operate with that agency.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question related to the functions of the observer team. In view of the fact, as the minister himself indicated yesterday, that the nature of the situation has changed with respect to the observers, in view of the importance of having direct and accurate information from the area, and also in view of his remarks today with respect to information coming primarily from the military, has the minister taken steps, in concert with those countries that are contributing to the observer team, to request the government of Nigeria to allow the observer team to look at the relief and refugee question now as well as the question of genocide and atrocities?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have opened discussions with the Nigerian government. General Gowon, I am informed, is looking sympathetically at the whole problem, and I hope he will give a favourable answer.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the urgency of the problem, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Prime Minister consider sending a special representative to Lagos immediately to help clarify the situation?

Mr. Sharp: Yesterday I announced the sending of four people to Nigeria and I think that the quality of these people is quite sufficient for the purpose. In particular, I think it is valuable that General Wrinch, who is the head of the Canadian Red Cross, should be there to give an impartial and objective view.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): I would like to ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

On Monday, January 12th, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs the following question:

Has the minister had any assurance that General Gowon will agree to relief from outside?

The minister answered and I quote:

Not yet. Reports have been coming from representatives of the Nigerian government which seem to point to that conclusion.

I would like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he is willing to produce copies of the reports pointing to acceptance of outside relief by the Nigerian government?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful, contrary to the view of the Leader of the Opposition, that the government of Nigeria will accept international aid. It is a matter only of the form.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to remind the Secretary of State for External Affairs that I am not the leader of the opposition but the member for Lotbinière and that I am the one who asked the question.

The minister said that he had received reports that gave him to understand that Nigeria would accept outside aid. Is he in a position to give hon. members copies of the reports that gave him to understand, at that time, that Nigeria would accept aid from outside?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is only asking the question he already asked a moment ago and, to me, the supplementary is not acceptable.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ACQUISITION OF CANADIAN COACHWAYS BY GREYHOUND LINES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport regarding the decision of the Canadian Transport Commission to allow the takeover of Canadian Coachways Limited by Greyhound Lines of Canada, which is a subsidiary of Greyhound Corporation of Chicago. Would he look into this application by Greyhound and the decision of the Transport Commission to allow it, and would he say whether or not he intends to use his powers under the act to recommend to the Governor in Council the disallowance of this takeover?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, to this moment the Canadian Transport Commission has been going through regular processes. I have asked for a copy of the decision, and I will consider it and the representations that have been made by the hon. member.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the minister if he has read or if he will read the transcript of representations of those who have intervened, who claim that Canadian Coachways Limited is the third largest line in Canada and that its elimination will lead to a lack of competition and be prejudicial to the public interest? Would the minister undertake to look into the representations of those who intervened before he makes a final decision?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will read the entire transcript.

INFLATION—MEASURES TO COMBAT INCREASE IN CONSUMER PRICE INDEX

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. As the consumer price index, which as we know indicates the cost of living, has risen by a further four-tenths of one per cent during the month of December, or at an annual rate of increase of 5 per cent a year, indicating that the increase in the cost of living and inflation have not slowed down at all—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly ask his question?

Mr. Hees: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question is: Would the government, in view of these facts, agree to give consideration to adopting the positive measures for controlling inflation which were presented to the government in the House by the Official Opposition on December 15 last, inasmuch as the government's policies for controlling inflation have proven to be complete failures?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I would love to answer the hon. member.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister rose exactly at the moment I sat down. Could he be given a chance to answer this important question?

Mr. Speaker: I realize that the question asked by the hon. member is important, but I respectfully suggest to him it was not quite a question he posed but perhaps a statement he made. This being so, I did not feel the hon. member should be allowed to ask a question in that way. If the hon. member would kindly ask a question in the proper way, of course it would be allowed.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am more than happy to abide by Your Honour's ruling—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: —because the government obviously, has no policies or suggestions to offer for controlling inflation in this country.

Mr. Benson: Neither has the opposition.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

CONTRAVENTION OF BILL OF RIGHTS BY HATE LEGISLATION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I think I am safe in directing a question to the Minister of Justice about the hate bill because it does not apply to members of the House of Commons or even to the Secretary of State for External Affairs who made an improper attack on the Leader of the Opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Since the Drybones case was decided by the Supreme Court of Canada after the hate bill received second reading, would the minister secure the opinion of the law officers of the Crown on whether the hate bill contravenes the Bill of Rights?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the bill was drafted by the law officers of the Crown and in accordance with the usual practice they would, as they are bound to do, have cleared the matter so far as the Canadian Bill of Rights was concerned. However, I would not think that the Drybones case would have had any bearing on that situation.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The bill was drafted before the case was heard. Will the minister secure the opinion of the law officers of the Crown regarding what apparently is a direct contravention of the Bill of Rights?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the preamble but I will accept the right hon. gentleman's suggestion.

INFORMATION

REQUEST FOR POLICY STATEMENT—OPERATIONS OF INFORMATION CANADA

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister arising out of his undertaking, given before the House adjourned for the Christmas recess, that he would make a statement to the House either before the Christmas recess or immediately after on government policy relating to Information Canada. He has not yet done so. When may we expect such statement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for reminding me. I have reminded myself and my staff about this matter several times in the last few days.

An hon. Member: Get some more staff.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, I must get some more staff. I hope to be able to live up to that declaration and make a statement soon.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the Prime Minister requires more staff in the Privy Council office before he can make that statement, I would sooner he did not make it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot make a statement. He must ask a question.

Mr. Lewis: I merely wanted to preserve the austerity program, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister say whether there is already existing and operating an Information Canada staff, with an office? If so, are the staff in that office concerned about planning the future of Information Canada, or is it already acting as an information centre?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, there are a very small number of officials who are perhaps calling themselves "Information Canada", but they are not actually Information Canada because the government has not yet taken a policy decision on the matter. This small

number of officials is working on the precise statement that I hope to make in the very near future.

Mr. Lewis: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the Prime Minister has just said that the government has not taken a policy decision on the matter, will he explain to the House by what right this small group of officials calls itself "Information Canada", as appears on the door of their office? They are acting as the centre for information even now.

Mr. Baldwin: Especially for a government which gives no information.

Mr. Trudeau: There's the answer.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: You admit it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for York South rising on a point of order?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to take too much of the time of the House. Like most other members, I prefer the Prime Minister when he is in a mood of humour rather than in a mood of scholastic obfuscation.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I remind hon. members that more than half the question period has already elapsed and we should get on with our business as quickly as possible.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the matter is serious. I have asked the Prime Minister whether there is an office called "Information Canada." As a member of the House I am entitled to receive an answer from the Prime Minister instead of seeing him give a flippant turn of the hand toward a member of the opposition.

POLLUTION

ACTION RESPECTING CONTAMINATION OF SASKATCHEWAN RIVER BY MERCURY

Mr. Gerald Richard Cobbe (Portage): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to put to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Can your department stop, now, the mercury poisoning from entering Manitoba and destroying our fishing industry?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows he must address his question

[Mr. Trudeau.]

to the Chair. I do not think the question has been asked in an appropriate way and I doubt that it is in order. Perhaps the hon. member may wish to give advice about the matter to the Chair so that it may be considered at the time of adjournment.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Has the source of the mercury pollution on the prairies been located and identified?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): Our fisheries task force on the prairies has visited the plant of the Interprovincial Co-operative just downstream from Saskatoon and is now of the opinion that this Chlor Alkali plant is the principal, if not the only, source of mercury pollution on the prairies. I should like to add that all the fish which were contaminated in any way are being paid for by the Freshwater Fish Corporation and destroyed.

Mr. Cobbe: Will the fishermen suffer by having deducted from their final payments the amount of money spent on destroying these fish?

Mr. Davis: The fishermen are being paid what would have been the going market price had the pollution not occurred.

AIR TRANSPORT

DISCONTINUANCE OF WESTERN MANITOBA SERVICE BY TRANSAIR

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport and arises from the application of Transair to discontinue class 1 air service into western Manitoba. Will the minister give assurances that a regional air policy will be implemented that will be in harmony with the government's regional development program and adequately meet the growing air transport needs of the prairie region?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member is asking for a policy statement which ought to be made on motions.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question. The matter is of great urgency because of the imminence of the decision. Will present services be continued until such time as a regional policy is implemented?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the regional policy is in operation at the present time. Regarding the matter of specific concern to the hon. member, discussions are going on today between the airlines that are involved. I believe the hon. member who asked the question has received reports directly, at my request, from the Canadian Transport Commission. I believe that the ultimate solution now being discussed with the CTC will be entirely satisfactory to the hon. member and those he represents.

PENSIONS

RETIRED CNR EMPLOYEES—INQUIRY AS TO INCREASE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the very welcome announcement of December 19 that the pensions of federal superannuates are to be increased in April, will the minister discuss with the officials of the Canadian National Railways the possibility of the same thing being done with respect to CNR pensions, also in April of this year?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do that. I understand that the matter of pensions of retired CNR employees is one that will be considered by the House of Commons Standing Committee on Transport and Communications and officials of CNR in the near future. I will be glad to ask those in the House who will be party to that consideration to speed up consultations.

AIR TRANSPORT

REALLOCATION OF ROUTES BETWEEN CANADIAN PACIFIC AIRLINES AND AIR CANADA

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Does the government intend to reallocate overseas air routes between Canadian Pacific Airlines and Air Canada in the near future?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker.

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

POLICY FOLLOWING THIRD REPORT OF COMMISSION

Mr. Patrick J. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It is succinct and in three parts, and I ask it that way for purposes of clarity and to avoid the necessity of supplementary questions. In light of the third report of the B and B Commission, has the government decided that it is necessary to review its policy with regard to bilingualism? If so, has it, and when will the Prime Minister make a statement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, no, and never, Mr. Speaker.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

DEER LODGE HOSPITAL—INCREASE IN COST OF DOMICILIARY CARE

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In his absence perhaps I could direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary or the acting minister. In view of the fact that the cost of domiciliary care at Deer Lodge Hospital in Winnipeg has been raised to $300 a month from $120, an increase of 150 per cent, effective January 1, 1970, will the minister explain to the House why such a great increase was felt necessary?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question should be placed on the Order Paper.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. It arises out of his statement yesterday and particularly the government's attitude to proposals to raise prices between now and March 1. Does the minister see any connection between this policy, the announced intention of the Toronto *Star* to raise the price of its weekend edition from 15 cents to 20 cents or 33⅓ per cent, effective next Saturday, and the editorial page headline in Monday's *Star*, "Pierre Trudeau's inhuman campaign to halt inflation"?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PUBLIC SERVICE

DELAY IN ISSUING RETROACTIVE PAY CHEQUES—SETTLEMENT OF LAWSUITS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. What kind of a settlement is the minister recommending in regard to actions commenced in the Exchequer Court by members of the Public Service respecting their long-awaited retroactive pay cheques?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will appreciate that the actions he refers to are before the courts and in accordance with the usual practice I should not comment on them.

Mr. Woolliams: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are the minister or officials in his department negotiating a settlement of these actions regarding retroactive salary increases that should have been paid and have not been because of the ineptness of the President of the Treasury Board?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

BIOLOGY

ECOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF NEW CHEMICALS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries. Was Dr. Peter Larkin, Director of the Federal Fisheries Institute in Vancouver, stating government or departmental policy when he said that federal legislation should be adopted to ensure that new chemicals are not used until their ecological consequences have been researched adequately?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will appreciate that the question as asked is not in order.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—COST OF MILITARY OBSERVERS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Can the minister inform the House whether it is a fact that the cost of the military observers operating in Nigeria is being paid by the Nigerian government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot ask the minister to confirm or deny a statement.

Mr. Nystrom: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member cannot ask a question supplementary to one which is not in order. Perhaps he could ask a new question.

Mr. Nystrom: I will rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to inform the House who is paying the cost of military observers in Nigeria?

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I will take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker. I would like to give a completely accurate reply to such an important question.

MEAT

USE OF DIETHYLSTILBESTROL

Mr. Percy V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Owing to the concern of our society about the health problems being created by the adulteration and contamination of food, will the minister assist in the process of eliminating this contamination by banning the use of diethylstilbestrol in the production of meat?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the impression that this is a rather technical question, and I am not sure to what extent it is urgent. If it is urgent, the minister will have recognized that fact and might want to reply.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Food and Drug Directorate is looking into the very matter to which the hon. member is referring. I hope to be able to give a more definitive answer later.

Mr. Noble: This material has already been banned in the poultry industry and I am wondering why there is an inconsistency in the policy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The supplementary question is argumentative.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ATLANTIC REGION—EFFECTS OF RESCHEDULING AND CHANGES IN WORK METHODS

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. As a result of the great inconvenience caused employees and the travelling public by Canadian National Railways in the Atlantic region as a result of rescheduling trains and also changes in work methods, which I am informed will cause still further lay-offs, will the minister ask the vice-president, Mr. MacDougall, and other top-level officials to meet with representatives at Sydney, where the effects of this rescheduling will be most serious?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I will be glad to convey that

representation to the representatives of the CNR, who have usually co-operated with me in complying with such requests.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In the minister's promised conversation with Mr. MacDougall and other officials, will he ascertain whether it is the continuing policy of the CNR to discourage the public from using trains?

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT

NEGOTIATIONS RESPECTING AMENDMENT--INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. Have the minister and his officials completed negotiations with the Attorneys General of the provinces with regard to amendments to the Juvenile Delinquents Act, and is it his intention to bring forth legislation in the near future?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is no, and the answer to the second part is yes.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

RETROACTIVITY OF PENSIONS TO FORMER DOSCO EMPLOYEES

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Now that the Treasury Board has approved the pension paid to coal miners formerly employed by Dosco, will this pension be made retroactive to the date on which Devco took over from Dosco?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the agreement took place between Devco and the miners' union and we will simply abide by it. We are not prepared to negotiate the miners' working conditions with the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister reviewed the legislation setting up Devco which was passed by this House and makes the payment of this pension mandatory? Has he ascertained from Mr. Blackmore why this was a negotiated part of the contract and whether he intends to use the contract as a threat to carry the one that has just been put over?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the miners are very well represented by their union which discharges its obligations properly.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I again ask the minister responsible to explain how something that was made mandatory by legislation passed by this House can become part of a negotiation, when these men are not even employed at the present time.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): That is your opinion.

POLLUTION

CANADIAN POSITION AT BRUSSELS INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the absence of a statement on government policy regarding the Brussels conference on oil pollution of the high seas, and in view of the debate which is to take place shortly on second reading of the Canada Water Act, is the minister prepared to make known to members of the House Canada's position at that conference?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. While I am on my feet I should explain that I have received a detailed report from our ambassador, who was the head of our delegation. I will look it over. I do not see any reason why it should not be made available to the committee. I will certainly do so unless there is some restriction. I also hope to make a statement.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

AMENDMENTS TO ASSIST THOSE OUT OF WORK

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the considerable increase in unemployment in industrial areas of Ontario and Quebec, will the minister bring forth as soon as possible long-awaited, appropriate amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Act in order to clear up many of the difficulties in

obtaining unemployment insurance experienced by those presently becoming unemployed?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the suggestion is useful. Happily, it does not require legislation but perhaps more efficiency on the part of the administration. I am pleased to say that despite the fact that more and more people are applying for unemployment insurance, we are able, with rare exceptions, to process their claims more efficiently than ever before.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR INQUIRY INTO CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that contractors who have claims against Canadian National Railways have recommended the appointment of Mr. Justice Samuel Freedman to head a one-man inquiry, will the minister say when he is prepared to accept the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications recommending this one-man inquiry?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): As soon as I get the letter which reached the hon. member before it did me.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—USE OF CANADIAN DOCTORS AND NURSES

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will the minister ask the government of Nigeria whether Canada can make available volunteer medical doctors and nurses?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As the House knows, one of its distinguished members went to Nigeria yesterday on just such a mission. I would encourage all voluntary agencies to work with their counterparts in Nigeria, because I think these voluntary workers would be welcome.

GRAIN

POWERS OF VANCOUVER MOVEMENT CO-ORDINATOR

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Has the recently appointed co-ordinator of grain movement through the port of Vancouver been given the power to resolve fundamental conflicts in this area of transportation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): This question should more properly have been directed to the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon, but I will undertake to bring it to his attention.

Mr. Southam: Perhaps the hon. gentleman would direct this question to him also. Is it the policy of the government that in situations where fundamental conflicts cannot be resolved between the participants the government should give the co-ordinator power to impose an arbitrated solution?

POLLUTION

HALIFAX HARBOUR—SOURCE, REMEDY AND COMPENSATION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Transport whether his departmental officials have discovered the source of the most recent, serious oil pollution in Halifax harbour. If so, what remedial action is being taken, and is consideration being given to the payment of compensation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take that question as notice. I shall try to answer it as soon as possible.

SCIENCE SERVICES

RATIONALIZATION OF MEDICAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. On December 19 I asked whether he would make a statement regarding government policy for the rationalization of the Research Councils and he said he would do so in the new year. I am wondering whether we can expect action soon.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Soon, Mr. Speaker.

AIR TRANSPORT

WEST KOOTENAYS—UNSUITABILITY OF SYSTEM

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): I have a question for the Minister of Transport,

Mr. Speaker. Having regard to the completely unsuitable and costly passenger air transport system now serving the West Kootenays, which was forced upon us last June by the Canadian Transport Commission, will the minister personally look into the matter and try to resolve the problems which have been upsetting this whole area?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation and he must assume the minister will take it into account.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

INQUIRY AS TO DATE OF DEBATE

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Referring to an answer that he gave some time ago according to which he was to meet with the leaders of the opposition parties about a debate to be held on constitutional matters, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he did meet with the leaders of the parties and whether he can still assure us that this debate is going to take place during the present session?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall answer yes to the last part of the question. As the hon. member said, it ought to have taken place before the Christmas recess but the leaders of the parties represented in the House agreed to postpone it. I think that other negotiations will take place with the leaders of the opposition parties in order to set the date.

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

BONNE BAY—SIGNING OF AGREEMENT WITH PROVINCE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): My question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister indicate when he expects an agreement to be signed between the province of Newfoundland and the federal government in connection with handing over the land necessary to establish the proposed national park at Bonne Bay?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I met the minister responsible for the implementation of this project in Newfoundland in December. Progress has been made as regards negotiations but I cannot say at this time when an agreement can be signed.

[*English*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ADDITIONAL COSTS OF TURBOTRAIN

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): I direct this question to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Since a spokesman for the CNR announced yesterday that a new series of tests on the turbine-powered train is beginning, and since the modification program will increase the cost orginally estimated by several million dollars, will the minister assure the House that these additional costs will be borne by the prime contractor and not by the railway?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question should be placed on the Order Paper.

NATIONAL REVENUE

REFUND OF SALES TAX ON GRAIN STORAGE EQUIPMENT

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister received representations from farmers who applied for the 11 per cent sales tax refund on grain storage but were refused because it had been paid to the manufacturers of the storage equipment? If so, is he considering taking any action?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): I do not recall having received such representations, Mr. Speaker, but I will look into it.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CORPORATIONS ACT

ADMINISTRATIVE AND CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS

The House resumed from Tuesday, January 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford 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 read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last night I was finding difficulty in giving an appropriate name to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford). During the debate on this bill earlier I called him the shadow-boxing champion of Canada. I thought this was an appropriate name at the time. But he has been making a great deal of noise with regard to consumer prices, and some people want to change the title of his ministry to the ministry of high prices. It seems to me he is making so much noise with regard to high prices that he should really be called a tinpot dictator. He is making a great deal of noise, but when it comes to action it is simply ineffective action.

I heard the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) talk yesterday about the results he had achieved in combating inflation in cooperation with the corporations, about the tenderness and kindness of the copper companies in agreeing to withhold price increases until March 1. He also told us that the banks had agreed not to increase their rate of interest on mortgage loans. Taking into account the fact that the copper companies had benefited from a 26 per cent increase before attempting to make the last increase, I must conclude that the minister is a man who makes a great noise but is capable only of ineffective action.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Bill C-4 is an 83-page bill which proposes to deal with 17,500 federal companies, of which 2,350 are public corporations. In introducing the bill the minister said that the bill would tend to modernize the laws governing financial statements, insider trading, takeover bids, proxy solicitation, inspection and investigation, and would otherwise conform with the standards and practices of other jurisdictions. Second, the bill would require the filing of financial statements each year by private companies of economic significance, defined as companies with either assets or gross annual revenue greater than $3 million. The bill would also require companies conducting more than one class of business to disclose the volume and profitability of each class.

This measure is designed to shed new light on conglomerates, but due to its complexity it will not be proclaimed for some time. In his eloquent and persuasive opening, the minister said that the bill had been brought forward to meet the recommendations of the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Consumer Credit, and that it was the first legislative step taken as a result of the disclosure recommendations of the Watkins inquiry into foreign ownership and the structure of Canadian industry.

Reviewing the bill, it seems to me that these measures are an attempt to block sophisticated financial fleecing of shareholders, thereby giving them some protection against white-collar fraud and malpractice. This bill gives no protection to Canadian financial independence and Canadian sovereignty, and certainly offers no protection against foreign domination.

Our business structure has moved a great distance, from sole proprietorships and individual entrepreneurs to the complex industrial and corporate society that we have today. Most people are confused and bewildered by this complexity. When one speaks of mergers, conglomerates, horizontal integration, vertical integration, insider trading and proxy voting, most Canadians are left far behind in understanding the meaning and application of these terms within our society.

Our society has had within it the growth of a corporate elite that exercises an economic power far greater than any political power that is exercised by the government. This is why it is very important that we be protected. The government has a first responsibility to require corporations not to act to the detriment of society, to make them respond to our national independence and sovereignty, as well as to fulfil the consumer needs of all Canadians to the best possible advantage.

Bill C-4 does not attain these goals. We would be greatly impressed had the government brought forward legislation setting up a Canadian Development Corporation. I say that because it is necessary to assemble the savings of Canadians and to direct their investment into social needs and requirements; it is also necessary to help rationalize our industries and to make them more competitive in world markets. Canadians are excellent savers; the record has indicated that. Yet they are finding difficulty investing in Canadian equities, and Canadian manufacturers are losing ground in the field of research and development. In some instances Canadians are experiencing employment difficulties as a result of foreign takeovers.

There is a myth that we in Canada are dependent upon foreign capital to continue our economic growth, and this myth is having serious consequences. Sixty five per cent of Canada's economy is now owned by foreign

companies and that percentage is rapidly increasing. No halt has been called by the government, and one suspects there has been encouragement in certain instances.

Statements made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) have alarmed many Canadians. He appears to want to negotiate away our energy resources of oil, water and electricity without informing the Canadian people about our inventory of these resources, our present and future needs and what price or trade-off he is prepared to accept with regard to these very valuable resources.

Canadians should be aware that Canada is a greater exporter of investment capital to the United States than the United States has been to Canada. Canadians should realize that 15 per cent of U.S. foreign expansion and growth in Canada during the last ten years has been financed by new U.S. capital, and that 85 per cent of the capital has been generated from profits derived in Canada.

I cannot help but recall an experience I had last year when I boarded a plane from Ottawa and found myself beside a businessman, a complete stranger to me, who told me he operated a small manufacturing concern. He had been to his bank to ask for a loan of $50,000 for the purpose of expanding his business. His "friendly" bank manager said he could not lend him the money because of the tight money policy of his bank and of the government.

A week later he was invited to lunch by his bank manager, who informed him that he had had a meeting with the representatives of a United States company who wanted to purchase this man's business, and that the bank was prepared to finance the purchase. So here we have a Canadian bank that was not prepared to lend a Canadian businessman $50,000 so he could expand his business, yet wants this Canadian businessman to sell his business to a U.S. company on the assurance that the bank would stand behind the purchase.

Canadians should realize that foreign investment in Canada has, according to the Watkins report, reached $27 billion book value. The book value of shares is usually rated below market level, and if a market value were placed on the shares it has been stated that the shares would be worth between $55 million and $60 billion. Consequently, it would be impossible to use the Gordon technique of buying back Canada; it cannot be done. But we must find ways and means of restraining the intrusion or invasion of foreign capital into Canadian business.

When I heard the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) say last night that he approved of the millions of dollars that had been invested in Canada by our U.S. friends, and his opening assertion that he would rather see western Canada a colony of the United States than a colony of central Canada, I—

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member is a reasonable person; he, like I, is a member of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. When I heard him make that statement last night I went and read my speech, and I challenge him to show me on *Hansard* where I made that statement. What I did say is recorded in *Hansard*. I was talking about U.S. investment in western Canada.

I have no intention of withdrawing anything that I said, but if the hon. member is going to quote me, let him at least use my words rather than putting words in my mouth. I know he has always been a fair member, but I have noticed that whenever these pseudo-socialists or Liberals get hit, as I hit them last night on the subject of unions, or whenever they are hit on economic matters, they just cannot take it; they try to misconstrue or misrepresent the facts.

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I have not had an opportunity to read the speech that the hon. member made last night.

Mr. Woolliams: That is obvious.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Gilbert: I was certain that he prefaced his remarks by saying he would rather western Canada were a colony of the United States than a colony of central Canada.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a question of privilege. How can the hon. member make such a statement when he says he did not read and has no knowledge of what I said? What manner of nonsense is that?

Mr. Gilbert: Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege and pleasure of listening to the hon. member last night.

Mr. Woolliams: You had better check the record.

Mr. Gilbert: Then the hon. member quoted the Toronto *Daily Star* and the *Telegram* in

relation to the millions of dollars invested in United States Companies operating in Canada. It seemed to me he was suggesting that Canada should become the 51st state of the United States. Surely, this is not what Canadians want.

Surely, Canadians want to retain our economic freedom, culture, sovereignty and political freedom. It has been said many times that once the economic freedom of a country is in the hands of another country, political freedom is lost shortly thereafter. We in Canada must export to survive. With the intrusion of foreign companies into Canada we have become a branch-plant economy, which does ensure our economic freedom. The intention of branch-plant companies is to serve the domestic market, not world markets.

I recall representatives appearing before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs in respect of the Kennedy Round. We had representatives of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the president of Electrohome. He told us a story which I think is worth repeating. He said we had nine television manufacturers in Canada, seven being American firms and two being Canadian. He mentioned that the two Canadian firms were Electrohome, of which he is the president, and Clairtone, which has had limited success in Canada.

Without the help of the government of Nova Scotia the latter firm might have had serious difficulties. As a matter of fact, it is facing serious difficulties now. This project was an attempt by the government of Nova Scotia to invite United States firms to invest in eastern North America in order to provide more employment in that area. The president of Electrohome said that many people had suggested we should not complain about our position because we have in Canada a population of 20 million compared with a population of 200 million in the United States, and that this provides a vast opportunity for Canadian exporters.

He suggested that this situation reminded one of the father who bought his son a big dog. The son looked up at the dog and said, "Dad, is the dog for me, or am I for the dog?" He was attempting to illustrate that for Canadian manufacturers to intrude into United States markets is almost impossible. He suggested that the service requirements which agencies must meet and the response of United States T.V. representatives make it impossible for Canadian companies to compete. He added that we are in a very disadvantageous position in respect of the development of our television and radio industries because of the vast financial and other resources of our United States friends. This makes it very difficult for small Canadian firms to compete. We find one of the two remaining T.V. firms in Canada trying to compete with United States firms which have set up branch offices in Canada, not to create markets for export but just to service the market here.

Representatives of the chemical industry appeared before the same standing committee. One of those representatives said that when an order is placed for a chemical, multinational corporations place the order in a computer which arrives at a price for labour, a price for materials, a price for transportation and a price for insurance. The computer then gives an answer in respect of which country can make the product at the lowest price. In other words, no consideration is given to developing Canadian markets as far as the chemical manufacturers are concerned.

These are some of the problems which small Canadian manufacturers face in respect of the growth and development of the Canadian economy. We should realize that we have no control over the automotive industry. As a matter of fact, this government encouraged the making of an auto pact with the United States. The result has been a lack of opportunity to compete in this industry. I was disappointed to learn that Canadians must depend upon United States know-how in the field of manufacturing, sales and promotion in the automotive field, particularly when small countries such as Sweden, France, Italy and Japan have developed their own automotive industries. We are at the mercy of our United States friends in this field.

If some of our Liberal friends on the other side had their way, we would have complete integration of United States and Canadian societies, not only in respect of the auto pact but in other areas. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has conducted with his United States counterpart negotiations regarding energy resources. I do not like this trend and I am sure many Canadians feel the same way. We should think of the significant control we have in the oil, rubber and chemical industries and the fact that at the moment our oil fields operate at only 35 per cent capacity. We are net importers of oil. This situation is not good. Let me hasten to add that we do not object to the co-operation of

our foreign friends in the development of this country, but we certainly do not want the integration which is beginning to take place.

The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) seemed to express cynicism yesterday with regard to corporate entity. He said that some of the disclosure provisions of this bill were not necessary, and that the main purpose of a corporate entity was to make money rather than to satisfy the social and economic needs of Canadians. He has had experience in this field. I should think he would shudder at the trend that is developing in respect of the integration of our economy with that of another country. I have in mind integration of a nature which includes control and decision-making, rather than investment of equity capital.

The sophisticated measures adopted by corporations make it very difficult to trace or determine ownership. The leader of our party has set forth measures which should be taken by the government to protect Canadian industry. First he referred to takeovers. He talked about supervision of takeovers and determining whether they are in the best interests of Canadians. He also referred to a state trading agency to promote exports. We all recall the sad experience in respect of exporting trucks to China and wheat and flour to other countries.

• (3:40 p.m.)

We realize that many United States branch-plant firms are contravening their own Trading with the Enemy Act. This should not be so. According to the Watkins recommendation, the establishment of a state trading agency would help solve this problem. I should like to see amendments to the Combines Investigation Act. When I read the report in the *Globe and Mail* yesterday or the day before about the $40,000 fine imposed on ERCO, I realized that the imposition of a fine on these companies is not sufficient because of their great financial strength; a $40,000 fine does little or nothing to prohibit their activities in Canada. The New Democratic Party has also suggested there should be a floating exchange rate, which would give Canada more flexibility in respect of foreign exchange and foreign reserves.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by reminding you of the great Canadian song, "This land is your land, this land is my land, from Bonavista to Vancouver Island". I would prefer that we continue to sing this song rather than have the Americans sing that our land is their land, from the Arctic waters to the tip of Texas. Unless we have a government which takes immediate steps to implement some of the stronger recommendations of the Watkins report and some of the suggestions the leader of our party has made, I am afraid I will have to join in the song with the Americans that our land is their land, from the Arctic waters to the tip of Texas.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, when Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act, was before the House on December 10 I did not have the opportunity to speak. Therefore, I appreciate this opportunity to make a few brief remarks. There has been a great free-wheeling debate on this subject. We have heard all about how to be good corporate citizens. We have heard about the control of our economy, the flow of United States capital, United States takeovers and many other subjects. I should like to confine my remarks under two headings; the first would include some of the practical applications and practical problems which will be involved if these amendments are instituted, and the second would include some of the principles involved in legislation of this type.

I say at the outset that so far as this legislation contributes to the protection of investors, creditors and the public generally, it has my support. However, I believe attention should be paid to the matters under the two headings which I have mentioned. Corporate businesses and the owners of big companies have been looked upon as the big, bad boys who cause all the trouble in this country. Let me remind the people who say these things that these companies provide jobs and make a useful contribution to the economy of our country. I do not think we should introduce legislation which would make it more difficult for large corporations to operate.

I turn to the heading of practical problems. Under this piece of legislation we are asking the companies to do more bookeeping and maintain more records. These are the firms which now collect Canada Pension Plan contributions, Unemployment Insurance contributions and money from the sale of Canada Savings Bonds. They also collect federal and provincial sales taxes. They do a great deal of the bookkeeping for the government. Now the minister would ask them to do even more; he would have them file more returns and perform additional functions for which there is no return or compensation.

Members on all sides of the House very often receive representations from companies who say that they are working overtime in order to provide statistics for the government and to fill government files. They say they are continually being asked to file too many statistics. They find themselves working longer hours in order to provide this data. I believe it can be said that government curiosity quite often leads to government interference. This legislation will also mean an increase in the number of civil servants.

Many other practical problems will arise should this legislation come into force. I believe there should be unification in respect of legislation. The minister is asking for reports from corporate companies. We find that already our provincial governments have enacted legislation asking for similar information. Regrettably, however, the information asked for is not always the same. The requirements in respect of disclosure apply to many corporations governed by the Canada Corporations Act. In order to avoid confusion on the part of shareholders and the investing public in general, maintain administrative efficiency and avoid multiplicity and duplication of costly returns, I think the minister would be wise not to bring into force these particular amendments until the legislation respecting disclosure is uniform throughout Canada.

The provisions in clause 16 relating to section 120A of the act should not be proceeded with until similar provisions are in effect in all provinces and in respect of all companies doing business in any part of the western world; otherwise, a company falling under federal legislation would be placed in a most disadvantageous position vis-à-vis its competitors. If these companies were required to give such information, their foreign competitors would know a great deal about their business and there would be a tendency toward more takeovers of Canadian companies than has been the case in the past. These are some of the observations under the heading of practical problems as I see them.

There is also a principle involved here. I think this policy involves an invasion of privacy. I do not think the information being asked for is necessary in all cases. I realize the minister said that this provision would be applicable only with respect to companies with sales or assets in the amount of $3 million or over, but is there any guarantee that it will not be amended later to reduce the figure to $2 million and then to $1 million?

Is there any guarantee that in time the government will not choose to have the affairs of Joe Smith Limited published, and will later suggest the same thing for plain Joe Smith? In respect of private companies or businesses owned by members of a family or by an individual, where there is no prospect of extending share ownership to others, I suggest that if the act is amended to require this type of information to be filed it will constitute a gross invasion of privacy which in no way serves the public good. When the committee studies the bill it should look into this matter very thoroughly.

• (3:50 p.m.)

This bill contains some drastic amendments. It must not be taken too lightly and skipped over. I hope that when it comes before the committee, many of these companies and corporations will appear before it and prove to the minister and the committee that some of the amendments are too drastic and are not in the best interests of our country.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, when the government house leader was speaking on the radio the other evening he said that it was the business of the government to bring forward legislation, and of the opposition to criticize and pass it. However, the government house leader left out the fact that if the government did not bring forward the legislation which seemed to the opposition to be important and of top priority, the opposition must speak about the legislation that should have been introduced and was not.

I think that perhaps the reason for a good many of the speeches on this bill on our side is that we feel that the type of thoroughgoing and strong legislation that should be introduced by the government in this session, dealing with problems affecting consumers, has not been introduced. Consequently, we have to deal with measures which are inadequate, and with the government's sins of omission rather than their sins of commission. Of course, we get a swipe at the sins of commission in passing, but their sins of omission are much greater.

I think when this legislation first appeared it came as a great shock to many people across our country to learn that under the Canada Corporations Act the only federally-incorporated companies required to file financial statements with the department are

public companies, those with at least 50 shareholders, offering shares to the public and placing no restrictions on the transfer of shares. I think that a great many people were astounded to learn that Canada was so far behind in this type of legislation.

Many people were shocked to learn that no Canadian government, before the passage of this legislation, had required private companies, no matter how large or influential, to file financial statements with the department. We welcome this legislation in so far as it will require all public and private companies with assets or gross annual revenue in excess of $3 million to file annual statements with the department.

Had this legislation been introduced half a century ago or even a quarter of a century ago, it might have been hailed with real enthusiasm by those who are concerned with protecting the consumer's interest. But this is not 1920 nor 1945. In view of the tremendous growth of corporate power, this legislation falls far short of what is required to protect the Canadian public and now it is largely irrelevant. It is all right so far as it goes, but it gives us an inch when we require miles. Consequently we have to point out what is needed and what should be done by the department at this time.

The reason that this legislation falls far short of what is needed—I do not intend to go into its good points because they have been outlined by various people—and has shortcomings is the rate at which the economy of this country has become the happy hunting-ground for large corporations and particularly huge, foreign firms with branch-plants in Canada.

I need only review very briefly what was put on the record yesterday by the leader of this party when he mentioned the latest release in response to a question asked by the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman). He mentioned the acquisition of Canadian businesses by foreign corporations as reported annually by the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act. In 1963 there were 35 takeovers of Canadian companies; in 1964 the number rose to 87; in 1965, 74; in 1966, 74; in 1967, 79; in 1968 there was a great jump to 155, and in 1969, there were 102 takeovers. It does not take great imagination, after watching the press these days, to see that the figure will jump up again.

While I am dealing with this matter I would like to finish setting the record straight. Whenever the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is referred to, he seems to be out of the chamber. I will not run the risk of failing to set the record straight and will do so even in his absence. Here is exactly what he said, as reported in *Hansard*. Perhaps he will realize that the ears of my colleague, the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert), were not at fault when he heard the following statement yesterday, as recorded at page 2339 of *Hansard*. The hon. member for Calgary North said:

> At this time when the NDP has been making inroads in Saskatchewan, not only in the farm areas but in the cities, the people of western Canada are worried about becoming a colonial outpost, not of the United States but of central Canada.

Our genial and gallant friend from the prairies who was bent on carrying everything before him, like the great west wind, in his attack on the NDP made a beautiful frontal sortie but he did not realize that he left exposed a beautiful posterior and an extremely vulnerable one. In his anxiety to attack the NDP what he actually said was that the people of western Canada are worried about becoming a colonial outpost, not of the United States but of central Canada. Many of us from the west may be concerned about central Canada, but compared with the dangers of being taken over from outside the country the dangers of being taken over by central Canada are much less of a hazard.

The takeover of Canadian companies at the present time, and the galloping rate at which it is proceeding, has one serious effect which has already been mentioned but which I would like to again emphasize. The most serious aspect of these takeovers entailing the risk of Canada converting to a branch-plant economy, is that it is not Canadians who are making the big decisions for consumers in this country, but outsiders. The outsiders make the big decisions for the consumers of this country. As proof of this I will quote one excerpt of a statement made by someone who is in a good position to know the situation. This is taken from an article published in the Montreal *Star* late last year. It says in part:

• (4:00 p.m.)

> —this week, an officer of one of the greatest international corporations, said with complete frankness:
>
> "It is clear that our living standards depend upon the investment decisions made by those who own our corporations."

This was Frank S. Capon, Vice-President of Du Pont of Canada, and in his case the crucial decisions are made by the handful of men in the United States who control E. I. Dupont de Nemours and Co. Mr. Capon was speaking to the meeting in Montreal of the Society of the Chemical Industry and, entirely apart from his frankness, it was a meeting worthy of attention by the people of Canada.

The chemical industry is generally regarded as one of the main sources of rapid growth in an industrial society, yet the president of a Crown corporation, Dr. E. R. Rowzee of Polymer Corp., warned that in its present condition in Canada it may require old-fashioned subsidies to survive. Very quietly, the Department of Trade and Commerce has been studying the industry's problems and a confidential report has been drawn up.

I suppose this will mean that some member of the New Democratic Party will have to put a motion on the Order Paper seeking an order for return with respect to that confidential report, once again battling the secrecy of the government which uses the taxpayers' money to draw up such a report. Now I return to the article:

If one of the great growth industries of the industrial era is in difficulties in this country, one must begin by questioning the quality of the decision making that has been involved and we immediately encounter the fact that in this case we are not concerned with a decision making process that takes place in Canada. As Mr. Capon frankly admitted, it takes place elsewhere: so far as this particular industry in Canada is concerned, largely in Britain and the United States.

That the foreign decision making process can be questioned can be seen in the comment of a highly responsible, industry-oriented official in Otawa who was discussing the Rowzee and Capon speeches:

"The basic problem is that the units of production are not large enough, but one must say that the industry takes very surprising decisions at times —astonishing ones. Rivalry leads it to create overproduction and then the industry encounters difficulties which it foresaw in advance."

If we had overproduction and the decisions leading to it were made in Canada, that would be one thing; but when Canadian consumers find their hands tied because they have no control over decisions made in other countries, it is another thing. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) should introduce legislation to deal with this situation.

I well remember when the minister and I both sat on a joint committee of the House and Senate, a committee of which he was joint chairman, and the question of a great international cartel controlling quinine supplies, including the drug Quinidine, was discussed. At that time men and women in this country who were heart sufferers needed this drug, but its price went up astronomically due to the operations of this cartel in Britain, Holland and the United States. Nothing could be done about it in Canada because of the law that existed then, and nothing can be done about it today because of the law as it exists now. That is the indictment that can be laid against this legislation. In a way, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is motherhood. Most of us can agree with it, but motherhood resolutions are not sufficient to deal with the problems facing consumers.

Yesterday I was amazed to hear a prominent frontbench member of the official opposition worry about the civil liberties of corporations and the possible invasion of those liberties by this proposed legislation. If we have to choose between the civil liberties of corporations and the consumers' right to know, I am sure in the minds of most Canadians the top priority must be given to the consumers. The civil liberties of corporations effect a relatively small percentage of the population, and it seems to me we should at all costs be prepared to protect the interests of the majority of consumers.

I hope the minister will recall that he has another and a better half—and I am not referring to his wife. While he may be Minister of Corporate Affairs, he is also Minister of Consumer Affairs. I have always thought it was wrong to include a conflict of interest, such as between corporations and consumers, within one department. From past experience I know that in such a case the consumers get the short end of the stick.

Canadian consumers are looking to the minister to help them. They hope he will introduce legislation of a worth-while kind to protect their interests, interests that have been badly damaged in recent months by some takeovers and by the activities of certain huge corporations. As I say, Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides protection for shareholders and people connected with corporations. But many people are not shareholders and have nothing to do with corporations. The great majority of the Canadian people need protection provided by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The sooner we have a divorce in that department, the better I will like it.

I would like to see the minister emerge as the Minister of Consumer Affairs and leave the corporations to the tender mercy of somebody else. There is on the other side of the House a lot of tender mercy for corporations

and they would not have to look too far to get it, whereas consumers badly need a friend.

Although in some respects we agree with this legislation because it is long overdue and it is housekeeping legislation, and we are prepared to go along with it, we in this party know it is merely a sop. The affairs of the country should be organized in such a way as to protect the consumers. The minister should not be misled into thinking that we will accept this bill as a substitute for genuine legislation to put the affairs of the country into order so that consumers can have a fair show.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, this legislation brings a very important subject before hon. members, and one that urgently requires debate. Corporations operating within the framework of our economic system are an important and essential instrument for carrying on economic activity and for carrying through our economic organization. They enjoy a special status in law, and their importance has grown with the evolution of our economic system.

The role and importance of corporations have changed throughout our economic history, particularly over the past 50 to 60 years. In many respects the role of the corporation and the power it enjoys has resulted in it becoming something of a monster, a monster which we have created and which in many respects is now beyond our control, particularly in view of the type of government we have, which fails to take any action to ensure that corporations operate in the public interest and that the public interest is adequately taken into account.

The situation necessitates very careful consideration of this legislation. It must be examined in a context far beyond the particular contents of the bill, far beyond the particular recommendations which the government is placing before us. This bill, Mr. Speaker, tinkers with the present structure of corporations and corporation law and it attempts to effect a number of repairs which, it is thought, will fix up the law, fix the system and make it work adequately.

• (4:10 p.m.)

In themselves, some of these changes and recommendations are important and some of them are very useful. Provisions with respect to the handling of and requirement for financial statements, the whole situation with respect to insider trading, takeover bids, proxy solicitation, inspection and investigation, are important matters in themselves. They require and deserve adequate consideration by this House and they do have a place in our corporate law. There is also a provision which is a rather weak, timid step along the lines that some of us have advocated. I refer to the provision to allow companies to restrict their shareholders to Canadian citizens. I hope that this weak, faltering step is only the first step among further measures that will be taken to ensure a greater degree of Canadian control over our economic activity.

I want to deal in particular with two features of this legislation. They refer to financial disclosure and with respect to the incorporation of certain types of companies and with changes that are made in the bill with respect to incorporation procedures. But first, Mr. Speaker, there is a basic comment that I think should be made. This bill, I suggest, by implication states the government's faith in the ability and willingness of corporations and of the entire economic system, as it is now structured and as it now operates, to respond adequately to the needs of the time.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, such faith is ill-founded. In fact, we have seen many examples of the degree of corporate control over our economy. Corporations do exert a control which ignores the public interest and which does not take into account the views of governments. Within the past couple of days there have been a couple of weak steps which the government will certainly play up in its favour; but I suggest that there are other, more ominous developments in the offing in that respect.

I also suggest that the faith exhibited by the government in the present corporate structure and in the operation of our economy is ill-founded, because of our present economic situation. We have seen many illustrations of corporations failing for the most part to respond to attempts made by government, however weak these attempts might be, to take action to hold off with price increases or to exercise some degree of restraint in order to ensure a measure of stability and balance in the economy.

Within the past couple of years in particular, corporations have completely ignored the public interest. They have carried on their programs with the sole thought of bettering

their own operations and of bettering their profit and loss picture. They have ignored the well-being of the economy as a whole.

I think this is very well demonstrated by the fact that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) very recently in a year-end review indicated that a survey of major corporations in Canada indicated that their capital spending plans in 1970 would be 14 per cent higher than their capital spending in 1969. I think it is quite obvious that this is not in line with the policy of restraint which the government has been advocating and pleading with corporations to adopt. Certainly, I think this demonstrates a degree of irresponsibility on the part of the private, corporate sector of the economy.

Finally, of course, we have the fact that much of our economy has been sold to foreign interests. I will have more to say about that later in my address. Thus, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we need a much more fundamental consideration in dealing with this legislation than is evident in the bill now before us. The tinkering changes that are proposed by the minister will be of little value unless basic changes are effected and unless we consider some of the basic questions. Obviously, the government is unwilling to take any basic steps is order to deal with some of the problems of corporate operations.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with two particular matters which are contained in this legislation. The first has to do with the question of financial disclosure. This is of particular interest to me because in some of my work over the past several years, prior to my entering the House of Commons, I had many occasions to look into the affairs of corporations and companies, as provided for under the laws of the province of Saskatchewan, where I live, and the laws of Canada.

Sometimes I was able to obtain the information I needed because the company involved was a public company and had to file certain information. But on many occasions I found that information I needed in order to adequately study questions of public interest could not be obtained because the companies in question were registered as private companies. Thus, information was denied to me and anybody else who might have been interested. Therefore, last year I introduced a private member's bill in the House of Commons, Bill C-61, which was an act to amend the Canada Corporations Act. It had to do with the filing of returns.

[Mr. Burton.]

This bill provided that every company, whether or not it was a public or a private company, would be required to submit financial statements to the Secretary of State, with a further copy to be made available to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. This financial statement would be filed with the department and would be available for public inspection.

The bill that I proposed last year was entirely in line with the recommendations of the Watkins task force, which was commissioned by a Liberal government a number of years ago. The legislation now before us proposes some changes with respect to financial reporting on the part of private companies. It proposes that any company with a gross revenue of over $3 million a year or assets of over $3 million be required to submit financial returns which would be open for inspection. This is a step in the right direction. Indeed, it is obvious that the present law based on the classical capitalistic concept that businesses or individuals can do whatever they want, regardless of the effect on other people, is simply not good enough today.

I suggest that the proposal advanced by the minister in this bill is still not good enough. I suggest that there is a good case to be made for corporations under the $3 million level in revenue per year, or assets, being required to make available to the government and to the public information on their financial operations. I suggest that the minister should give consideration to a further amendment to his bill to provide that companies coming below the $3 million mark be also included. I have often found from my experience and studies that there are companies under the $3 million mark, either with respect to revenue or assets, which are operating in a way that would make adequate disclosure of information with respect to their financial operations a matter of public interest.

There is an old saying that big oaks from little acorns grow. Many big companies grow from very small businesses. Once they reach the $3 million level, information will have to be made available; but I suggest that it is important to secure information about some of them while they are still below the $3 million level of activity.

The importance of obtaining adequate information was highlighted in the Watkins

report on foreign ownership and the structure of Canadian industry. This report stated in part:

• (4:20 p.m.)

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.

I would also draw to the attention of the House the recommendation of the Watkins task force on foreign ownership and the structure of Canadian industry. This report stated at page 398:

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—

The report goes on to recommend that all private companies be required to submit information on their financial operations. I suggest that the government should give further consideration to this matter. There may be cases where it is not necessary, or even desirable, to reveal the financial situation of a particular corporation, but I suggest there are ways and means by which this could be taken into account.

I was interested to note that John Saunders, a staff writer of the Toronto *Star*, did some follow-up work after this bill was introduced last session. Mr. Saunders, who has written a thesis on the subject of financial disclosure and certainly knows what he is talking about in this respect, went to see some owners of large businesses about the question of financial disclosure. I would like to place on the record some of the comments he received when he interviewed some of the heads of large corporations. He went to see John David Eaton, the head of the T. Eaton Company. He had this to say about the interview:

John David Eaton was very much to the point before he hung up abruptly. The man who employs 50,000 people and reputedly sells $750 million worth of merchandise to Canadians each year made it clear he thinks the operations of his company are nobody's business but his own. Would you want to reveal your plans like a bankrupt in court? Eaton and many other executives of private firms may not be able to take this approach much longer. Amendments to the Corporations Act introduced by the federal government would force large private companies like his family-held department store chain to reveal as much to the public as other publicly incorporated competitors. As yet this idea of corporate disclosure cuts little ice in Eaton's Queen Street office. I had asked Eaton if he feels the affairs of the T. Eaton Company Limited are his personal private concern. "Naturally I do", was his reply. Seconds later a loud click ended our minute-long phone conversation.

This is an indication of the attitude of some businessmen. In all fairness, I should say that some of the other interviews which Mr. Saunders had demonstrated that some businessmen were prepared to meet this change in legislation. I indicated that Mr. Saunders of the Toronto *Star* wrote a thesis entitled, "The Politics and Practice of Corporate Disclosure in Canada". He went into the matter very thoroughly. Among other things, he discussed the evolution of the corporation and the whole question of public interest, the protection of the public, equality and fairness in disclosure and the value of disclosure to firms themselves.

He also noted there had been many recommendations throughout the years for changes in disclosure legislation, and that there was a good deal of pressure against any such change which involved a variety of factors such as interest groups, passive government and also business-government co-operation. Finally, I wish to place on the record Mr. Saunders' conclusion—after the study in relation to his thesis. He states:

The levels of corporate disclosure required in Canada are clearly inequitable in many cases, and almost as clearly insufficient in all cases. Extensive recommendations for reform have been made. The objections to reform which business is willing to raise in public are negligible. Yet the progress toward improved laws has been so gradual and halting that it's sometimes hard to discern movement at all—or to be sure that it's forward. Considering the obvious need, the indicated course is to enact legislation immediately to bring all firms up to the level of disclosure now required of public companies; and to follow this as quickly as possible with measures to increase the over-all level as far as is needed and to rationalize the methods of collecting and distributing the information.

But to accomplish these aims a number of other reforms would probably first have to be implemented—and these byproduct reforms could well be vastly more important for justice and social efficiency than the mere provision of information. They would, if fully put into effect, go a long way toward remedying the imbalance between the power of large corporations and that of individuals and between the political influence of wealthy, organized interests and of weak, diffuse ones.

The first necessary step would be to discredit once and for all the ersatz liberalism which endows corporations with such human rights as privacy.

This warping of a worthy philosophy will undoubtedly have to be eradicated eventually in any case if corporations—perhaps even private enterprise—are to be permitted to operate in a relatively unfettered manner.

He says later:

Disclosure remains corporations' most promising course. As Mill implied, secrecy—when combined with such other advantages as large size, permanence and limited liability—gives corporations an unacceptable edge over individuals in both financial and political transactions; without disclosure other methods must be found to even the odds. The acceptance of effective corporate reporting would be symbolic of rejection of the old, perverted liberalism and would create the possibility that a workable modern version of Mill's liberalism might be developed—

He suggests it is essential to effect a number of changes in order to ensure that such a change will be effective.

I would now like to discuss the amendments with respect to incorporation procedures. The bill provides that certain pipelines, oil and gas pipelines in particular, will no longer have to be incorporated by obtaining a charter from parliament. As a result of this legislation they will be able to obtain the necessary charter from the minister.

Various money lenders, with the exception of banks, insurance companies, trust and loan companies and certain railway companies, will also be able to obtain a charter without coming before Parliament. As a mechanical procedure, Mr. Speaker, I suggest this provision might make some sense. I also suggest that because of the importance of these institutions, this type of economic corporation to the Canadian economy, and the role that they play in the Canadian economy, it is very difficult and in fact impossible to go along with the provision contained within the framework of this bill.

If in fact the bill provided for adequate control or regulation of corporate activity as a whole, I think a good case could be made for changing the incorporation procedures. On the basis of the bill now before us, I feel it is essential for Canada's future economic welfare that Parliament retain some control over the manner in which this type of company is established and is able to carry on its activities and operations within Canada.

● (4:30 p.m.)

Turning to some of the important considerations involved in this bill, we have to ask ourselves why the government has not gone further in this legislation, why it has avoided some of the basic questions which a number of my hon. friends have attempted to place before the House during this debate. There are probably a number of reasons. The timidity of the government in dealing with this issue is obvious. While the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and other ministers have promised hon. members from time to time that a clear enunciation of government policy would be made with respect to foreign ownership and other aspects of corporate activity, no such announcement has been forthcoming up to the present time.

The manner in which the government operates was made clear by an answer which I received to a question I placed on the order paper last year when it became evident that the government was considering certain changes to the Corporations Act. It had been made known that a number of panels had been set up to discuss those changes. I directed a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) on February 3, 1969, as follows:

What are the names, addresses and occupations of the team of experienced businessmen and lawyers who are being consulted respecting proposed changes in the Canada Corporations Act?

The answer was:

Three panels of lawyers, accountants and businessmen were formed and met early in 1968 to review and comment, in confidence, on the recommendations for changes which were made by the task force on the Canada Corporations Act. These individuals are not involved in the current drafting of the bill and will of course bear no responsibility for its contents.

There followed lists of businessmen, accountants and lawyers from across the country. I have no doubt that each of the individuals named to these panels was a competent and able person in a position to offer useful advice to the government. But I would also suggest that they were considering this legislation from their own points of view. No group of people was called upon by the minister to deal with this question of amendments to the act solely from the point of view of the public, one might say from the point of view of the layman, even—the average working man, farmer and small businessman.

An hon. Member: What do you think the task force was doing?

Mr. Burton: I think it important that the kind of consideration I have suggested should be given. I mentioned a few moments ago that there are certain fundamental considerations which ought to be taken into account. I have already referred to the role of the cor-

porations in the economy, the fact that corporations have a great deal of power within the framework of our economic structure. I noted, also, that we are talking about large corporations, not about small companies. Large corporations are able to exercise a great deal of control over the degree and circumstances of economic activity in Canada. Many of them have the size and power necessary to influence the course of economic activity and affairs. In addition, there is the factor of foreign ownership and control. This comes into the picture when we examine the performance of Canadian companies and corporations over the past number of years.

The fact is that the government has carefully avoided dealing with the issue. There is, really, no policy with regard to it and Canada is the only country without such a policy. This was made clear by Professor Melville Watkins when he spoke to the Montreal Society of Financial Analysts in January, 1969. He said at that time:

> The current situation is well known to this audience: Canada is strong on foreign investment and weak on policy. The extent of foreign ownership of Canadian industry is unique among the industrialized nations of the world. We are also unique in the matter of policy by having the least. I note that only in Canada am I invited to speak on Canadian policy toward foreign ownership. In the United States, the invitation typically says "Canadian attitudes toward foreign investment". The Americans are more realistic; we don't have a policy, only an attitude.

He then went on to say that the absence of policy could not be attributed to the recentness of the problem, and outlined some of the history as it has developed. I am sure nobody will quarrel with Professor Watkins' words. Most hon. members are familiar with the history of these institutions, the history of economic development in Canada, and I believe an examination of our economic history gives cause for hesitancy in relying upon Canadian capitalists and Canadian corporations as guardians of the Canadian interest. We can see that at the time of confederation Canadian businessmen obtained a base for commercial expansion. The national economic structure was at that time protected by tariff walls and assured of captive markets, in many instances.

In the last quarter century we have witnessed a great sell-out. Many Canadian businesses and enterprises have sold out and opted to become junior partners of United States corporations. Not only United States companies have shown an interest. I have an article here which shows that a number of business interests in other nations are attempting to obtain a chunk or share of the Canadian economy.

For example, Algoma Steel Corporation is now 25 per cent owned by Mannesman International Corporation of West Germany; the Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills is 96 per cent owned by the Reed Paper Group, London; B.P. Canada Limited is wholly owned by British Petroleum, London; Canadian Breweries is 49.5 per cent owned by Rembrandt Controlling Investments Limited of Stellenbosch, South Africa, through Rothmans Holdings, Canada Limited; and Canadian Industries Limited is 73.4 per cent owned by Imperial Chemical Industries of Canada Limited, a wholly owned subsidiary of Imperial Chemical Industries Limited, London. Many other companies are also listed, including some which play an important role in the Canadian economy.

I also read with interest the statement by Professor Watkins in an article he wrote for the Montreal *Star* on May 16, 1969, analysing developments in recent years. Referring on that occasion to the spread of conglomerate firms not only in the United States but in Canada, he said:

> There is more to it than that. If foreign investment, or foreign takeover, rests on the superiority of the foreign firm, its converse is the inferiority of the domestic firm. To be not only a giant company in its own right, but owned in turn by a giant holding company, was apparently not to gain immunity from takeover.

This, of course, refers to the Canadian Breweries case.

> For those who believe that having Canadian-controlled firms was a protection against foreign ownership, without any additional government policy being necessary, the case of Canadian Breweries should have provided food for thought. This time there was no U.S. department of justice around to save the day.

That reference has to do with the attempted takeover of the Molson firm by the Schlitz Company in the United States. Later on, Professor Watkins had this to say:

> E. P. Taylor can bask in the sun of a Caribbean tax haven. As John Porter observed in his book The Vertical Mosaic, Canadian capitalists have not been known for their willingness to put patriotism above dollars, or country above cash—a point which Labatts, that old establishment family, had already demonstrated so far as this industry was concerned.
>
> Nor is that surprising; the nature of capitalism is to create an ethic that at best transcends, at worst erodes, nationalism. If there is a Canadian national interest then there has to be a government able and willing to formulate and exercise it.

I would ask the minister to note those words carefully. There is no question that Canadian corporations and financial institutions, with government acquiesence, have allowed large blocks of Canadian savings and capital to escape Canada unnecessarily in the past. This has increased our dependence upon foreign capital.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I think two questions need to be asked on the subject of importation of capital. The first is: In what form is capital imported? Is the capital imported as equity capital, or is it imported as debt capital? If it is equity capital, then the development is carried out and is owned by the foreigners who supplied the capital. On the other hand, if the capital is debt capital, when the debt is paid off Canadians own the development or industry concerned.

The second question is: Have Canadian capital resources been adequately mobilized? I think the very simple answer to that question is: No, much more could have been done throughout the years and could be done today to mobilize Canada's capital resources. For example, one thing that could be done is to establish the Canada Development Corporation, one of the promises of the present Liberal government.

This project has had a very interesting and rather speckled history. Some former Liberal cabinet ministers publicly advocated its establishment and made it quite clear that the legislation would be introduced in and passed by Parliament. That, of course, never happened. For several years in a row the legislation was promised in the Speech from the Throne at the beginning of each session. This year the proposal was not even included in the Speech from the Throne, which I suggest shows that this government is now even more at sea on this whole issue than it was last year and in previous years.

I suggest that at the present time the government is preparing to scrap the Canada Development Corporation as part of its program. I suggest the government wants to give it a burial of some sort in the near future. The fact is that the government is going to scuttle this proposal, and I do not think the Canadian people will in the long run accept this action.

At the recent federal New Democratic Party convention in Winnipeg, consideration was given to the proposal to establish a Canada Development Corporation, and a very strongly-worded resolution was passed in this connection. It was pointed out that the people of a nation possess the right and the power to agree on the use of their human and material resources through political decision, that in this way they determine the nature and the purpose of their existence.

The resolution passed by the convention went on to state that our national goals have remained unfulfilled by governments traditionally allied to corporate interests and committed to continental integration of our society. The major conclusions affecting our lives are still being made on the basis of equating the profit of corporations with the good of humanity. This philosophy has been, and continues to be, challenged by democratic socialists.

It is clear that we cannot rely on private enterprise alone to give us an economy designed for Canadian needs. That is why our convention proposed the establishment of a Canada Development Corporation. We should bear in mind that it is very important to distinguish the type of Canada Development Corporation that we want—not just some sort of mutual fund, which has been the notion of some members opposite. I should like to set out what we feel should be contained within the framework of a Canada Development Corporation. I quote eight points set out in a resolution passed at our convention at Winnipeg:

(1) To mobilize funds and to channel them into investment serving the public interest of Canada as a whole.

(2) To expand the public sector of the economy where necessary for the growth of the economy, for national planning and for increasing Canada's independence. This will normally be done by the creation of crown corporations. However, the CDC may also enter into consortium arrangements with private concerns where it has or can acquire effective control.

(3) To act always as an instrument of government planning and development policy and be directly responsible to Parliament through a Ministry.

(4) To stimulate the rationalization and greater specialization of industry in Canada in order to create a more productive economy.

(5) To be involved in regional development policies with provincial bodies and agencies in order to insure that every part of Canada capable of supporting viable development is extensively involved in the industrial future of this country.

(6) To promote worker participation plans in enterprises established or assisted by the Corporation, as a model for such plans in industry generally.

(7) To finance and develop new initiatives in research, scientific and technological developments which will increase the ability of Canadian industry to specialize and compete in world markets.

(8) To assist companies and individuals to fashion economic opportunity out of inventions and to ensure that Canada derives the benefits therefrom.

The resolution then went on to point out:

As secondary objectives, the Canada Development Corporation would be involved in marketing services and the provision of entrepreneurial talents.

It would provide joint marketing arrangements with the private sector for export purposes. It would also enter into partnership with other groups in order to protect the public interest.

An important aspect of the Canada Development Corporation is that it will insure the benefits of competitive forces where they are desirable, through yardstick operations and the stimulation of new firms.

I think this would be a very worth-while course of action to follow, and I recommend this set of proposals for the consideration of the minister, though I am not too hopeful that he will give them much consideration. The New Democratic Party convention at Winnipeg also dealt with the issue of foreign ownership and came up with a very strong policy to deal with this very serious problem. I suggest we must regain mastery over our own economic destiny and be master of our own house.

Coming from the province of Saskatchewan, I was very interested to note some recent developments regarding potash operations in that province. These were reported in an article in the *Globe and Mail* of October 9, 1969, and reference was made to a somewhat curious situation. Anti-dumping hearings were being held in the United States at the time in connection with imports of potash from Canada, and the article asks the question:

Are U.S. potash producers setting the price at which some imports from Canada are being dumped to the alleged injury of the U.S. producers?

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we have a curious situation here. For the most part U.S. companies are shipping potash from Canada to the U.S. through their Canadian operations or subsidiaries at a price level which results in a finding of anti-dumping by the United States government. This is indicative of some of the problems we encounter when we have the degree of foreign ownership of our economy that we have at the present time. This is one of the many questions that requires consideration if we are to ensure that our economic development is for the benefit of Canada as a whole.

Finally, I suggest there is one other area that requires very serious consideration. I refer to the development of multi-national corporations. This is a new phenomenon in our society. Some people, like George Ball, the former Undersecretary of State in the Johnson administration in the United States, have stated that power in the world in the future will be held, not by national states but by multinational corporations.

• (4:50 p.m.)

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Burton: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two or three more sentences to conclude my remarks. As I was pointing out, the Undersecretary of State, Mr. Ball, indicated that the economic power of the world in the future would be held, not by national states but by multinational corporations. I suggest this philosophy introduces an entirely new dimension in dealing with our economic problems. It is a problem in respect of which none of us has as yet come up with an adequate solution. We will have to look at this problem and find solutions, because multinational corporations will be with us for some time.

We can take into account the manner in which they operate under our laws, but technological developments have in many instances given them an advantage in carrying on operations. This is a matter to which the government should be paying considerable attention. How do we ensure that corporations operating on a world wide scale operate in the best interests of the people, whether in Canada or any other nation? In some instances we may have to look for international solutions to these problems, if we are to ensure that the predictions made by George Ball do not come true. Thus, I urge that this question and many others which have been outlined during this debate be taken into account by the minister.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes this afternoon to deal with Bill C-4, to amend the Canada Corporations Act. It is a rather voluminous bill and I do not intend to deal with all its clauses. I should like to speak about the aspect of foreign ownership which has been touched upon by a number of the members of this group, and also with one or two of the main points of the bill.

There are some very interesting and acceptable amendments contained in the proposed legislation but the government, as

usual, has failed to come to grips with one of the greatest problems and dangers facing Canadian sovereignty today. I refer to increasing ownership and control of the Canadian economy by foreign interests. An increasing loss of economic control will inevitably erode our political independence. This is resulting in an inadequate industrial structure in our country and threatens the very survival of a Canadian national entity. It does not meet in the aspirations and objectives of the Canadian people.

There has been a host of warnings from economists over the years which governments of the day have seen fit to ignore. As a result, the erosion of Canadian independence has continued. A previous speaker summed up this legislation very aptly when he said that after 34 years the cabinet had finally come to the conclusion that public investors are entitled to expect that there will be disclosure of business activities, that inside trading will be restricted and reported, and that proxy solicitation will be more restricted than in the past.

Apart from these rather interesting but relatively minor points, the bill has in my opinion failed to tackle the real problem facing the Canadian people today. The recent Watkins report on foreign ownership warned the government that Canada had a limited time in which to stop this trend toward foreign ownership. Only two years ago we were given from ten to 15 years at the most to stop the trend or forever lose the ability to stop it. That report pointed out that no other country in the world was prepared to tolerate the high degree of foreign ownership that there is in Canada.

Most countries in the world have laws limiting the extent of foreign equity investment and controlling investment. Countries with this type of legislation include the United Kingdom, France, Japan, Sweden, Denmark and practically all others in the western world. The way they have used their power has been to limit the control exercised by foreign investors. It is difficult to understand why Canada should not take a similar course.

The laws other countries have passed have not materially affected either their industrial growth or investment from outside. Their good relations with other countries have not been affected because of the desire to be master in their own house. Why cannot Canada follow a similar pattern and at least pass the legislation required to keep us economically and politically independent? It seems to me that the old line parties are tied-in so tightly with the economic powers of this country that they are afraid to act or speak out against the controls which are slowly but surely strangling the economic independence of this nation. If thoughtful Canadians would only study and understand the extent of these takeovers and their eventual influence on Canadian independence, they would rise in wrath against those parties which have controlled the destiny of this nation for so many years.

A quick look at the economic control which Canada has lost to foreign ownership over the years is both upsetting and deeply disturbing. In 1968 alone, the Combines Investigation Committee reported 159 takeovers of Canadian firms. Many of these firms over which we have now lost effective control are among the most substantial in Canada. When the final list is out for 1969 we will find that a similar pattern of takeovers is evident.

Since 1962 more than 600 Canadian firms have passed into the control of foreign companies. This shows the extent to which we are rapidly trading away the future independence of our nation. The Watkins report on foreign ownership states that no other country seems prepared to tolerate the high degree of foreign ownership that exists in Canada. We cannot find this degree of ownership even in the so-called backward countries of Africa. This report confirms the fact that between 50 per cent and 80 per cent of our manufacturing, petroleum, natural gas, mining, smelting and other industries are owned by multinational corporations which have their headquarters in the United States. In some industries we find that foreign control is almost complete.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The Watkins report points out that in 1963 foreigners controlled 97 per cent of the capital employed in the manufacture of automobiles and parts, 97 per cent in the manufacture of rubber, 78 per cent in the manufacture of chemicals and 77 per cent in the manufacture of electrical apparatus. It pointed out, also, that in 1963 there were in Canada 414 corporations with assets greater than $25 million each. The total value of these assets amounted to $37.9 billion. It was estimated that 53 per cent of the total assets of these firms were in companies more than 50 per cent owned by non-residents of Canada. The picture is more serious today.

I suggest we cannot long delay making those moves which will reclaim for Canada both her political and economic independence which the vast majority of Canadians desire. An hon. member has already quoted the late John Foster Dulles. When speaking about an Asian country he said, "There are two ways to conquer a foreign nation. One way is to gain control of its people by force of arms. The other is to gain control of its economy by financial means." This statement should be a warning to all Canadians that economic control of our country will be followed by political control. If this is undesirable, we have no option but to institute those counter measures which will stop the present trend of foreign ownership and eventually reverse it.

The present administration is receiving warnings from many people in its own ranks about the danger of excessive foreign ownership. Walter Gordon, a former Liberal cabinet minister, as recently as May, 1969, pointed out that the United States will dominate Canadian politics if we allow it to control our resources and public enterprises. He called for policies to counter this influence and to keep Canada a truly independent nation. As recently as two months ago, at the Liberal think-in at Harrison Hot Springs, we find that a number of delegates were interested in Canadian economic sovereignty and were desirous that this administration move to protect it. One of the panelists at the Liberal Party conference pointed out that much of the capital required to expand Canadian ownership of industries is already present. The only thing lacking is Canadian organization to bring these funds into the investment picture.

The New Democratic Party believes the answer to this problem is the establishment of a Canadian Development Corporation. In fact, the Liberals have been promising a development corporation for a number of years. We are hopeful that legislation along these lines will be introduced this session and that a start will be made along the arduous road of expanding Canadian ownership of industry and repatriating some of the industrial enterprises which have already been lost. The member who preceeded me dealt at some length with the Canadian Development Corporation. It is not my intention to repeat the points he made.

The first reason why this corporation has not been set up is that the old line parties are fearful of being tagged with the label of having at least some public participation in the area of resource development. This seems to be a nonsensical position for any party to take. All we need do is look around us to see the grave disparities in many parts of Canada. Oftentimes we see areas in which industries could and should have been established. If these should be marginal operations, I can assure you that foreign-controlled companies would not be interested in coming in and setting up industry.

I urge this government to take another, close look at the question of a Canadian Development Corporation and see that legislation is initiated at this session of Parliament. When we consider the question of foreign ownership, I am always amazed to hear politicians both in the House and outside talk about the need for outside investment. They seem to think that Canada is a poverty-stricken nation with no money. On numerous occasions it has been pointed out that there are vast amounts of money available in this country for investment which could and should be used for the type of development foreign-controlled firms are taking over each and every day.

I note that in the speech of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) last night he was very critical of our party. That is his prerogative in this House. I have no objection to his attacking us on the stand we have taken. I am certain, however, that not for a long time has so much valuable ammunition come to hand as that contained in the speech of the hon. member for Calgary North last night. One statement he made is the following:

> While we must make sure that the rights of our people are not usurped, at the same time we must realize that we need the investment of these corporations. We must all work together.

If the rights of the people are not to be usurped, how does he propose to protect the rights of Canadians? How does he propose to protect our independence economically and politically when control in the hands of big corporations can directly control the political direction of this nation?

There have been examples in Canada of firms from other countries dictating to their branch-plants and thereby stopping the sale of goods to other countries. An example is the automobile industry. The sale of trucks to mainland China was stopped because the parent company in the United States told its subsidiary in Canada it could not sell them. There are other examples. A recent example is the control of a flour mill establishment in respect of the sale of flour to Cuba. This sale

was stopped by outside interests. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is direct interference with the political life of this country. This picture cannot help but get worse as the economic control of some of the key sectors of our industry accelerates.

• (5:10 p.m.)

There is another aspect of economic control which has worried me for many years. I want to say at this point that I am not anti-American or against any other country in this world. However, I am convinced as a Canadian that it is our duty, regardless of the party to which we belong, to see that we keep Canada a strong, independent nation both economically and politically. As soon as a move is made, whether it be for the control of our resources or of a key sector of our industry, which will upset this independence, it is up to members in the House to speak out against it. They should not only speak out but also take steps which will retain for us for all time the independence which we so proudly proclaim and which the vast majority of Canadians desire to retain. I see the independence of our nation gradually slipping away. I am astounded that more members on the government side of the House have not made very clear their position on this question.

I will refer to my own province of B.C. for a few moments and point to several resource acquisitions by foreign-owned firms which I think are detrimental to British Columbians generally. Before I deal with any specific resource I will speak about a treaty which was signed in the early 1960s—the Columbia River Treaty. It was debated in this House and many hon. members remember the debate which raged for weeks all over Canada. The treaty was signed and the Liberal administration of the day finalized it, together with the province of British Columbia. In effect it gave away the control of one of our great river systems and its water resources.

At the time—I have read the debate and am well acquainted with the story—the Premier of B.C. sold the people of that province on the idea that we were going to get a bonanza in return for the signing of the treaty. The Liberal government, without adequately examining the aspects of the treaty, went along with it and, to their discredit, finally agreed to signing the treaty, which in my opinion has done a great deal of harm not only to the people of B.C. but to all Canada.

[Mr. Harding.]

I should like to outline two or three points in this respect. In my opinion this is how resources are given away without proper thought or research. Consider the case of the Columbia River Treaty. It was signed, sealed and delivered. The dams have been built. The last dam is in the process of being built and is to be finished in 1973. What do we in B.C. get out of this? Where is the economic empire that we were promised would result from the development of the Columbia River? Where is the economic development, after we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars? I will tell you. There are not even 20 jobs on the Arrow dam, and on the Duncan dam just a handful of engineers are employed to lower or raise the gates in order to feed the turbines south of the line. We sold our power in B.C. for 30 years for $274 million. We were told that this money would build the dams, clear the reservoir basins and adequately recompense everyone.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but I have been listening to his remarks very carefully and I am having difficulty in reconciling them with the subject matter before the House. I realize that there is a specific principle involved, and I do not want to infringe upon the hon. member's right to deal with the principle. However, I would be happy if he would deal with an example that falls within the purview of the bill, rather than the specific example with which he is now dealing.

Mr. Harding: The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that in this bill we should guard against the allocation to foreign countries of specific resources either through treaties of this nature or through the alienation of a particular resource in a province. These precautions have not been taken, and as a result the economic development of Canada has suffered.

If you will bear with me for a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out how this policy has affected our area in particular. We have sold the power for 30 years. We will end up over $200 million in the hole, money which must eventually come out of the pockets of the taxpayers of B.C. And where is the economic development that was promised us? It is south of the line. Just south of the border a very large number of aluminum plants are operating on the hydro power which we sold so that we could construct the dams to flood our land. Those plants are

providing tens of thousands of jobs for Americans while we in British Columbia have created about 20 residual jobs out of this over-all development.

This sort of blind reasoning which leads governments to make treaties and deals of this sort is not good for Canada. We export our raw materials, we export power, and then we turn around and export the most precious product we have in Canada, our educated young boys and girls who have no jobs. Unemployment is soaring because we are exporting jobs every time we make a deal in which we export material which could and should be manufactured in Canada. This is where the Canadian Development Corporation comes into the picture. Why has it not been set up to develop our copper, iron and asbestos resources?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have the impression the hon. member will not permit a question, but I do not want to prejudge the issue. I believe the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) wishes to ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? It will not take long. He had mentioned the Canadian Development Corporation so many times, and so did his leader. Is he aware that there is presently an incorporated company known as Canadian Development Corporation, with its head office at 85 Richmond Street West, Toronto, with directors in London, Ontario, and its solicitors being Thompson, Brown and Broadfoot? Surely he does not suggest that the Canadian government support the promotion of the stock in this private company?

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Harding: That was a rather facetious question. The hon. member should have known better than to ask it. He is aware that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has indicated on numerous occasions that the government will introduce a bill along the lines which I have been discussing.

I wish to emphasize that I am particularly upset over the lack of plans to process our copper concentrates in British Columbia. Every pound is shipped out of British Columbia. For every job we have in the extractive industries there are dozens of jobs even in the first stages of manufacture. We do not even have a copper smelter to do the refining of the copper. This is where a Canadian Development Corporation could easily come into the picture and give assistance if proper direction were given by the government.

There is just one more point I would like to make before I sit down. It is in connection with insurance companies. These are financial institutions. Over the years many of them have passed out of Canadian hands. I note that back in 1956 the Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects said in its preliminary report:

> Foreign ownership of the stocks of the Canadian chartered banks and of life insurance companies, which are incorporated under Canadian law, is not particularly large at the present time. It is desirable that Canadian control of these institutions be maintained. The commission suggests, therefore, that appropriate action be taken to prevent any substantial measure of control of the chartered banks and of life insurance companies from coming into possession of non-residents. One way in which this might be accomplished would be to provide by statute that any shares in such institutions which are acquired by non-residents of Canada in the future would be ineligible to vote. This restriction should not be applied to existing non-resident holders of such shares.

That recommendation was made 13 years ago. Since that time many insurance companies have passed from Canadian control. Every year we see a list of companies which have been lost so far as Canadian ownership is concerned. This is not an NDP story. This is the finding of economists who have been given a job to do. They have taken a look at the picture. They have come up with recommendations, but apparently those recommendations have not been acceptable to governments that have been in charge of Canada since 1956.

I see that my time has almost expired, Mr. Speaker, and I presume there are other hon. members who wish to say a few words on this bill before six o'clock. In closing I urge hon. members, regardless of party, to examine seriously the situation regarding foreign control. If they are convinced, as I am, that our independence, both economic and political, can be jeopardized by foreign control, I believe we should all make an effort to put teeth in the legislation in order to keep Canadian sovereignty in our hands for all time.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

[*Translation*]

WATER RESOURCES

PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed from Thursday, November 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, 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, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

[*English*]

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, this is my third attempt to try to speak on the matter of pollution. Last spring we had a debate on water. We had an opposition day debate, and I was the last speaker scheduled. Last November we spent a couple of days discussing the subject, and again I was the last speaker scheduled. Today I am glad to be the first speaker.

Let me say at the outset that any measure introduced by the government to curb pollution is certainly welcomed by all members of the House. The minister explained this bill four or five weeks ago. The pollution of water is not a problem for the future; it is a problem which requires our immediate consideration. It is in this context that I wish to make a few remarks on this bill known as the Water Act.

Man is living through an environmental crisis of his own making. Early in his evolution man was a passive agent in his surroundings, largely controlled by the factors of the environment. But modern man has become much more powerful. He can even use his technology to regulate elements of his environment. The extent of man's influence on his surroundings is escalating rapidly. Indeed, scientists warn us that the environmental changes brought about in this generation of human hyperactivity have been greater than those of all the years since the appearance of man on earth. But while we have learned to control or affect individual elements of nature, we are still far from understanding the complex interrelations between ourselves and our environment.

[Mr. Harding.]

• (5:30 p.m.)

Too often human technology is used in ways which unintentionally worsen, not improve, the quality of life in our society. Too often the by-product of our progress is pollution, pollution of our surroundings or the disturbance of the delicate interrelationships of our environment. Striking examples of unintentional effects resulting from all kinds of activity abound. For example, on its introduction, DDT was heralded as a successful agent for the control of insect pests, but now its effects have led to its removal from the majority of its applications.

The unintended effects of man's efforts may go far beyond the potential pollution of his world. Scientists are also beginning to wonder whether man's "progress" will substantially affect such important processes as those which control the volume of oxygen in our air and the earth's heat balance. The potential effects of such changes are obvious. They have led one eminent ecologist to state:

> What is now popularly known as 'progress' begins to look very much like the path to extinction.

Pollution has been referred to as a patient assassin which chokes its victims ever so slowly and silently. We must learn to consider all the effects of our actions. We must preserve a clean, healthy, enjoyable environment and we must safeguard the biological balance of nature. Man must not be allowed to pollute himself out of existence.

Pollution has been around for a long time. But what has happened in Canada? We have been very fortunate, Mr. Speaker; we have a big country with a lot of water and a lot of air. But anyone who has smelled the river outside this building, travelled the Gardiner expressway in Toronto on a still morning, or makes his living providing the country with herring from Placentia Bay knows what pollution is.

We cannot afford to sit back in confidence. We should count ourselves lucky that we have no Los Angeles, where carbon-dioxide levels are 10 per cent higher than normal. We cannot afford to be complacent. At the moment this bill does not deal completely—I underline "completely"—with pollution.

Let us first look at fishing. Forest spraying in New Brunswick has led to observations of fish mortality running between 50 and 98 per cent. Pollution has seriously affected shellfish beds. It is estimated that 25 per cent of the clam and oyster beds have been closed as a

result of pollution making the shellfish unfit for human consumption. I have experience in this matter, Mr. Speaker, because in my constituency a good clam-digging operation had to be stopped because the beds were contaminated. It becomes a vicious circle. Pollution leads to higher costs for everyone. Fish-processing plants have been forced to bring in water from far out at sea because of local pollution.

To show hon. members how serious the situation is, let me tell them that the Atlantic Development Board has subsidized operations like this. I am not blaming it; I am merely telling hon. members what is happening in order to show them how much concern there is over this matter.

The west coast salmon and herring fisheries add about $70 million to our economy each year and governments have taken great pains to ensure that power projects and pollution do not interfere with the lives of these fish. But the recent—when I say recent I am talking about last year—Placentia Bay experience should prove to us all that we cannot be complacent about past successes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Comeau: New developments are bringing danger from oil pollution. I am not talking only about oil tankers travelling in the north but also about offshore drilling. The Department of Fisheries and Forestry should supervise these operations. It should not stop progress in oil discoveries, but it should protect our fisheries. Nowadays some of our best fishing grounds are being examined in the search for oil. There is a danger of pollution here. The Department of Fisheries and Forestry should carefully supervise these activities and make sure that the waters are not contaminated.

Let us look at the related problem of freshwater fisheries. There are many lines that we could follow here. Problems of pollution for commercial fishermen on our big lakes need no elaboration. The problem is much larger than that, however. We cherish our outdoor life and recreation; but who enjoys fishing in water he cannot bear to smell? There are hidden costs which governments must weigh and act upon.

I could talk about other areas, such as agriculture and what has happened with regard to pesticides and the cost of providing good and clean drinking water. That also is becoming a problem. Pollution is a testament to a collective failure of man to live in harmony with his environment.

We have had many conferences and studies and, unfortunately, need more. Despite all its protestations of concern, this government has until recently remained pathetically inactive. Its cry of "We have got to do something", is becoming political jargon. Oh, yes, we have the Water Act. When we have argued our case over the past two years, or talked about pollution, the minister or member responsible for matters of pollution has come forward and said, "Why not wait until the water act is passed?". For the past two years we have advocated such a measure, and now it is on the statute books.

I do not wish to repeat all the arguments that were raised in the previous debate. Although there are some good provisions in the act, it does not, to my mind, alleviate immediate problems associated with pollution—and I am speaking not only of water pollution but of air and soil pollution. In my opinion, the fastest action the government can take under this legislation is the setting up of water quality management agencies.

I would not be too critical of this step being taken on a long-term basis. The act does not provide for the solution of immediate problems to do with pollution. It makes no provision for minimum standards relating to water quality, which I think are absolutely essential. We must have across-Canada minimum standards applicable to water quality. While there is a good argument for having different standards in the various regions of Canada, minimum standards should be spelled out and adhered to. In fact, it is still open for one province or region to encourage industry because of lower standards of pollution control. I am aware that the minister has marshalled arguments to counteract this statement. He says that we have the act. I suggest that the committee should look carefully at suggested amendments that deal with points I have raised.

Of course, the provinces know that federal involvement involves a financial commitment. When you talk to the provinces and want to get them involved in anything, the first thing you hear mentioned is money. Here there is no firm commitment of funds from the federal treasury. The control of pollution involves funds, Mr. Speaker. This point could be summed up by saying, "You either put up or shut up."

• (5:40 p.m.)

I could mention many more areas which the committee will have to scrutinize very carefully, but I wish to speak more specifically on action the government should take immediately, to which I am sure the House will give its consent. I refer to action which should have been taken several years ago. According to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) at present we have an effective tool to deal with the problem of pollution. I quote from one of his speeches:

> We are fortunate in that we have a clear-cut avenue for federal participation in the battle against pollution. We are fortunate in that we have an effective tool in the Fisheries Act.

The minister went on to say:

> In this country, the nation has full authority over our "sea coast and inland fisheries". It makes our fishery laws and it approves our fishery regulations. True, Ottawa has delegated some of its authority to the provinces in respect to freshwater lakes and rivers. But our provincial government, if they want to make a change in any of our fishery regulations, must first submit them to us for approval. Any change in the Fisheries Act itself of course, is a matter for Parliament alone to decide. Our federal Fisheries Act, in other words, must be updated. It must include a few clauses which are essentially anticipatory in nature. It must not only say what kinds of chemicals can, and which cannot be discharged into Canadian waters, but see to it that our municipalities and our industries are aware of these guidelines ahead of time. It must provide certain penalties for non-compliance, of course.
>
> With a new and amended Fisheries Act, we will no longer have to find dead fish in order to prove our case. We will no longer have to wait until the damage is done to our environment. We will no longer have to discipline maverick companies which themselves have failed to look ahead and to plan for the future. We will no longer have to plead with municipalities to do the right thing for themselves and their citizens.
>
> Being simple and straightforward, it should also be economical in terms of manpower and red tape. So we can use our existing establishment to do a job on pollution, to do it quickly and to do it well.

The minister puts it very plainly. That is a long quotation, but I wanted to put it on the record because according to the minister there is no problem in immediate action being taken by the government to control pollution of our waters. Why hasn't some action been taken in the past, or why is it not being taken now?

Since May 30, 1969, when the minister delivered his speech, why has not the department drafted the necessary legislation to update the Fisheries Act? This would be much simpler matter than the bill we are now considering, and it would control pollution of our waters. This bill only talks about water. However, it is much more complicated than that. In fact, it might be so complicated that many Canadian citizens will not know what it is all about. It sounds good, but I am sure there are many who do not realize the complications involved. It does not do away with the red tape.

Of course, the Fisheries Act is concerned only with water, and a more broad approach to pollution is desired. When talking about pollution we must consider more than just water. However, this could be done and would probably be more effective for immediate water pollution. This bill, which is the major piece of legislation concerning pollution that the government has introduced, could then encompass pollution in all its aspects. The bill is not really attacking or getting at the root of the problem of pollution because, it concerns itself only with water. According to the Minister of Fisheries, effective action could be taken under the Fisheries Act. This bill might create more red tape and confusion. I do not understand how it will cut out the interdepartmental maze that now exists between the various departments of government.

The problem of pollution is national as well as regional and local. Co-ordinated national action is required to combat this national problem. One of the greatest failures of the present government is its failure to realize this fact and take the appropriate action. Consequently, the attack on pollution, water and air, has been frustrated by the action of numerous intergovernmental and intragovernmental agencies and bodies. Every department spends money in the field of pollution, but nobody can tell us exactly how much.

The Progressive Conservative Party has long recognized the need for co-ordinated action in pollution control and has repeatedly proposed the establishment of a single federal agency called the Canada Pollution Abatement Commission, reporting to Parliament through the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) with the single purpose of providing technical and financial assistance in pollution control to existing agencies in the federal, provincial, municipal and industrial fields. The purpose of such an agency would be the undertaking of research programs and the co-ordination of existing

programs. The agency would also be responsible for the development of a national pollution abatement policy.

To these areas of responsibility should also be added that of providing emergency information and assistance. If the federal government were to keep abreast of the technological means of combating pollution or, better still, providing leadership in pollution control research, such an information centre would be of great assistance in emergency situations. Experience gained from one emergency situation could be applied with possible modifications to a similar emergency situation. Some even advocate a department of environmental control. This might not be a bad idea, because at the present time every department is concerned with pollution and not one is really getting at the root of the problem. The Minister of Fisheries has already stated plainly that his department could have introduced legislation to update the existing legislation in order to provide effective water pollution control.

This new legislation could have attacked the whole problem of pollution. Recently a new and as yet unpatented method of dealing with oil pollution was implemented to correct a threat of crude oil pollution in Israel. This was considered to amount to a breakthrough in pollution control. I think it saved the Jordan River and even the Sea of Gallilee from contamination. Pollution is a global problem as well as a national one, and valuable information could be gained from foreign experience. Such information should be acquired, kept on file and made easily accessible to parties concerned. This is one way in which a Canadian pollution abatement commission could operate, thereby affording some co-ordination to the present hit-and-run tactics in fighting pollution.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I hope hon. members will consider the suggestions I have made along with others which have been made in earlier debates. There appear to be many loopholes in this bill. It is far too complicated. Since hon. members can read, I shall not repeat the points raised during the incomplete debate which took place on the subject before the Christmas recess. There are many areas which could, of course, be dealt with now and perhaps I ought to refresh the memories of hon. members with regard to them. Nevertheless, I shall end my remarks within a few moments.

As I say, the bill is much too complicated. It will involve far too much red tape and its machinery will take a long time to become effective in controlling water pollution. For example, the setting up of all these agencies is bound to take a long time and no one knows how long it will be before effective action results. I shall conclude by adopting everything said so far by my hon. friends, particularly my hon. friend from Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), when he replied to the minister after the bill had been introduced. In raising our objection to this bill I move, seconded by my hon. friend from Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"since it does not spell out, declare or assume a federal jurisdiction in pollution control matters; since no specific commitment of federal funds has been made; and since provision for establishment of water use standards, pollution offences, and penalties are not nationwide but are limited to water quality management areas, this bill is therefore ineffective as a basis for a national water pollution control program and the minister is directed by the House to redraft Bill C-144 to include these and other fundamental omissions before it is read a second time."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Perhaps I might simply read the amendment rather than put it to the House, because I must confess I have grave doubts as to its admissibility. I would prefer to consult Mr. Speaker on the point, but for the benefit of the House I shall read it so that it may be clear on the record.

It is moved by Mr. Comeau, seconded by Mr. McCleave:

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"since it does not spell out, declare or assume a federal jurisdiction in pollution control matters; since no specific commitment of federal funds has been made; and since provision for establishment of water use standards, pollution offences, and penalties are not nationwide but are limited to water quality management areas, this bill is therefore ineffective as a basis for a national water pollution control program and the minister is directed by the House to redraft Bill C-144 to include these and other fundamental omissions before it is read a second time."

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order to raise as to the propriety of the amendment. I could commence argument now, or call it six o'clock. In any case, I wish to inform the Chair that I have an objection to the form and nature of the amendment and suggest it is not in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Six o'clock.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There may be procedural argument arising on this point. I have expressed the doubt which I myself feel, but rather than begin a discussion at this point I think we might consider it at a later date.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, January 15, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion under Standing Order 43, and I base my reason for obtaining unanimous consent on the following facts:

During December the number of unemployed persons in Canada rose from 354,000 to 383,000, an increase of 9 per cent over the previous month, and showing a further steady increase in unemployment from month to month.

What is particularly alarming is the government's refusal to take positive action to increase employment, specifically:

1. A greatly expanded drive to increase exports, rather than the steady contraction of our efforts in this field during the past year which has caused our exports to increase at only one-third to one-half of the rate of increase of all of our principal competitors.

2. The introduction of tax incentives to increase productivity, thereby making possible lower costs and lower selling prices and enabling our products to sell more easily against foreign competition, with the result that more jobs would be available.

3. The introduction of tax incentives to induce more industrial research to improve the quality and style of our products, thereby making them more saleable and capable of providing more jobs.

In short, the attitude of the government toward expanding production and jobs has been a completely negative one, and must be changed immediately to a positive, constructive approach if further serious unemployment is not to develop.

I therefore move the following motion under Standing Order 43:

That this House, comprising the elected representatives of all of the people of Canada, consider and recommend a more effective method of increasing exports, productivity and sales, and thereby increase employment in this country.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed to the House under Standing Order 43. I shall not comment at this time on the form of the motion as proposed by the hon. member. The matter he has raised is an important one, but before the motion can be put to the House we must obtain unanimous consent and I must inquire whether there is such unanimous consent on the part of hon. members.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Trudeau: We have already heard the speech, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I heard at least one objection.

Mr. Trudeau: The facts are wrong in the speech, too.

Mr. Hees: You will not be happy until it hits 6 per cent.

[*Translation*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO CHANGE NAME OF CONSTITUENCY

Mr. Antonio Thomas (Maisonneuve) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-177 intitled "An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act".

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Thomas: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to give back to the riding of Maisonneuve its former name, to wit, "Maisonneuve-Rosemont" to avoid its being mistaken for the provincial constituency of Maisonneuve, a great area of which is located within the limits of the federal constituency of Maisonneuve.

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

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

OIL

AGREEMENT WITH UNITED STATES—ASSURANCE AGAINST LESSENING OF CONTROL OF WATER RESOURCES

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. Would the right hon. gentleman assure the House that any agreement which the government works out with the United States government regarding greater sales of Canadian oil to the United States market will not include the handing over of any degree of control of any of Canada's water resources to the United States or the lessening in any way of this country's sovereignty over our Arctic waters?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I think I can give that assurance, Mr. Speaker.

CRUDE PETROLEUM—POSITION RESPECTING EXPORTS TO U.S.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I am sorry the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is not here today, Mr. Speaker, though his name is on the roster. I trust the Prime Minister will give the House an answer to my question. In the many discussions that both the Prime Minister and the minister himself have pointed out are continuously being held between our officials and those of the United States in regard to the export of crude petroleum, has there been any recent suggestion by the United States officials that there be a cut-back in our exports of crude petroleum to the United States or tariffs placed thereon; and are we working toward an open and free trade policy on crude petroleum?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have the impression that the hon. member is asking a question of such wide import that perhaps it should be answered by way of a general statement on motions. However, if there is a short answer perhaps it might be made available to the House now.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the only short answer is that the question itself was very long. Many aspects of the answer have been previously put before the House. The discussions are in fact covering very many aspects of our relationships, and they are still going forward.

[Mr. Thomas.]

Mr. Woolliams: A further supplementary question. In view of Your Honour's suggestion, which I thought was a good one, would the minister have the minister in charge make a full statement on this subject in view of the fact that the president of the Independent Petroleum Association has raised the question of tariffs on crude petroleum exports from Canada to the United States?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I will bring that suggestion to the attention of the minister.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which I should like to address to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that a United States cabinet committee, headed by Mr. George Shultz, Secretary of Labour, has recommended to the president the removal of all restrictions on imports from Canada into the United States in return for Canada being willing to negotiate a total energy package deal, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the Canadian government at any level has had such a proposal put to it?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that particular proposal having been made to the minister, but the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has, of course, been in discussion with authorities in Washington regarding this question for some time now.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question which the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, who has just entered the House, may care to answer. In view of these developments in Washington would the government be prepared to refer this whole matter to the House of Commons Committee on National Resources and Public Works with a view to enabling its members to ascertain what are the known potential resources in Canada, and what our requirements are likely to be for the foreseeable future?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, if I might answer that question, the National Energy Board has, of course, very comprehensive information regarding resources, the totality of those resources and their availability for export. In any application for export the very issue that the National Energy Board has to decide is whether or not the resources in question are surplus to Canada's needs and available for export. From the standpoint of

any negotiations with the United States, Canada's position would, of course, be that only resources that are clearly surplus to Canada's needs now and in the future would be available. We have made no commitments or decisions; all we have done is to express our willingness to discuss any matters that might affect Canada's interests in regard to energy resources.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A further supplementary question. In view of the fact that any integrated energy policy between Canada and the United States would have to be approved by this House, and that not only the National Energy Board but members of the House ought to have the relevant information, I again ask the minister whether he would be prepared to refer this whole question to the appropriate committee of the House in order that members may be fully aware of what is our known potential and what our long-term needs are likely to be?

Mr. Greene: I would be very pleased to consider that suggestion. I am sure that at least some, if not all, of the information can be obtained when the estimates of the National Energy Board are before the committee. However, I will consider the specific suggestion of the hon. member as well.

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

WATERS OF ARCTIC ARCHIPELAGO— OPPORTUNITY TO DEBATE COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I wish to put a question to the government House Leader, or perhaps I might raise the matter as a point of order. When is the government going to arrange to move for concurrence in the first report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development instead of continuing to bury this report as it has been doing for some time?

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of privilege on this particular point and I raise it now because I think this is the only appropriate time to call Your Honour's attention and the attention of the House to a breach of privilege which has affected all members of the House. It arises because of a failure to allow hon. members their right, under tradition, practice, precedent and rules, to debate the report in question.

I do not intend to take up much time now because I will conclude by indicating the course I propose to take. The fact remains that while all reports of standing committees are not the subject of debate, a report of this character, in which the committee says that the waters lying between the islands of the Arctic archipelago have been and are subject to the sovereignty of Canada, and that without exercising such sovereignty the possibility of pollution and danger to the Arctic environment may be very great, should be presented to the House in such a way that it can be debated. I am in a position to establish this later, but rather than take up the time of the House during the question period I propose to give oral notice now, to be supplemented by written notice later, that a member of this party will give 48 hours notice under the appropriate Standing Order that the report of this committee be debated on a motion that it be concurred in. I would urge that such a motion be presented for discussion during Routine Proceedings.

OIL

UNITED STATES INVESTMENT IN CANADA

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the minister who has just come into the chamber, and I make nothing of that fact. It relates to questions posed by the leader of the NDP and members of this party about the situation regarding our petroleum trade and the serious implications in the question by the leader of the NDP. Has there been any suggestion or pressure brought to bear by the Canadian government regarding cutbacks by the United States of investment in Canada in the petroleum industry, with particular reference to developments which would directly or indirectly affect the employment of thousands of men and women in Canada as a result of a decrease in exports of crude petroleum from this country to the United States?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I have said before, the Canadian posture during our discussions with the United States in connection with its review of United States oil policy has been that it would be in Canada's interest as well as in the interest of the United States to have an open market for Canadian oil in the United States. If such is achieved as a result of our negotiations it will

enhance employment in Canada as well as oil sales, which would be very much in Canada's interest.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INCREASE BY EATON'S AND SIMPSON'S IN CHARGE ACCOUNT INTEREST RATES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, in view of the absence of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs perhaps his Parliamentary Secretary might deal with this question. In light of the announced intention of Eaton's and Simpson's to raise their interest rates on revolving and instalment charge accounts, can the minister inform the House whether he or his officials are investigating this apparent collusion with a view to prosecution under the Combines Investigation Act?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I will take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, will the minister indicate whether he is preparing legislation to restrict the interest charges that retail stores and others may impose on their customers?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Langlois: I will also take the second part of the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA-BIAFRA—SUGGESTION THAT POPE ACT AS MEDIATOR

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Since we have established diplomatic relations with the Vatican, could the minister not ask the Pope to act as mediator in the Nigeria-Biafra conflict, in order to alleviate the suffering in that part of the world?

[*English*]

GRAIN

RAPESEED—AVAILABILITY AT TERMINAL POSITIONS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio who answers for the Canadian Wheat Board. Since, according to the weekly grain letter issued by James Richardson and Sons, exporters of rapeseed have not been able to take advantage of markets because of the unavailability of rapeseed at terminal positions, could the minister indicate whether this is the fault of the railways under the block system or is it the fault of the Wheat Board?

[Mr. Greene.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think I should bring to the attention of the hon. member that the question as asked is hardly in order. He is asking the minister to express an opinion whether a particular situation is the fault of one party or another. I do not think the question as asked is in order.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question. Can the minister indicate to the House whether in fact there is a shortage of rapeseed at terminal positions so that exporters cannot fill their orders?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, there are good quantities of rapeseed available at the terminals and any shipments required for sales are certainly provided in quick order.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. In view of the fact that space for rapeseed in the west coast terminals was apparently allocated before wheat acreage reduction caused a heavy increase in rapeseed production and subsequent sales, does the minister now consider the space allocated for this grain adequate under present conditions?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether that supplementary question is in order, but in view of the importance of the matter the minister may wish to reply.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is adequate but the matter is under review with the prospect of major markets in mind.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. Since the two agents of the Wheat Board, Mr. Joe Caplan and Humboldt Milling Company, have been suspended as agents for the Wheat Board, I should like to ask the minister whether it is the intention of the Wheat Board to reinstate them as buying agents for the Board?

WHEAT—REASON FOR LOSS OF SALE TO JAPAN

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt. Could he indicate to the House whether the loss of a Canadian wheat sale last week to the United States and Australia, based on the tender prepared by the Japanese food agency, resulted from Canada's asking price being raised by ⅞ of a cent per bushel?

Mr. Speaker: This question is in the form of debate. I do not think it is in order.

WHEAT—ABILITY TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF SUPPLEMENTARY QUOTA

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister in charge of the Wheat Board tell us what provisions are being made to rectify the inequitable position that grain producers are placed in whereby they cannot take advantage of supplementary quotas that are offered if they do not have any acreage seeded in a given year to the type of grain to which the supplementary quota applies? Does the minister not believe that a specified number of bushels on a supplementary quota would be a fairer way of administering a supplementary quota and—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is argumentative.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—COST OF MILITARY OBSERVERS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he was in a position to inform the House who is paying the cost of the military observers operating in Nigeria. He said at that time he would take the question as notice. Is he now in a position to answer the question?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have a general answer but there is one detail I want to check to satisfy myself. The next time I am in the House I will give the answer.

NIGERIA—ACCESSIBILITY OF WAR ZONE TO OBSERVERS

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I asked the minister about the accessibility of the war zone to the observers and the minister indicated he was not certain about the situation. Is there an answer now and can we be assured there are no restrictions on the military observers throughout the entire zone?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The observer team composing some eight members representing Canada, Poland, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United Nations has made a report. It is to be released tonight. I think the time is 9 a.m. Greenwich mean time or something like that. I have glanced at it and could table it were it not for the embargo. It indicates that they have been close to the troops constantly during the recent fighting and were never denied access.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

In view of the fact that the play "Hair", now showing in Toronto, is the target of much criticism as to whether or not it respects our standards of morality, would the Secretary of State tell us whether or not he or the government intends to set up an inquiry into this matter, in order to determine if that play meets Canadian standards?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am not sure this matter is the responsibility of the minister to whom the question was put.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST FRENCH-SPEAKING EMPLOYEES

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

A study on the Department of External Affairs, made by professor Lalande from the University of Montreal, gives facts and figures which indicate that French-Canadian employees are being discriminated against in that department. In view of this, does the minister intend to ask an independent commission to investigate the matter thoroughly so that French Canadians may know that a stop will be put to all such discrimination?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, this report related to conditions some years ago. It has been reviewed recently by the department. While I have no objections to an inquiry, I would be very happy to answer questions arising out of that report to satisfy the hon. member that there is in fact no discrimination and that in particular the Department of External Affairs practises the principle of bilingualism at least as effectively as any other department.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ALLEGED MISLEADING ADVERTISING BY IMPERIAL TOBACCO COMPANY

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): My question is directed to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. However, in his absence may I be permitted to direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary. I might add that I have given the minister notice of this question.

Will the minister undertake to investigate the misleading and probably fraudulent advertising by the Imperial Tobacco Company with respect to its Casino brand cigarettes marketed in Canada, indicating that prizes in amounts from $5 to as much as $100 are contained in every package? Would he also check with the residents of the Smoky Lake district in Alberta, where some citizens are claiming winnings of $20,000 to $30,000 as a result of participating in this Casino game, and the fact that Imperial Tobacco now refuses to honour such claims?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this is a question which should normally be put on the Order Paper. If there is urgency, the hon. member may suggest that it be considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Mazankowski: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. May I say with all due respect that I think this is a matter of urgency. Imperial Tobacco has claimed in its advertising promotion that every package of Casino cigarettes contains a voucher worth as much as $100, and in light of the refusal by the Imperial Tobacco Company to honour—

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is hardly a question of privilege. If the hon. member is convinced that this is a matter of urgency, the question can be considered at the time of adjournment.

[Mr. Asselin.]

Mr. Mazankowski: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

LAY-OFFS OF EMPLOYEES—CHARGES FOR USE OF FILMS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State. When will he be prepared to make the statement which he promised some time ago would be made today dealing with the situation at the National Film Board?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member is mistaken. I have never undertaken to make a statement today. I said that the unbiased person appointed to review some decisions made by the authorities of the National Film Board would submit his report on the 15th. I know that it has been handed to the Board Commissioner and it is up to him to forward it to me. I have never undertaken to make a statement today, and it would have been very unwise for me to do so, because I knew beforehand that I would not have any information on the matter before tomorrow.

[*English*]

Mr. Orlikow: I am sorry I made a mistake, but in view of the great interest throughout the whole country, would the minister give consideration to making a statement on the situation at an early date?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, once I have read the report, I will be able to see whether it is advisable to make a statement.

[*English*]

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State. In view of the CRTC's decision on cablevision, cutting off many communities in Canada from access to American T.V. culture, and the NFB's decision cutting off many isolated communities, in the main, from Canadian film culture, when the minister makes a statement would he indicate what action he is planning to take to fill this void?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the second premise of the question. How can the hon. member express the opinion that the situation at the National Film Board is

isolating the various Canadian regions from one another from a cultural point of view?

As for a statement on the matter, I shall willingly consider whether it would be useful.

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he would be ready to defer this report to the House committee instructed to study these questions as soon as he receives it?

Mr. Pelletier: As soon as I receive the report, Mr. Speaker, I shall be able to determine whether the suggestion of the hon. member is advisable under the circumstances. I must advise him right now, however, that it may well not be the case, since the report will not be submitted to the minister, but to the Commissioner with whom I shall have to discuss the matter. It is not impossible, however, that this report could be tabled in the house and referred to the appropriate committee.

[*English*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a supplementary question arising from the fact that he could not accept the premise in the question of the hon. member for Brandon-Souris in reference to the National Film Board. Does he not consider that when the Film Board places a cost on its services which is beyond the ability of communities to pay it is cutting off access to Canadian culture as mentioned by the hon. member?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The supplementary question is argumentative.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO CANADIAN CITIZENS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. If he does not have an answer, perhaps he would like to take it as notice. Will the minister say if instructions have been given to Canadian consular personnel in the United States to deny assistance or advice to Canadian citizens in the United States who may be in difficulty because of the U.S. draft law?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I shall take that question as notice. It is the first time it has been brought to my attention.

PENSIONS

RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. On November 20 last, as noted in *Hansard* at page 1034, the minister indicated that an agreement between this country and the Federal Republic of Germany regarding reciprocal pension arrangements might be concluded shortly. Can he say whether that agreement has been concluded and, if so, will a copy of it be tabled?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the hon. member that the agreement has not been concluded. However, negotiations are currently going on and we are hopeful that they will be concluded as soon as possible. When that is done I would be happy to announce it to the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of the fact that the answer last time was similar, can the minister say when "as soon as possible" might be?

An hon. Member: Soon.

HOUSING

AVAILABILITY OF MONEY FOR PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. Can the minister inform the House if he has indicated to the provinces when moneys will be available and the amount which will be allocated for the year 1970 in regard to public housing?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I think we will be giving that information to the provincial ministers concerned within a matter of days.

SPORTS

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR OLYMPIC GAMES BIDS

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Because of the urgency with respect to confirmation deadlines and in order to clarify con-

fused reports, will the minister advise the House whether firm commitments of federal financial support have been given to the sponsors of the Montreal bid for the summer Olympic games and to the sponsors of the Garibaldi winter games bid and, if so, the amount of federal aid pledged to both?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubts as to the urgency of the question asked by the hon. member. If there is urgency that is not apparent to me, perhaps the hon. member would like to give notice of the question so that it might be considered and debated at the time of adjournment. Insofar as the supplementary question is concerned, that is the type of statistical or detailed information which normally is given by way of a written answer.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT INCREASE—CHANGES IN MANPOWER TRAINING RULES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Arising out of the increase in unemployment during the month of December, which historically is likely to have increased by another one per cent to 2 per cent by now, I wish to ask the minister whether, in view of the fact that the largest group of unemployed is in the 16 to 19 year bracket, he has considered or is considering changing the rules with regard to manpower training so that these young, unskilled people may be given training during their enforced unemployment?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the rule to which the hon. member refers. It has been under consideration in the past and at present that aspect of the program, as well as others, is before the Advisory Council on Manpower and Immigration. It is also being considered by the deputy minister in conjunction with the provincial deputy ministers. I cannot say whether any change will be made or when, but I want to assure the hon. member that the matter is under active consideration.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question. In view of the fact that these discussions are likely to take some time, have the minister and his department evolved some way by which these young unemployed Canadians may be given some opportunity for retraining, advanced education, or some other opportunity to enter into remunerative work immediately?

[Mr. Pringle.]

Mr. Speaker: It appears to me that the information sought by the hon. member should be given to the House in the form of a general statement on motions.

Mr. Lewis: Then may I ask the minister whether he would make a statement on motions with regard to this particularly difficult and painful part of the unemployment problem affecting young people from 16 to 19 this winter?

Mr. MacEachen: No, Mr. Speaker. I cannot give an undertaking at the moment to make a statement on motions on this matter.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—RESPONSE TO OFFERS OF AID

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Would he bring the House up to date with regard to any response which may have been received by the government from the government of Nigeria regarding either offers of direct aid by the Canadian government or offers of aid by Canadian and other organizations such as Joint Church Aid?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to what I said yesterday about the position of Joint Church Aid and Canairelief. I think the statements by the leaders of the Nigerian government speak for themselves. However, I would like to say to the House that the money that was approved by the government and turned over to the Nigerian authorities is now being spent for the relief of hunger in Nigeria, including the amounts of money turned over to the Nigerian Rehabilitation Commission, the Nigerian Red Cross, and UNICEF.

Mr. MacLean: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister assure the House we are correct in assuming that the government made clear to the government of Nigeria that the offer of Canairelief and Joint Church Aid was made on the basis that this food and these facilities would be made available under the management of any organization acceptable to the government of Nigeria?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall that the House of Commons passed a resolution to that effect which was transmitted immediately to the Nigerian authorities.

POST OFFICE

MAILING OF HATE LITERATURE FROM NIAGARA FALLS, N.Y.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications. Is the minister aware that some of the most nauseating hate literature, which can only be described as filthy, is being mailed to Canadian citizens, including Members of Parliament, from Niagara Falls, New York, on behalf of what is called the Natural Order of Gooderham, Ontario, whose mailing privileges have been cancelled? Would he be prepared to check with the American postal authorities to ascertain if they will co-operate to have this practice stopped?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): This is normally our practice, Mr. Speaker, and we go farther ourselves. After we get a ruling from my colleague in the Department of Justice we deny mailing privileges to those who send out such pornographic material. I am not aware to which particular instance the hon. member is referring, but I shall certainly take notice of it.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the literature apparently prepared by these congeni al fools also reflects upon the presiding officer of this assembly and our Jewish citizens, would the minister consider referring the matter to the justice committee?

Mr. Kierans: Absolutely, and with all the more reason, Mr. Speaker.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. What recent progress has been made in the negotiations for the recognition of the Peking government?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the state of play is that some weeks ago we presented to the Peking authorities proposals to which we have not yet had a reply.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is it play or ploy?

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

GOLD MINING—POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS

Mr. Oza Tétrault (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Could he tell us whether the government intends to keep on granting subsidies to gold mines after December 1970?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly pass on this question to the minister concerned.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR POLITICAL ASYLUM BY POLISH SEAMEN

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Has a decision been made yet on the request by the nine Polish seamen seeking political asylum in Canada. If not, when may a decision be expected?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, a decision has not yet been made. The matter is currently being actively considered and a decision will be made very shortly.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

ACTION RESPECTING ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Has the minister taken any steps to stop the discrimination carried on at Devco and which he himself has admitted?

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. MacInnis: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I did not get an answer so I will clarify my question by repeating it. Has the minister taken any action to stop the discrimination carried on at Devco, which he himself has admitted?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I do not know when I made such a statement. It is true

that Devco has hired a number of foreigners, and I believe I have told those responsible that it would be more advisable to give preference to Canadian citizens.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister check *Hansard* when this question was asked previously and see how far his present answer is removed from the truth?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I should like—

[*English*]

INFORMATION

AMALGAMATION OF DEPARTMENTAL SERVICES UNDER INFORMATION CANADA

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the direction of Information Canada. Is it the government's intention to disband the information sections of each department and amalgamate them under Information Canada?

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Moose Jaw.

Some hon. Members: No information.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, maybe a minister has not been officially designated to that position. Therefore I will direct my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Is it the intention of the government to disband the various information sections in each of the government departments and amalgamate them under Information Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I think it was only yesterday that I answered the hon. member for York South—

Mr. Hees: No, no.

Mr. Trudeau: —that we would be making an announcement on the operations of Information Canada which as yet has not been officially set up. Therefore, I am not now in a position to make this announcement; it is not ready.

Mr. Hales: A supplementary question—

[Mr. Marchand (Langelier).]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacEwan: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I interrupt the hon. member only to say that I think we should go on to another subject as we are running short of time.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR PAYMENT OF FARM STORAGE COSTS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the plan announced by the minister to move grain slowly to the Lakehead, which in effect means more grain being left on the farms for a longer period of time, would the minister say whether he will give favourable consideration to some payment to the producers for farm stored grain storage costs?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the plan to promote steady movement to the Lakehead is one of deliberateness in moving the grain as effectively as possible. General plans with respect to the grain industry are under consideration.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

PURPOSE OF MEETING BETWEEN FEDERAL AND QUEBEC MINISTERS

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport or to his Parliamentary Secretary, but since both are absent, I shall put it to the Prime Minister.

Could he tell the House—I wonder if he can hear me—whether the purpose of the meeting between the federal Minister of Transport and the Quebec Minister of Municipal Affairs is to discuss matters concerning the airport at Sainte-Scholastique?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the minister actually told me about that meeting, but he has not indicated whether the Quebec minister and himself had agreed to divulge the purpose of the meeting. Therefore, I believe we shall have to wait until the minister is present to know if, by providing such information, I would infringe some agreement between the two ministers.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

Will the location of the Sainte-Scholastique airport be actually discussed at that meeting?

[*English*]

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

POLICY FOLLOWING THIRD REPORT OF COMMISSION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the very brief answer yesterday regarding the third report of the B and B Commission, I should like to know when the government will make up its mind about that report?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Joliette—

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, he has not had a chance to answer. I am rising on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member might make his point of order in a moment. I was going to suggest to him that to ask when the government is going to make up its mind is hardly a proper question.

Mr. Nowlan: I will rephrase my question, Your Honour. Since the third report of the B and B Commission was tabled, questions asked, starting before the House rose for Christmas, have been handled in a cavalier, callous and very facetious way by the Prime Minister. That is why questions have to be phrased somewhat differently—

Mr. Perrault: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nowlan: I am speaking to His Honour and not to you, Burnaby-Seymour.

An hon. Member: Who the hell is he?

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the three-part question asked yesterday and the first answer that no decision had yet been made on the third report of the B and B Commission, can the Prime Minister inform the House when the government will make a decision on the B and B Commission report? Could a statement be made in the House even though the Prime Minister said yesterday he would never make one?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the report is under consideration and we will make a statement of government policy in this regard in due course. When I said "never", it was in answer to the question that the member had asked about whether we had to reconsider our past policy.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

STATUS OF GROUP OF SPECIALISTS IN CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour being absent, I would like to direct my question to the Prime Minister.

The Minister of Labour has announced today the setting up, within the Conciliation and Arbitration Branch, of a group of experts in labour relations. May I ask the Prime Minister whether in the government's opinion this will be a permanent negotiation committee?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I know nothing about the matter, Mr. Speaker. I will take the question as notice and I will discuss it with the minister in charge.

[*English*]

ENERGY

ASSISTANCE TO GLACE BAY HEAVY WATER PLANT

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the inability of the Glace Bay plant to produce heavy water, will the minister make a statement on motions indicating what the federal government is prepared to take on this urgent problem?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as I think my hon. friend knows, the Glace Bay Deuterium plant is, I believe, owned by a corporation which is a part of the Nova Scotia government and is not in any way a part of the federal entity in this regard.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There are three or four members rising on supplementaries. We have already gone beyond the question period by approximately three minutes. I thought I would give the last row members a chance to ask questions even though the time had expired. Perhaps we would be in order to now call Orders of the Day.

Business of the House

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the President of the Privy Council what the business is for the balance of this week and next week.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to continue today with the Canada water bill which was commenced yesterday. That business will be followed by the four bills with respect to financial institutions.

In more detail they are government order 44, Bill S-8, with regard to trust companies; government order 45, Bill S-9, with regard to loan companies; government order 42, Bill S-6, with regard to the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act, and government order 43, Bill S-7, with regard to the Foreign Insurance Companies Act. I might say in that regard that there has been some discussion about the possibility of making a special order so that these four bills, which all concern a similar subject matter, might be treated as a package.

The next three bills will be with regard to fisheries. They are government order 17, Bill C-133, with regard to the Deep Sea Fisheries Act; government order 18, Bill C-134, with regard to the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, and government order 56, Bill C-175, with regard to the Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

Whatever the outcome of this particular business, Tuesday of next week will be an allotted day under the auspices of the Official Opposition.

Mr. Aiken: Could I ask the minister whether it is the intention of the government to carry the second reading of the water bill through to conclusion before proceeding with other matters?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It is difficult to predict, Mr. Speaker, since it has not been possible to make any arrangements to allocate time for the second reading debate of that bill. That will depend very much on the circumstances that develop.

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question time of members of this House. I call Your Honour's attention to the fact that earlier in the question period there were quite a number of questions which had to be repeated for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources because he was late arriving. I do not think hon. members should have to sacrifice their time for a minister who is on today's roster and cannot get to work on time.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Without going into the matter, the hon. member will recognize that I mentioned that a few additional minutes were added.

Mr. MacInnis: We wasted five.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we wasted five and added three so we may be short two minutes. I might take that into account tomorrow.

Mr. Greene: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes better to be late and be of some use than to be here on time and be of no use.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

WATER RESOURCES

PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed from Wednesday, January 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, 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, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, and of the amendment moved by Mr. Comeau (page 2411.).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: On adjournment last evening, I think that the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) had moved an amendment to the motion for second reading of the bill before us, and some hon. members had indicated their intention to object to that amendment, which seemed contrary to Standing Orders. If the hon. members wish at this time, to put forward arguments either for or against the amendment on procedural grounds, I would be glad to hear them before making a ruling.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words with respect to the admissibility of an amendment in this form.

The amendment which the hon. member has put forward is perhaps not as clear in its terminology as it might be, but it seems to me that it might be objected to under the existing precedents with regard to amendments on second reading on several grounds.

In the first place, the hon. member seeks to oppose second reading of this bill and to refer it back for redrafting so as to add certain additional provisions to the bill which he feels have been omitted and which should be included.

Perhaps it might be useful for me to make a number of references to the relevant rules in May's 17th edition, page 527, dealing with the question of amendments at this stage of public business. The first of the rules is that the principle of relevancy applies to an amendment here as it does elsewhere and the amendment must not include in its scope other bills then standing for consideration in the House. No objection could be made to the amendment on that basis.

Perhaps of greater importance is the second of the two rules to which reference is made. I quote:

> The amendment must not be concerned in detail with the provisions of the bill upon which it is moved, nor anticipate amendments thereto which may be moved in committee; nor is it permissible to propose merely the addition of words to the question, that the bill be now read a second time, as such words must, by implication, attach conditions to the second reading.

I suggest that the hon. member in his proposed amendment is at least in part suggesting certain propositions which it might be competent for him to move when the bill is before the committee or indeed at the report stage. To that extent, his amendment falls under the second of the two rules cited and for that reason the amendment should not be received.

The third of the rules would also appear to be relevant since, in effect, what the hon. member is doing is asserting a direct negative to the proposition that the bill before the House be read a second time. I quote this rule from page 528 of May's 17th edition:

> An amendment, which amounts to no more than a direct negation of the principle of the bill, is open to objection.

I suggest that the best interpretation of what is a rather complicated amendment is that the hon. member is intending to negative altogether the proposition involved in the second reading and for that reason his amendment falls under the third rule. What seems more likely is that he is negativing the proposition in part and making certain suggestions as to possible inclusions in the bill, suggestions which could be carried out by the hon. member or other hon. members at a later date by way of an amendment at either the committee stage or by taking advantage of the report stage. For those reasons, I suggest the amendment not be received.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, this amendment is presented in a form somewhat different from others which have been submitted in the past. It is designed, however, to be in harmony with the new rules under which we are operating.

I submit the amendment meets all the established criteria provided for an amendment on second reading. First, it declares principles adverse to and differing from the principles of the bill. I think this is obvious from the wording. In the second place, it opposes the progress of the bill. These are two of the essential criteria set out in citation 382 of Beauchesne at page 277. The amendment does not seek to change any words in the bill itself. It seeks, rather, to give reasons for opposing second reading until the bill is redrafted.

The amendment does not anticipate amendments which may be moved in committee. Such amendments would largely be amendments concerning detail. The amendment we are moving affects questions of principle involved in the bill as a whole. For these reasons, I contend that the amendment meets the criteria established by citation 389 of Beauchesne. It is a reasoned amendment in that it sets forth the basis upon which the bill is held to be unsatisfactory.

If it is thought—and this view has not been expressed by the President of the Privy Council—that the conclusion of the motion which asks that the bill be redrafted differs from the normal wording, I would say that the House is surely master of its own proceedings and may direct such redrafting if it is so inclined. The amendment would not be out of order for that reason.

The motion to which the reasoned amendment has been moved is that Bill C-144 be read the second time and referred to commit-

tee. This motion is made pursuant to Standing Order 74(1) which provides that:

> Every public bill shall be read twice and referred to a committee before any amendment may be made thereto.

This new Standing Order combines the two motions which existed under the former rules, namely, the motion for second reading and the motion to refer to committee.

Under the new rules, a reasoned amendment can therefore be directed to the motion in its present broader form, combining the motion for second reading with the motion for referral to committee.

A further change was made under the new Standing Order 62(2), which provides:

> The message and recommendation of the Governor General in relation to any bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax or impost shall be printed on the Notice Paper and in the *Votes and Proceedings* when any such measure is to be introduced and the text of such recommendation shall be printed with or annexed to every such bill.

I call Your Honour's attention in particular to the words: "and the text of such recommendation shall be printed with or annexed to every such bill".

Under the new standing orders, therefore, a motion for second reading now imports the motion for second reading, the motion for referral to committee, and, additionally, in the case of a money bill or purported money bill, the financial recommendation by the Governor General that the House appropriate public moneys to the purposes of the bill.

In other words, a reasoned amendment can now be directed against the bill in any or all of its three aspects: second reading, referral to committee and the financial or appropriation resolution which is now incorporated in the bill.

In the time at my disposal I do not intend to discuss the principles applicable to a reasoned amendment; they are dealt with in May's 17th edition at page 526 and following. However, I will refer to the following paragraph which appears in May at page 527:

> A reasoned amendment is placed on the paper in the form of a motion and may fall into one of several categories. (1) It may be declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy or provisions of the bill. (2) It may express opinions as to any circumstances connected with the introduction or prosecution of the bill, or otherwise opposed to its progress.

I submit that the reasoned amendment put forward by the member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) meets these criteria.

[Mr. Aiken.]

The bill, in its long title and in the financial resolution printed with it, claims that it provides for the management of the water resources of Canada, including research and the planning and implementation of programs related to the conservation, development and utilization of water resources. This it does not do. The government admits that the bill, as drafted, does not live up to the long title and the financial recommendations in the third paragraph of the preamble where it is set out that comprehensive programs—and therefore programs which are vital to the bill—would be undertaken by the government of Canada in co-operation with provincial governments. Unless the co-operation of all ten provinces is obtained, the bill does not provide for the management of the water resources of Canada or for the implementation of programs for conservation, development and utilization of our water resources. These objects of the bill, which are essential to it, would be provided for and implemented, if at all, under federal and provincial agreements.

In the second place, the recommendation as printed with the bill and in *Votes and Proceedings* does not appropriate any public moneys and therefore does not comply with the requirements of Standing Order 62(2). The relevant portion of the recommendation says:

> All expenditures for the purposes of the Act, including any expenses or allowances of any advisory committee, shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament therefor.

It should be noted that Clause 31 provides:

> All expenditures by the minister for the purposes of this Act shall be paid out of money appropriated by parliament.

The clause does not follow the resolution inasmuch as it restricts the appropriations by Parliament to expenditures made by the minister only, that is, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources as defined in Clause 2(1)(i) of the bill. All expenditures made under the Act are not made by the minister—if he makes any at all. Clause 15(1)(b) provides for contributions or loans by the Government of Canada.

In conclusion, the most serious defect in this connection is that precedents of this House hold that a bill which provides that expenditures thereunder be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament is not a bill which requires an appropriation recommendation under Section 54 of the British North America Act. The money would be provided later under an appropriation, and it

is this latter appropriation which would be accompanied by a resolution. This is a general subject on which a previous ruling has been made. The fact I am trying to prove is that this amendment is, indeed, adverse to and opposed to the principle of the bill as it is recommended and as it is printed. For all these reasons, I believe it is a perfectly valid reasoned amendment.

I rather like the form of the amendment because it provides for something we have not been able to do prior to this time. Previously, we were able to move simply that second reading should not now be given, and this, if it were accepted, was the end of the bill. The purpose of the type of motion now proposed is to assert that the House is dissatisfied with the form in which the bill has been brought down—the form in which it appeared after the first reading had been agreed to. By approving the motion of my hon. friend, the House can advise the minister that it is not satisfied with the bill in its present form. The measure can then be redrafted and then proceed without any necessity for the earlier formalities being repeated. The object of an amendment, of course, if accepted, is to start again and go through the recommendation procedures, and so on.

• (3:10 p.m.)

For this reason, I would urge Your Honour to give serious consideration to the form of this amendment. We feel it is one that would be eminently acceptable and satisfactory under the new rules that have been adopted, and it otherwise complies with the fundamentals that have been laid down in relation to an amendment on second reading.

Mr. Speaker: May I express my appreciation to those hon. members who have taken part in this brief debate on the procedural point that has been raised by hon. members following the amendment that was proposed last evening by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau). The fact that this amendment was proposed shortly before the adjournment, and that some reservation was expressed to the House at the time, has given me the opportunity of looking into the matter from a procedural point of view and of considering the arguments that might be advanced either for or against the form and substance of the amendment proposed by the hon. member.

I have spent some time studying the different procedural aspects of the matter, and keeping in mind the point of view that has been expressed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), I should like to give my view of the matter.

At the outset I should like to restate for the record both the motion and the amendment proposed by the hon. member for South Western Nova. To the motion for the second reading of Bill C-144, the hon. member proposed an amendment which reads as follows:

> That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:
>
> "since it does not spell out, declare or assume a federal jurisdiction in pollution control matters; since no specific commitment of federal funds has been made; and since provision for establishment of water use standards, pollution offences, and penalties are not nationwide but are limited to water quality management areas, this bill is therefore ineffective as a basis for a national water pollution control program and the minister is directed by the House to redraft Bill C-144 to include these and other fundamental omissions before it is read a second time."

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has very rightly brought to the attention of the House the fact that this is a new form of amendment. We will all recognize that this does not automatically make it out of order, but it does perhaps bring it more particularly to the attention of the Chair from a procedural standpoint. My original reaction, which I gather is the same as the one which the learned Deputy Speaker had last night, was that the proposed motion did not appear to be an amendment but, rather, a statement or declaration of principle in itself, it is more a substantive motion than an amendment.

As hon. members have pointed out, citation 382 of Beauchesne's fourth edition states that, at the second reading stage:

> It is also competent to a member who desires to place on record any special reasons for not agreeing to the second reading of a Bill, to move as an admendment to the question, a resolution declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill, or expressing opinions as to any circumstances connected with its introduction, or prosecution; or otherwise opposed to its progress; or seeking further information in relation to the Bill by Committees, Commissioners, the production of papers or other evidence or the opinion of Judges.

This citation in Beauchesne originally came from one of May's editions, to which I believe the President of the Privy Council has alluded. The operative words in the citation are that an amendment must propose "a resolu-

tion declaratory of some principle adverse to, or differing from, the principles, policy, or provisions of the bill".

Recognizing this, the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has sought to indicate to the Chair that this type of principle is exposed in the amendment proposed by the hon. member.

There are two other citations which I would commend to hon. members. Section (1) of citation 393 of Beauchesne's fourth edition states, in part:

> An amendment purporting to approve the principle of a Bill and at the same time enunciating a declaration of policy cannot be moved to the second reading. It must oppose the principle of the Bill.

The most pertinent of the two citations, I suggest, is section (3) of citation 393 of Beauchesne's fourth edition, which reads as follows:

> An amendment which is not adverse to the principle of a Bill but proposes that certain provisions be added to the Bill cannot be moved on the motion for second reading.

It seems to me that this citation is very relevant to the procedural question that is now before the House. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka suggested in his argument that this amendment is drafted so as to be in harmony with our new rules. I find it difficult to agree with this suggestion. It is still possible to amend new sections of a bill in committee. It is still possible to amend a bill on second reading according to the forms and principles that are long established and recognized by the practice of the House. In addition, detailed amendments can still be proposed at the report stage; and amendments on third reading can be proposed in the same way as they could prior to the adoption of the new rules.

In my humble view there is nothing in the new rules, I suggest, that can be taken to broaden the scope of the amendments which can be proposed to the House and received by the House as in order. To my way of thinking, the amendment proposed to the House is not a reasoned amendment because it does not, in my view, oppose the principle of the bill.

I am not suggesting that it would not be possible to move an amendment at this stage which might include some parts of the amendment that has been presented, and which could be moved in the acceptable form of a reasoned amendment. I would think that could be done quite easily. But at that point hon. members would be called upon to vote for a principle which opposes the essence of the bill before the House; and at that point hon. members are in fact invited to vote against second reading of the bill, which is not what this amendment seeks to do.

For these reasons, it seems to me that the Chair has no alternative but to rule that the proposed amendment of the hon. member for South Western Nova cannot be received at this time. Again, I do not want to insist that the same purpose might not perhaps be achieved in other ways. However, I have very serious reservations that the purpose can be achieved in the ingenious way proposed by the hon. member for South Western Nova, and I must refuse to put the amendment to the House at this time.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, we do, of course, accept your ruling. We will examine your words of wisdom very carefully and try again.

Mr. Speaker: I trust the hon. member will not look at them too closely.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the procedural arguments, but not being an authority in this area I naturally will not refer to procedure.

I first came to Ottawa as a member of Parliament about a year and a half ago. I was not nearly as aware then of what pollution meant as I am at the present time. I recall the first time I smelled the miasma from the pulp mill across the river. I thought the House was on fire or that something was smoldering. I went to the Sergeant-at-Arms and suggested that he make a check. I am sure he did not know what I was talking about, but that is the way it struck me. I thought we had a fire.

An hon. Member: There has been some pollution here.

Mr. Thomson: Someone suggested the House has suffered some pollution, but that is of another kind. I hope I can clear the air so far as this party is concerned.

Certainly, everybody today is talking about this very urgent problem. Let me read from an editorial that appeared in the *Canada Month*. This is the apostle of free enterprise in which appeared an epistle. I should like to read one or two excerpts from it as follows:

> We ought not, at this point, to need the creative capacities of little men stacked in offices at Ottawa

to advise us as to how we shall avoid the pollution of our neighbours' environments. The highly creative private economy should be more than sufficient to the task of providing the answers, as the belatedly active automobile industry is now ably demonstrating.

The people who subscribe to the private enterprise theory should take a good look at what some areas of North America have become. If they are going to respond it is high time they did so. Let me read another paragraph from this editorial:

Let us simply hope that we who pollute will recognize our obligations under the social contract, so that the potential harshness of the police power will be unnecessary. Let us take advantage of the huge technological creativity that the private economy is, more than any other power, capable of supplying to solve a problem we have left unsolved—excuses aside—for just a little too long.

I agree with the writer in this respect. It is high time we did something. If private industry will contribute from its own resources and initiative, more power to it; but I suggest that it get on with this. If it does not, then the police powers which the writer spoke of should be used to enforce regulations whether they pertain to private industry, government or municipalities.

This editorial also referred to the expense of cleaning up the pollution from which we suffer in Canada. I grant you there is a considerable expense involved. We never paid too much to get rid of our sewage. We do pay at the city level, but anything we do costs money and it is high time we started to spend money in this respect. We have used what nature has given us and we must now look after our own problems.

I read another item which appeared in the *Christian Science Monitor* and which contained a picture of mountains and water with the caption "U.S. Flourished on a water-rich continent". The United States has now used up many of its resources and is looking to Canada for some of our water. The United States has squandered its inheritance and now wants some of ours. We have argued this party's point of view that the minister should not barter away Canada's good water for a pittance. If the United States wants to squander its water, that is fine; but let us not squander ours. Let us insist that we get at least adequate compensation and make sure that Canada's future needs will be met before we commit ourselves.

Let us consider for a moment the cost of getting rid of our wastes. As a farmer, I raise beef cattle. The cattle are put in a corral for the winter and I have to clean out that corral at my own expense in the spring. I suggest this is one cost of raising beef cattle. It represents part of the price per pound or unit for the production of beef. Why should industry not pay the same charge on the same basis? Industry should include this cost of disposal of waste as part of the cost of production. I must do this so why should someone else be allowed to pollute the water, air or surrounding land?

In all fairness, I should admit that some industries take care of their own pollution problems by spending large sums of money, and it is not fair to them when others do not do the same. I suggest we should enforce the regulations in this regard.

In this day and age, when provinces and municipalities are competing with each other for various industries, it seems to me that the province which is willing to offer cheap labour and allow industry to ignore pollution clean-up is the one which will get the industry. This is not right and these provinces should not be shopping around for industries which in turn are looking for areas in which they can dispose of waste products. We should insist that industry take care of pollution wherever it is situated.

Some industries are contributing much toward pollution control. I have before me a feature article which appeared in the *Dofasco Illustrated News*. This is a very well-written and illustrated article. I do not know whether it has accomplished its entire goal but the article reads well and I want to commend the people who published it. The article refers to the production of steel, galvanizing and tin plating. I understand there is a considerable amount of waste as a result of this production. The article states in part:

Unfortunately, during these processes many undesirable by-products are produced. As steel productivity is increased by improved technology to meet the market demands, the quantities of these potential pollutants increase accordingly. Dofasco is keenly aware of this potential threat to the public welfare and realizes this problem must be met and dealt with.

• (3:30 p.m.)

This is why, over the last decade, Dofasco has spent $14,000,000 on air and water pollution control installations. Eight million dollars of these expenditures have been made since 1963.

I would compliment this particular steel company for the effort it has put forward. If the effort is not yet adequate, hopefully it will be continued until it is adequate. As a leader in this area, I think this company should be complimented for doing something in a field of which we should all be more

aware and in respect of which we should all be doing something more constructive. I spoke to a chap who works in a Crown corporation. He told me that sometimes when nobody is around they will dump waste from the plant into the river on which the plant is situated. He said occasionally the inspector comes around and they do not dump it then, but sometimes at night when they have a problem they just turn a valve and dump the waste into the river. When an employee of a Crown corporation admits this has been done at a time when the government is trying to do something about pollution, I think this is an incompatible situation about which the minister should be doing something.

I mentioned how the plant across the river pollutes the air in the city of Ottawa. Then, we had the example of the co-operative in Saskatchewan which, because it did not use sufficient wisdom, polluted the water of the Saskatchewan River. This pollution resulted in the poisoning of fish. Whether it is a Crown Corporation, a private corporation or a co-operative corporation, I say we need some adequate policing to make sure that pollution control is implemented. In fact, we need a law. We need a law with penalties and one which will be policed by an administration which has enough gumption to enforce the law in a manner which will result in improvement for the entire society. We want to clean up pollution but we also want to be fair to those who are spending a great deal of money in this area so that one does not benefit at the expense of another.

Recently I attended a conference on the subject of pollution. One of the gentlemen at that conference said that a commandment to cities which were taking their drinking water from a river might read in this way: Thou shalt take thy drinking water from below thine effluent. That is different from the present practice. At present a city takes its drinking water from a river, uses it, muddies it, and then passes it on downriver for somebody else to drink. This is not a very pleasant situation when we think of the inadequate sewage disposal systems of some cities. It is time we looked for some other and more adequate method to clean up this pollution rather than just passing along the problem to someone else. Sometimes I wonder whether, instead of taking water for a plant from a river and then passing it on downstream filled with waste, it might be better if the plant were to take water from a river, lake or well and then dump it into a series of ponds where, at the expense of that plant, the water would be cleaned to the point where it could be used again. This in effect, would be a cycling system.

Although for the purposes of some plants I do not think the water would have to be too pure and could contain a certain amount of taint, if this practice of dumping tainted water into a river were followed at a number of points a serious problem could result with consequent danger to fish and other life in the waters of the river, sea or ocean. I think perhaps we should look at some other methods which are at our disposal, particularly in respect of some industrial plants. As I said previously, we had the example of a plant in Saskatchewan which caused the poisoning of fish. This will result in an expense to the taxpayers of Canada or to somebody in Canada. I am not picking on this plant particularly, but it is one which came to light just recently. There are a number of different types of pollution in Saskatchewan. I do not believe there is normally as much industrial pollution there as there might be in British Columbia, Ontario or some other areas of the world.

However, there are some things we should be more careful about. Nearly every farmer there uses 2-4-D which may or may not have some long range harmful effect. Hopefully, it will not. As a farmer, I would not like to be denied the use of it. Farmers in Saskatchewan have used DDT for control of a number of items. I recall occasions when the Department of Agriculture in Saskatchewan called back some types of grasshopper spray which they found left a residue in the tissue of animals. We should be constantly aware of situations like this. In Saskatchewan there has been a fair amount of pollution in the sense of erosion of land. This has occurred in other areas of the world as well. The Chinese have had long experience with this type of pollution. The Yellow River is noted for its great floods. The sands silt the river further downstream. The Chinese used unwise forestry policy. They cut down the trees for fuel and other purposes and this is the net result.

While we seem to have unlimited forests and land in Canada, I suggest we too could suffer if we do not use a little more wisdom in this regard. This is particularly true when we consider the heavy rain areas of Canada, such as British Columbia and some sections of Ontario. We have not used wise methods in respect of the control of erosion. Last spring in some sections of rural Ontario there were

floods and a considerable amount of pollution of lakes and rivers because the soil washed away in some sections.

I believe there should be a co-ordinated policy in respect of pollution, whether it be related to farming operations, lumbering operations or industrial operations. I think one reason we have done some of the things we have in respect of pollution in Canada is that we have sort of a "big thing" complex. This is particularly true in the United States. We have large acreage farms, big fields, and have a large erosion problem. We carry on lumbering operations by the use of large efficient units. We cut down our trees and when there is heavy rain or heavy snowfall in the winter, we have a large erosion problem. We have a large pollution problem which requires a large anti-pollution program. Perhaps a little more judgment should be used along the way. Much of Canada is not yet spoiled. Much of the country is still covered by forests and virgin sod. Surely we have benefited from our experience to the extent that we can save ourselves some expense in the future in respect of what we still have. I should like to see the clean air and water that we have preserved. I should like to see the oxygen and carbon dioxide in the lakes, rivers and oceans in and around Canada kept in proper balance. By using a little wisdom, we might at least contribute to our share of the total environment control on this planet.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I would like to make another comment in a slightly different area. I do not think it would be fair to industry, to municipalities or to anyone else who has to set up pollution control to say that overnight they must install in their plant for pollution control. I think they must be given an opportunity to adjust the prices of products to cover pollution control or waste disposal. A municipality must be given the opportunity to raise taxes or in other ways raise funds or to build facilities, and, within limits, we should accept this as being just and right. I think that the federal and provincial governments should be prepared to assist financially, whether by grants or by loans as the case may be. We might give aid through Central Mortgage and Housing or through some other means. I suggest that the present act is not adequate in this respect.

I think that fines—if that is the right term—should be imposed on those who pollute. How about putting the fine from a company or a municipality into a fund, and if that company or municipality installs pollution control or whatever is required in that area within a specified time they will get their money back. I do not think that a fine should be imposed as a punishment. This should be done to induce these people to build adequate pollution controls. I am sure that this is the purpose of the bill, so why not do something that will make it attractive for those involved to obey the law? This should be the intent of the bill. Let us do something about improving our environment and let us do something practical to encourage these companies or municipalities to make this move now.

I was in the Arctic this summer and I noticed around the Resolute air base the remnants of several planes lying about. It looked as if the accident had occurred yesterday. The remnants were bright and untarnished. It might be a little scary for a fellow landing at the airport in a fog to see parts of an almost new plane lying around. This is what happens in the Arctic. Some of these planes have been there for years, and apparently no one has made an effort to gather up the parts lying around the airport. I have suggested that there are special problems in the Arctic with regard to pollution. Material lying on the ground does not rust, deteriorate or sink into the ground to become part of the soil as it does elsewhere, so some special action must be taken regarding this problem. Much of the Arctic is virgin territory so far as industrial pollution is concerned—let us keep it that way. I do not think anyone really knows what an adequate pollution program in the far north would be, in view of the freezing temperatures and the perma frost. Perhaps we should carry out some further studies there. I know there have been some minor ones done but perhaps further studies should be carried out on how to dispose of waste from plants, municipalities or residents in that area.

I should like to speak for a moment about the oil industry in the Arctic. Some efforts have been made internationally to control pollution on the high seas. We in Canada are very concerned about what might happen in our Arctic in this respect. We do not know how long an oil slick might last in the Arctic because of the particularly cold temperatures that exist there, what damage it might do or how large an area it might cover before it is finally cleaned up. We do not know whether any satisfactory means are available for removing this oil from the Arctic waters. I believe that some research should be conduct-

ed in this respect. I would like to see the Canadian government put some pressure on other countries and on international companies to do some research in this area to see if we cannot protect our future. Two or three large tankers within the last few years have broken up on the high seas. The *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England caused a great deal of harm to that area and to the marine life and birds in the region.

There is some talk of making the companies which ship oil responsible for this damage. I think that the insurance companies are edgy about the whole problem and do not really want to cover the type of damage that might occur. Perhaps there should be further international co-operation in this regard, and perhaps the governments concerned might offer to carry a portion of the insurance if no other means are practical.

I believe pollution control is an important project. As a Canadian, I would like to see us do something specific about it. This act is not strong enough to do the job which we would like to see done. I am sure that Canadians will resent it if we do not take adequate steps now. I think that such steps would be politically palatable for most people at present. They have come to realize now that it is a sufficiently important problem to warrant the raising of money, whether by taxation or by any other means, and that it requires a government with sufficient gumption to say: "let us do something about it starting today".

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): I had not intended to take part in the debate until I found myself seconding the abortive motion of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) last evening. I had an opportunity then to study the bill, the second reading of which is proposed. I do not think this is a half-hearted measure because I suppose there is an intention to do something. However, I think this is a very strange way to deal with pollution which is a very serious problem in Canada. As I shall prove, we are increasing the number of people who are already dealing with the problem without, I think, doing anything to set up an authority which will make the management of pollution problems more coherent and comprehensive.

A few years ago I brought into the chamber for the purpose of asking a question a bottle full of water from Halifax harbour, and about half the bottle contained oil. People simply could not believe that in this day and age harbour water could be so polluted, but unfortunately from time to time that is what happens in Halifax harbour when some pollutant is at work.

The reason I did not bring that bottle down this afternoon to display it on my desk during my speech is twofold. First, Your Honour tends to frown on these little exhibitions, and second, it might upset the stomachs of many hon. members. If they were to rush out of the chamber our quorum might be in serious jeopardy. But anyone who wants to see a practical example of what pollution can do might want to go to room 553D in the House of Commons.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is the window open?

Mr. McCleave: The window isn't always open but the jar is very securely secured on top, so that one just looks. One does not smell this particular specimen.

Mr. McGrath: Good Nova Scotia rum would offset the effects.

Mr. McCleave: I shall ply that to the hon. member when he visits me.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the proliferation of bodies dealing with the problems of pollution. This came to my attention very dramatically a few days ago when a large slick of oil was sighted near Eastern Passage, actually on the shoreline at Eastern Passage, causing considerable hardship with the lobsters stored there, messing up the beach, and making it very difficult for the fishermen to carry on their profession. The fishermen who called me and drew it to my attention asked me to take steps to see that the matter would be pursued.

I called the Steamship Inspection Service of the Department of Transport ten minutes before closing time that day, and the gentleman there asked me whether this oil slick had come from a vessel in the harbour or from some other source. The reason this question was important was that if it did come from a vessel leaving Halifax harbour, the Steamship Inspection Service of the Department of Transport would investigate. If they could pin the blame on a certain ship, they would then take appropriate action in the courts. However, if the slick came from a land source, say, an oil refinery or from somebody jettisoning oil on shore, it would be some other board, the National Harbours

Board, or some other section of the department that would have to carry out the investigation.

My friend in the Steamship Inspection Service, whose office overlooks the harbour, could not see at that moment any ship in the vicinity of Eastern Passage that could have created that particular oil slick. Upon investigation, however, it turned out that a ship, which might or might not have been the guilty party, had just cleared the harbour so the Steamship Inspection Service of the department did get into the act.

The point I am making, perhaps rather laboriously, is that I might have been left phoning both parties, the National Harbours Board and the Steamship Inspection Service, with each of them saying, "No, it is the other fellow's responsibility." Then, the poor fishermen would have had no recourse whatsoever. It is a matter of disappointment that in this bill there is not spelled out specifically some over-all authority that would cut down the interventions of various federal departments and establish one over-all authority to deal with pollution whether it came by land or by water, as happened in this case in Halifax harbour.

My puzzlement has become even greater in that a few days ago the Department of Fisheries got into the act. It carried out an intensive investigation of the conditions in Bedford Basin, that great body of water back of the peninsula of Halifax, which is familiarly known to most Canadians as the great gathering place for the wartime convoys. At one time the Bedford Basin used to have fish life in it. The fish are getting fewer and worse looking as time goes by.

Mr. Greene: That applies to a lot of us.

Mr. McCleave: Yes, the minister may well say that this is happening to a lot of us. But it is happening to the fish because of pollution in that body of water. Part of that pollution comes from the Halifax city dump, and part from the effluents from the Bedford Basin shoreline on which are located several large government enterprises such as the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, conducted by the minister himself, a naval magazine, a great number of homes and several villages. I do not know if the Bedford Institute of Oceanography pours its sewage into the basin, but certainly a lot of sewage gets in there and the Department of Fisheries has found that this is really wreaking havoc with the fish in the basin, so that eventually we are going to have a very large open sewer in the back part of the city of Halifax.

As I say, the Department of Fisheries getting into the act greatly increased my puzzlement. Then, just before Christmas the CMHC simply ran out of the money which had been allocated to sewage loans, and here I mention such places as Hamilton and the city of Halifax which were in line for loans. Therefore, while the minister, with that burst of eloquence that so characterizes him and which we hope will never diminish, presents this bill to us and talks about the brave new world in which we will fight pollution, another member of the cabinet in this chamber, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras), finds that the sewage disposal plants that the city of Halifax, the city of Hamilton and other places want, have to be postponed because money is not available.

Yet, Sir, around the peninsula of Halifax, the old part of Halifax, there are probably 50 to 60 sewer outlets into Halifax harbour, into the Northwest Arm and into Bedford Basin. So, one minister preaches and the other minister says, "Boys, you will have to wait because we don't have money to carry out some pollution remedies at the present time." If one tried to spell out an intelligible war on pollution from these things one would be left very badly adrift.

On looking into the bill itself there are points about it that strike me as even more curious than the arguments I have related up to now. For example, there is the setting up of the management authorities. This brings another new body on to the scene, which in some cases can be set up unilaterally. In other cases it is set up in consultation with provinces or with a province.

What will happen if either Ontario or the Quebec government becomes obstreperous over the setting up of such a water quality management authority for the Ottawa River which, as the hon. member who just preceded me noted, is the source of noxious smells of its own? What happens if the minister is able to wheedle one of the two provinces into agreeing to set up the authority but his powers of persuasion fail with the other provincial government? Above all, what happens during all the delay while this diplomatic stuff goes on? I think the approach is certainly open to question.

While our amendment was thrown out, the points that were advanced so ably by my colleague have all the validity in the world. I

hope we will yet come up with something that will pass muster with the Chair or with the chairman of the committee, whereby some teeth can be added to this particular venture.

Then, Sir, another body makes its appearance on the pollution scene through this bill. He is an inspector. He has power to traipse about on land, and in the water too if he gets aboard a ship, and he may make certain inspections. Perhaps this gentleman can replace those various other people I noted earlier. But looking at the powers set forth in the bill for him, I am not sure that in all cases he can replace all of those others I have mentioned. It would be a good thing if these powers were very carefully examined, so that what now exists within the empire of the Department of Transport and what now exists within the empire of the Department of Fisheries, could be brought under one roof when we are dealing with problems of water pollution. If that does not happen, then I suggest we are going to face the same proliferation when we get into the problems of dealing with land or soil pollution and when we deal with the problems of air pollution.

I believe we should be building up one authority that can tackle these problems instead of adding a new body that would be engaging in a tug-of-war, or rather the reverse of a tug-of-war, resulting in some gentlemen in the government of Canada saying to each other, "It isn't my problem; it's your problem," and thus keep on passing the buck. If the minister thinks this is not a serious problem or that I am being facetious, I can tell of an actual case that occurred some years ago in Halifax. Whilst a ship was being fuelled, some oil escaped and the question was whether the breakage in the line feeding the fuel into the ship occurred on the land jurisdiction or on the water jurisdiction. Was it that part of the line which was out from the oil refinery itself which broke or was it that part of the line attached thereto which was on the ship? If it were the former, one fellow from the Department of Transport had responsibility for investigating and, if there was a criminal offence, taking court action. If it was another part of the line that broke or the coupling, then it was up to our old friends from the steamship inspection service to take action.

• (4:00 p.m.)

While great debate raged as to who was responsible for investigating where this break had actually occurred, and whether any fault was involved, the time for action passed and another great example of pollution went unpunished. I think the case actually went to court, and the poor magistrate had to give the defendant the benefit of the doubt because responsibility for the break that poured hundreds of gallons of oil into Halifax Harbour could not be clearly established. The harbour suffered, but no penalty could be applied at that particular time.

So I am pointing out, Sir, that we should recognize we have a serious duty in dealing with water pollution or any kind of pollution, and it is up to us to draft the best legislation possible. I am suggesting that a bill which causes proliferation of the established bodies rather than drawing them together into a cohesive authority with fairly wide powers should be replaced after a new look at the problem. Unless we can weld these organizations together in a form which can be more easily dealt with, we will simply add to the confusion which exists in the field at the present time.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the people of Vancouver and the lower Mainland could see what a very thin House we have this afternoon when the matter of pollution is being discussed, they would be astonished. It is thin all around. When I was at home at Christmas time there was no topic as much discussed as that of water, air and soil pollution. However, I am very glad that the minister is present because it may well be that during this debate he will be brought to consider changes which would make this legislation really effective.

My colleague, the hon. member for Kootenay West, (Mr. Harding) who led off this debate on the Canada Water Act, for the NDP, went over its shortcomings. I shall merely enumerate what these were, under headings, but I intend to deal with only one of them. In the first place, the act falls short in not setting Canada-wide standards for water quality, leaving various areas to set their own standards. This is not good enough in a country with such mobility of population. If we want to make the country unified we should do so in the matter of water standards. Water, too, is mobile; it does not stop at provincial or other boundaries and quality in one area affects the quality in another. Secondly, the legislation fails in that it does not spell out the cost-sharing federal-provincial arrangements for the $3 billion or $4 billion which the Minister of Energy, Mines

and Resources (Mr. Greene) says will be needed for the next decade to handle the problem. Neither does it suggest any possibility of federal grants or federal matching monies for provincial or regional water control systems.

In the third place, the legislation fails to provide financial help for municipalities all across the country whose resources are very, very limited. Some municipalities have asked for Central Mortgage and Housing Loans to instal sewage treatment plants, but the minister states that such loans are not available. I do not know whether he intends such loans to be made available when the present period of belt-tightening and austerity is over; we have not heard about that.

In the fourth place, this legislation falls short because it is not anti-pollution legislation. It is not legislation to stop pollution; it is legislation to permit pollution. It promulgates a "pay-as-you-pollute" policy which will permit industry to pollute and then pay public authorities to take out pollution. In my view that is not what the people of this country want nor is it good national housekeeping in any sense of the word.

The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, is not hard to find. This law was not framed to provide clean water for Canadians. This law was framed to suit the convenience of big industries whose operations pollute the waterways of Canada. The minister admitted as much when he said he had sought to devise "a method compatible with our free enterprise system." Had he reflected a little he would have realized that it is quite impossible to devise any method of keeping Canada's water clean that would be compatible with the will of individual industrialists to pollute the water and then leave it to municipal sewage plants to take out the pollution.

Whether fees are paid is not the main issue because no amount of fees will get the pollution out of the water and, as my colleague said earlier in this debate, there is no sense in loading onto the public something which ought to be the responsibility of the polluting industrialists. The result of this legislation will only be to allow the waste-dumpers to continue to foul the water. In my view, that is not a good piece of legislation. Sure, they will have to pay for the privilege of doing this, but what the people of Canada need now is a law to ban pollution; not to take dirt out of the water but to prevent dirt being put in.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Now I should like to talk about the one issue of phosphate detergents and what they are doing to the lakes, rivers and waterways of Canada. People are becoming aroused about this matter. If there are excuses to be made for the shortcomings of government in this field or for those of anybody else, such excuses can rest on only one thing and that is the speed with which this matter is developing.

In the fall of 1969, the International Joint Commission issued a report on this subject which was quite specific. It stated that 67 per cent of all the phosphorous in the form of phosphates being put into Lake Erie and Lake Ontario comes from municipal sewage. Of this amount, 50 per cent to 70 per cent is the direct result of phosphates in detergents. I see no reason why the minister could not have acted upon that finding of the International Joint Commission when framing this legislation.

Women all across Canada are suddenly realizing that all these detergents which they have been using with claims to make clothing whiter than white and brighter than bright have assisted in the process of killing the Great Lakes and are well on the way to murdering the other lakes and waterways into which they find their way. The women of this country are becoming alarmed and disgusted at having been made unknown accomplices in this process of ruining and wrecking the waterways of this country under the guise of getting clothes whiter than white and brighter than bright. It is too great a price to pay.

A group of consumers near Montreal last fall said quite definitely that a not-quite-so-white wash is a small price to pay if it helps make our choked and stinking rivers clean again. They were even prepared to again start using non-polluting laundry soaps in order to save the rivers of this country. Not only would it save our rivers from pollution but it would keep the health of children of this and other generations from being wrecked and ruined in the same way that the rivers are being wrecked and ruined because of pollution.

An article in the October 18 edition of the Montreal *Star*, commenting on the International Joint Commission's report stated:

> The daily use of detergents by housewives is doing more to ruin our waters as a major balancing factor in the ecological cycle than almost anything else.

The reference was to the fact that the International Joint Commission had urged that there must be a ban on phosphate detergents by 1972 to save Lake Erie and 1975 at the latest to save Lake Ontario from eutrophication, which is a polite word for death.

The Montreal *Gazette*, on November 5, quoted the past president of the Quebec Wildlife Association as saying that it was crazy that the city of Montreal got its drinking water from the polluted St. Lawrence. He is quoted as saying:

> In New York they get their water from lakes 100 miles away, but here we drink sewage.

It is not only the Great Lakes which are in jeopardy. Many members have been reading about what is happening to the lakes and waterways from one end of the country to the other. With regard to Placentia Bay, where the Electric Reduction Company of Canada is located, last winter because of a proliferation of algae this plant killed the fish, thereby taking away the livelihood of the fishermen.

I read the other day that Lake Osoyoos in the beautiful Okanagan is today well on the way to eutrophication and the other nearby lakes are close behind. Housewives all across Canada are appalled at having been made accomplices to the twin crimes of murdering the lakes and rivers and poisoning the water that people have to use. There have been many letters on the subject. One appeared not long ago in the *Globe and Mail* and I quote most of it:

> I would like to ask if we women are ignorant, stupid or criminally selfish.
>
> If we are none of these, why is it that despite the terrible effect of detergents on our streams, rivers and lakes, and the life they support, we continue to use these products? Would we deliberately pour poison, if it were clearly marked "Poison", by the millions of gallons into these dying waters, to the increasing detriment of ourselves, our children and their children, if any, not to mention wildlife?
>
> I think not—then what are we waiting for?

I have already mentioned what consumers near Montreal have had to say. In my opinion, legislation is required along the lines suggested by the International Joint Commission, including a ban on phosphate detergents. This Commission states that these must be banned by 1972 in order to save Lake Erie and by no later than 1975 to save Lake Ontario. I see no reason why the other rivers and waterways should not receive equal consideration and I urge that there should be a Canada-wide ban.

Naturally, the producers of detergents and other large firms do not want a ban, but if it is a matter of deciding between helping two or three large industrial firms or preserving the life and health of our people and the beauty of our country, I know what the decision of the government should be. What is the hold-up in banning these detergents? I think the reason is obvious. It is because of detergent companies such as Lever Brothers, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet and the Proctor and Gamble Company of Canada Limited. I have copies of correspondence that has been sent to these firms asking why they apparently have not been working hard on getting a substitute. Two of these replies are very similar, the one from Lever Brothers and the one from Proctor and Gamble. They both point out that at the present time there is no replacement. I may say these letters were sent prior to finding a replacement which I shall mention in a few moments.

These companies point out that it is going to take a long time to develop a replacement, although they must be aware that in Sweden there has been a replacement for some time which is working very well. They advocate that the best plan is to have the municipal sewage plants remove the phosphates after the detergent has been used. It is this statement that makes me wish I could have been a fly on the wall to watch their extra-sensory perception arrangements with the minister who drafted this legislation. He could not have drafted anything more in line with the thinking of the big detergent companies as to what is required in the Canada water act. It is interesting to note that the vice president of the Electric Reduction Company, the firm which manufactures all phosphates for detergents in Canada, the same firm which has been pumping pollution into Placentia Bay, killing the fish and taking away the livelihood of the Newfoundland fishermen, also happens to be the Chancellor of Toronto University and the president of the Science Council of Canada.

On December 20, 1969 an announcement was made by Dr. Philip Jones, a pollution specialist at the University of Toronto, to the effect that he had discovered a non-phosphate, non-toxic substitute for phosphates in detergents. A group of housewives had been trying out these detergents made with non-phosphate compounds for three months and found them to be eminently satisfactory as a substitute for phosphate detergents and in some respects they were better cleaners.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Dr. Philip Jones announced that this was safe and had been thoroughly researched; the

same materials were used in it as were successfully used in Sweden in non-phosphate detergents there. Dr. Solandt was very cool and sceptical in his response to this news. He admitted at a press conference some days later that because of his connection with ERCO his views on the subject might be, and I quote, "slightly biased". He admitted that this Swedish detergent did exist. He sounded a little dubious about it, but he admitted that it was in existence and working.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Solandt was not the first person to be cool about this discovery. Not surprisingly, perhaps, the firms making detergents had also been cool about it. On a CBC program "Weekend" around the middle of November, Brian Kelly was forthright in saying that the reluctance of the detergent companies to come to grips with the problem of harmful detergents arose from the existence of long-range contracts with ERCO. I believe this is precisely the case.

This then is the situation. A suitable replacement does exist; it has been researched and publicized by a pollution specialist at the University of Toronto. Now, I want to finish off the story of the Electric Reduction Company of Canada to date. Two months later, on January 13, 1970, the press reported that the Electric Reduction Company of Canada had been fined a total of $40,000 and forbidden to make long-term contracts with either customers or suppliers after pleading guilty to three violations of the Combines Investigation Act. It had been convicted on charges of maintaining a monopoly against the public interest and the special prosecutor accused ERCO of tying up the two biggest detergent manufacturers, Proctor and Gamble and Lever Brothers, with 10-year contracts to make it uneconomic for a new competitor to enter the market. The prosecutor also said that ERCO had paid between $800,000 and $900,000 as a bonus to acquire Dominion Fertilizer and thus eliminate competition. These are facts which we should bring out when we are talking about pollution and the need for action rather than indulge in the delightful poesy which the minister used to introduce this legislation.

These are hard facts. Now, we know why the big detergent companies were lax in looking for phosphate substitutes; it was because they had long-term contracts tying them securely to ERCO. Now, we know why the Chairman of the Science Council of Canada was so cool in his reception of the news that a non-phosphate detergent had been found.

We have heard a good deal in this House recently about the danger of conflict of interest. I suggest that this is an example of a more dangerous conflict of interest than even the ones we have heard mentioned in this House; it is as dangerous a conflict of interest as any which is likely to come to notice. Here we have a man who is the Chairman of the Science Council of Canada, a man who is supposed to be in a special position to look judicially at discoveries and inventions and improvements in science in order to make pronouncements upon them. At the same time, we learn, this man is the Vice-President of the company which makes all the phosphates which are used in detergents in Canada and which are responsible for between 50 and 70 per cent of the municipal sewage pollution flowing into lakes Erie and Ontario.

I think it is time we did something about this. How can a man who is supposed to be above influence and above conflict of interest, a man who as head of the Science Council of Canada makes decisions affecting science in this country, command the confidence of the Canadian people when at the same time he is the Vice-President of the firm which makes the phosphates which have polluted almost to the point of sterility Lakes Erie and Ontario? And this substance is being used in every city and small hamlet across Canada.

I want to say quietly and with deliberation that in my view it would be a good thing if the government were to look very seriously at this particular case of conflict of interest with a view to requesting the resignation of the Chairman of the Science Council of Canada and his replacement by somebody who is free from special interests. This is a matter of grave concern to the people of this country. Here is a situation where big industry is allied with big scientific institutions and big educational institutions—the University of Toronto is the largest university in this country, I believe—and allied also, as I firmly believe up to this point—with big government which has drafted this type of water legislation and tried to put it across as an act to ban pollution. When this happens I think it is time the people of this country sat up and took notice.

This is not a matter of party politics. It is a matter of whether we are likely to survive in our own environment. I have been reading books by scientists this winter, and I have reached the conclusion that many scientists today are worried as to whether the animal,

man, has enough brains to enable him to control these scientific processes in time to prevent the pollution of the environment and his own destruction by his own technology. This is a case in point. I think it is completely wrong to allow these conflicts of interest to go on, as well as entirely unfair to the men who are placed in these impossible situations. They are gagged, bound and helpless from the point of view of being public servants. I believe it is wrong to put people into positions where conflicts of interest can threaten their usefulness to the people of this country. And it is lethal to the people that such situations should exist.

I want to appeal to the minister to take a hard look at this legislation when it goes to the committee. I appeal to him to acknowledge that this bill is not an anti-pollution measure and that sooner or later the Canadian people, when they are up against it, will recognize that it is not.

What this bill desperately needs is some provision by which municipal bodies would receive funds for the establishment and improvement of sewage plants, either by way of a shared program between the provincial governments and Ottawa or by some other means of making grants available for such a purpose. In the second place, the minister must take action to ban the use of phosphate detergents completely. One of my hon. friends said earlier that there might need to be a time lag. I think the target date of the International Joint Commission, 1972 for Lake Erie, is a good one. A time lag of that length would give an opportunity for readjustment. But the idea of a time lag extending until the detergent companies and ERCO have unloaded their supplies of phosphate on the unsuspecting people of this country is not my idea of the way in which this should be done. It would be too long. It might well be too late.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. I hope it is enough to ensure that some action, at least, is taken to ensure that we have an effective Canada water act when it comes back again to this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, before the hon. lady sits down may I say that I was not too sure whether she was in favour of the basic premise contained in the bill, namely that the polluter should pay for rehabilitating the water, or whether in fact water quality should be achieved by the rehabilitation or by restricting the use of various substances, the cost being met out of general tax revenue.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I believe the people causing the pollution ought to pay for preventing pollution; and pollution should be prevented by keeping it out of the water in the first place. In other words, industry should see to it that it adopts methods that cut out pollution entirely.

I do not know whether it is possible to do this in every case straight away or in the period I have suggested. However, from everything that I have learned about pollution, detergents are far and away the biggest single pollutant. An alternative to detergents has been discovered and is already in use in Sweden, and I suggest that there is a good place to begin. I suggest a ban be imposed on phosphate detergents, to take effect not later than 1972, which I do not think would be unrealistic. In fact, this is probably the best solution that could be devised.

I did not go into all of the other forms of pollution this afternoon so I am not prepared to say what should be done in regard to them. I have confined myself strictly to detergents because it is detergents that are threatening the very life of our biggest lakes.

I do not want to go further afield since I have not had time to study other pollutants, but I am sure of the facts that I have put on the record this afternoon. I believe there is a good place to begin, and no doubt other members will suggest other remedies. But certainly the polluter should be responsible for the cost of eliminating his pollution; and wherever possible pollution ought to be eliminated at its very source.

Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House today will have wide repercussions on the development of Canada as a healthy resource controlling nation, a nation which is opening up new frontiers in every direction and, at the same time, is conscious of the need to preserve our environment free from the curse of pollution.

I commend the minister for a very forward looking piece of legislation. I also commend him—and here I disagree with the comments of the last speaker—for the flexibility of drafting. The bill is designed to adapt itself to differing water conditions throughout an intensely diverse water-supplied country.

Mr. McGrath: Save your breath.

Mr. Gibson: Thank you, I will. The bill before the House represents a systematic attack on the problem of water pollution, jointly with the provinces wherever possible but alone, if necessary, to achieve the aim of clean water. In order for this bill to succeed, it is necessary that industry, municipal and provincial governments give their full co-operation.

The member who last spoke exhorted the minister to provide finance for city sewage systems. This question is already actively being studied by the government and efforts are being made to provide finance. Largely due to the minister's efforts, lots of industries, in co-operation with the provinces and federal government, have provided large sums of money to combat pollution. In the Hamilton area large sums of money have been earmarked to clean up the bad spots of Hamilton Bay. This has been a joint project, a co-operative effort, largely instigated by the minister, and it has resulted in this approach to pollution problems.

This bill is a big step forward in the control of our resources. It represents a constructive approach to the protection of our environment. It is a great bill, and I am sure that it will lead to a vast improvement in this difficult area.

Obviously, the bill contemplates water pollution control in the new areas of regional development. I hope that this extremely important aspect of pollution control will be kept in mind when areas of the country are newly developed under our regional expansion plans as well as when we open up the great north of this country. I hope that in the matter of pollution control we will not make the mistakes of the past but guard against them with sensible, well co-ordinated pollution regulations. I suggest this legislation provides the right sort of signpost to point the way to the achievement of this end.

We are conscious of the need to protect the regions of the Northwest Territories, the Yukon and the Arctic areas as well as the heavily populated areas to the south. The per capita use of water in urban centres is rapidly increasing, and total urban consumption is likely to have more than doubled by 1980.

Programs on pollution on CBC television and also the publicity given to the problem on radio and in the press have all played a substantial part in bringing to the attention of the public the necessity for action by all levels of government and industry to deal with this vitally important subject.

The real issue can be summarized as follows: Will we permit the development of our natural environment to be ruined by pollution? The federal government has a vital responsibility in this regard and it has assumed it.

I wish for a moment to speak to the question of pollution in the Great Lakes and along the international boundary. With the Canada Water Act now before us, I suggest that the federal government commence negotiations with the federal government of the United States, the governments of border states and our own provincial border governments with a view to establishing an international pollution control agency. The purpose of the agency would be to prevent pollution of the Great Lakes and of the boundary waters between Canada and the U.S.A. We should give this agency power to enforce pollution control by means of fine or injunction against offenders along the borders of Canada and the U.S.A.

Some might say that this is far too precipitate action; that we are just starting out on pollution control and it will take a long time to work out a constructive agreement with the United States. I agree it will take a long time, but let us start now at this early stage of our initial phases of pollution control.

Perhaps this agency could operate under the aegis of the International Joint Commission. Nevertheless, it seems to me that since we are preparing now to clean up our own waterways, this is the time to urge the United States to co-operate in a joint venture within which the international body could take action to establish enforceable anti-pollution controls.

It may be said that such a venture of this kind would be difficult and cumbersome and unlikely to succeed. But it is obvious to me that the good work done on the Canadian side of the border should be augmented by a co-ordinated effort by our neighbour to the south.

I am compelled by a sense of urgency to suggest that preliminary steps be taken now to illustrate to the United States governments concerned that we mean business. Since it may not be possible to devote large sums of money to this type of project now, I suggest it may be possible to bring it about without a great deal of expense. Perhaps the Canada-U.S.A. parliamentary association could deal with the question, or perhaps it could be dealt with on an informal basis. But at least we should make an enthusiastic start.

The governments in the U.S. will be obligated to co-operate, and I suggest publicity alone would tend to trouble any state government that malingered in this vital field of legislative control. The means are at our disposal under the International Joint Commission. Prosecutions could be undertaken on each side of the border on complaint by the International Joint Commission. Persuasion, Mr. Speaker, is not enough. We need a vibrant, effective, alert board to police pollution offenders. I believe that if we commence action now it will not be too late to save the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River from the perils of pollution.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, when listening to the hon. member who took his seat I began to wonder whether I had perhaps suffered a lapse of memory or a momentary lapse of consciousness, or that the debate had changed because I could not recognize the bill he was describing. Certainly, he was not describing Bill C-144 regarding the Canada water act. As a matter of fact, the extensive background material provided to hon. members by the Minister in this attractive green folder had no relation to what he was saying. It probably came from the Minister's green environment. I am sorry to say that the Minister could not be called the jolly green giant in his fight against pollution if this Bill is to be considered as a criterion.

One of the background papers entitled "Proposed Canada Water Act—background notes" reads in part:

> The Canada Water Act is expected to give the federal Government and the provinces an administrative framework for managing and developing Canada's water resources and coming to grips with some of the country's major water problems—particularly the pressing problem of pollution. It calls for a close working partnership between Ottawa and the provinces.

That is all very well if you can achieve such a close-working partnership with the provinces, but there is a very important fact which seems to have escaped the attention of the government in this particular regard. Let me quote briefly from a periodical issued by the Montreal *Star* entitled "Pollution—everybody's business". On the last page there is a very interesting comment by Professor J. R. Dales of the University of Toronto. It reads:

> To a large extent ... pollution is whatever people (most people, or the typical person) consider it to be.

Consequently, Sir, it follows that pollution control under this legislation is whatever the particular province involved considers it to be. This is not the type of pollution control needed to solve what many people believe to be one of the most serious problems facing this country today. When you talk about the control of Canada's water resources and coming to grips with pressing problems of pollution, there is a tendency to lose sight of the fact that there is existing on the statute books of Canada a measure which in my opinion has considerably more teeth than any provision in the bill now before us. I refer to the Fisheries Act.

Section 33 of Chapter 119 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, deals extensively with pollution and the pollution of water in all aspects. Perhaps it might be worthwhile to put the substance of the section on the record. It states that the Governor in Council may deem any substance to be a deleterious substance for the purposes of Section 2 of the Act, which refers to the offence of polluting waters of Canada by any deleterious substance.

Then, it goes on to outline some punitive measures by stating that every person who violates any provision of this section is guilty of an offence and liable on summary conviction to not less than $100 and not more than $1,000 or a term of imprisonment not less than one month and not more than six months. It goes on to deal with the punishment becoming more severe in respect of a second offence.

I submit that the Fisheries Act gives the federal government the constitutional authority to deal with pollution of the waters in Canada without having to enter into any type of agreement with the provinces. This aspect of the legislation now before us is, in my view what makes it a weak and ineffective bill. The Fisheries Act deals with this in quite specific terms without any reference whatsoever to the provinces.

One illustration of how this measure can be brought to bear in a particular instance was the case of the pollution of Placentia Bay by the Electric Reduction Company of Canada. The sad part of that story is that apparently the pollution was allowed to take place and reach the extent it did before the federal government realized its obligations and its responsibilities under the Fisheries Act.

Why is it necessary to enter into an agreement with the provinces whereby each province will be placed in a position to adopt its

own definition of just exactly what constitutes pollution? I suggest that instead of dealing with this as a problem of national urgency we will be dealing with it from ten points of view, if indeed we are fortunate enough to get agreement with all the provinces. That, to my mind, is the basic weakness of this legislation.

The government of Newfoundland is a good example. It knew full well what it was doing when it gave a financial inducement to ERCO to establish a phosphorus plant in Newfoundland. It knew the consequences of a phosphorus plant located at tidewater. It also knew that this province, backward economically with a large and growing problem of unemployment, would have an industry providing jobs. So, Newfoundland turned its eyes away from the immediate threat to the fisheries of the province—the pollution threat to the bay and the displacement of the fishermen involved in that fishery—and went along with the short-term advantage of creating employment for two or three hundred people.

That is an example of how one province might be expected to react. I cannot see for the life of me the province of Newfoundland co-operating in any way, shape or form with this government under this bill if it interfered in any way whatsoever with that province's plans and efforts to induce industry to establish there. The same would apply to any other province in the country. Certainly, it would apply with a great deal of force to some of the regionally disadvantaged provinces such as New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

We have what I consider to be a major weakness in the legislation in that it does not even come close to doing one of the things it is supposed to do. Let me refer to a statement issued by the Minister's office. It is suggested the new bill calls for the pooling of federal-provincial resources across the country to control and combat pollution. That is what the proposed Canada water act is supposed to do.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I am literally astounded at the manner in which this government is treating this problem. There is no reference in the bill to the contiguous waters of Canada. Notwithstanding the immense threat posed to our coastal waters by the opening of the oil reserves of the Arctic and Alaska, the opening of the Northwest passage to supertankers, the possibility of oil being discovered and exploited on the continental shelf on our east and west coasts and the disastrous consequences of these efforts in respect of the contiguous waters, and indeed the whole ecological balance of life itself, there is no reference whatever to this. Indeed, the bill in my view in its present form is a useless ineffective piece of window-dressing. It is a farce, nothing more and nothing less. It tries to do what the Fisheries Act now could do quite efficiently and effectively if it were properly administered. It is trying to do something in a puny and ineffective way. I am concerned about this. I am concerned about pollution. I am sure many people in this country are concerned about it. Indeed, it is becoming a world problem.

I am concerned about this government's approach to this problem. There is a jurisdictional haze; there is no question about that. There is the Navigable Waters Protection Act which is administered by the Department of Transport. There is the Fisheries Act administered by the Minister of Fisheries. There are various measures which come under the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Indeed, there is quite a bit of ambiguity about who has the ultimate responsibility. Surely, however, the Fisheries Act is quite explicit in setting out what Parliament at that time considered to be the responsibility of the Minister of Fisheries. That responsibility is to ensure that the waters of Canada remain clean. So, why do we have this bill? Why do we have the legislation which is before us?

Mr. Gibson: There are different types of waters in different parts of the country.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, we have already heard the submission of the hon. member and most of us were unimpressed. I suggest he restrain himself until I finish my speech. There are other areas of pollution which are not even covered by this legislation. We are concerned about this. For example, we are concerned about the pollution of the air. In this age of the Apollo when we can reach the moon, we have yet to come up with an effective means to have a clean automobile engine which will not pollute the atmosphere. We are concerned about the pollution of our environment. No one seems to be doing anything about such things as the non-returnable bottles which are littering the countryside. We are concerned about the pollution of the high seas. We are concerned about the pollution of our coastal waters. In this House we have been pressing the government to state its position on the conference which recently

took place in Brussels on oil pollution of the high seas. Surely, it was reasonable for us to expect the government would make its position known before this debate took place because this subject is directly related to this debate.

Only yesterday I asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), in the absence of the statement he promised to the House on Canada's position taken at this conference on the pollution of the high seas, whether he would make Canada's position papers available to members of Parliament so that we could relate them to the debate taking place now. This was a reasonable request. Yet, we were denied this and do not know what the Canadian position is. I am glad the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is in his seat because the United Nations is about to sponsor a conference on pollution in 1972. It might be worth while if he were to indicate what Canada's position will be at this conference.

We are faced with very serious problems of pollution but nothing will be solved by this type of legislation. In my opinion it is bad legislation and does not do what it is supposed to do. I regret that the Chair did not accept the amendment we proposed today because we feel the only way to effectively deal with this matter is for the government to withdraw the bill now before us and redraft it in a meaningful way so that it will take into account the jurisdictional problem to which the amendment referred. A redrafted bill could take into account the power the government now has under the Fisheries Act, and the power the government has under the Navigable Waters Protection Act. Perhaps the government could convene a conference on pollution in this country so that everyone would know of the urgency and gravity of the problem. Then, having come to a full realization of the urgency of the problem, perhaps the provinces would be prepared to give up some of the constitutional responsibilities they enjoy in the area of pollution. But instead, we have a bill which is inadequate. All it does is set up the machinery for the government to enter into negotiations with the provinces which will have the final say in this matter.

Mr. Aiken: Machinery for more machinery.

Mr. McGrath: Yes, machinery for more machinery. It is really setting up more jurisdictional bureaucracy. It is not cutting through the haze. It is creating more haze. In fact the crisis is so severe that it calls for a precise definition.

May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Criminal Code—proclamation of remainder of amendments respecting breathalyzer; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—Transport—Coal—application by Great Northern and Kootenay Elk Railways; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Consumer Affairs—charges respecting operations of council.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private member's business as listed on today's order paper, namely, Private Bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

PITTS INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Sudbury) moved that Bill S-10, to incorporate Pitts Insurance Company, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think this bill and the one next following, S-11, are probably bills in respect of which members of the House will not find much to debate. However, I shall go through them briefly. Both are connected with and arise out of the same matter. Both have already been dealt with by the Senate having first been introduced there on Thursday, November 20, having been referred to the Senate Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, where both were dealt with on Wednesday, November 26, and then having been returned to the Senate where they were given second and third reading on Wednesday, November 26 and Thursday, November 27.

The subject matter of Bill S-10 is the incorporation of Pitts Insurance Company and the subject matter of the one following it, S-11, is the incorporation of Pitts Life Insurance

Company. Pitts Life Insurance Company was incorporated on March 1, 1963 under the Ontario Corporations Act and Pitts Insurance Company was incorporated under the Ontario Corporations Act on July 5, 1956. The principal place of business of both companies is London, Ontario, which is where the head office of both companies is located. They are small companies The Life Insurance Company having commenced business in 1963 had a paid up capital of $260,000. It has had a good record of development since that time. Its capital and surplus now total in excess of $1 million. Similarly, the general insurance company started in 1956 with a capital of $100,000 and has grown to have a combined capital and surplus figure in excess of $600,000.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The most important feature of these companies is that they are both wholly Canadian owned. They started their existence through their connection with the Dominion Automobile Association, whose directors and shareholders are virtually the same as those of the companies we are now considering. The members of the Dominion Automobile Association have the benefit of a certain coverage under the life insurance company and the general insurance company. All the directors and shareholders are Canadian and are in fact employees of the companies.

The reason for the federal incorporation is that the membership of the Dominion Automobile Association has expanded considerably since its inception, the companies have substantially increased their volume of business and now do business in several provinces. However, there are several provinces in which the Automobile Association is able to solicit membership but in which there are certain technical difficulties about doing business under an Ontario provincial charter. Since it is very natural at this stage for these companies to extend their businesses into these provinces, they are desirous of obtaining incorporation under an act of the federal Parliament.

This matter came before the House in December, at which time, upon the request of some members opposite, I agreed to stand the matter over until this time because in December there had not been sufficient time for some members opposite to familiarize themselves with some of the information that was pertinent to their decision as to whether incorporation by an act of the federal Parliament should be granted. I think those members have now had time to explore the background of these companies and to satisfy themselves that they are indeed wholly Canadian owned companies, and that their motive in applying for a federal charter at this time is to enable them to do business on a wider basis throughout the Dominion of Canada. In fact their plan, if the present trend continues, is, perhaps in three or four years, to expand their business into the United States, which, I am sure, hon. members will find is a welcome and refreshing change from the usual trend of American companies expanding their business in these fields into Canada.

I trust that hon. members have taken the trouble to examine the Senate minutes and *Hansard* records that are relevant to these matters and to otherwise inform themselves about the affairs of these companies to satisfy themselves on the points that I have mentioned. I hope that they will have found that these companies are indeed worthy of receiving a federal charter. I believe that wholly Canadian owned companies doing successful business should indeed be encouraged to expand their operations on a national basis, for which a federal charter is a virtual necessity. I also believe that they should be encouraged further to expand their business into the United States.

Accordingly, I have pleasure in commending the bill to hon. members.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): I do not want to say very much except that this type of bill will not have to come to Parliament after the legislation concerning insurance companies is passed later on in this session.

I am pleased to note that the company which is to be incorporated is wholly Canadian owned and is operated by Canadian personnel. I also note that the bill contains a few other items of information other than the fact that the company is connected with the Dominion Automobile Association. The fact that the company is Canadian, and that it is operated by Canadians, meets the criterion that we suggested should be a requirement for companies being chartered in Canada. Personally, I will be interested to hear the arguments advanced by counsel in the committee indicating their support of the idea of insurance companies operated by Canadians and for Canadians.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Let me say very briefly that I also am pleased to note that this company is to be wholly Canadian. However, I should like to say that regardless

of whether the company is Canadian or owned by foreigners applying for such a licence here in Canada, it is just as incumbent upon it to observe the laws of Canada. Too often we have heard it said that because such companies are Canadian they might have an edge in the business. I hope that the hon. member who sponsored this insurance bill tonight can assure the House that this company will pass on the benefits that will accrue through its operation to its policyholders. I would also like to suggest that this company take cognizance of the bills which are before the House at this time and supply information to its shareholders in a manner that can be clearly understood by them. All too often insurance companies use language that is not readily understood by the average policyholder. I suggest that the hon. member sponsoring this bill should pass on this information to those who have asked him to bring the bill before the House.

I believe that since we are still in the process of passing these insurance bills the insurance companies should lower their premiums to their policyholders and to those who will apply for their insurance under whatever the terms may be. All too often the reverse has applied. There are many thousands of insurance companies, and this fact does not do the user a bit of good. I hope that the hon. member can truthfully tell the House that the company he is sponsoring will take cognizance of these few facts.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): It is not our intention to talk out this bill, I can assure the hon. member who is sponsoring the bill. Over the years, members of this party have examined this type of bill very closely and we have been accused by some members of the House and by certain individuals outside it of trying to block this type of private bill. The two hon. members who spoke previously have indicated that Canadian owned insurance companies bringing in private bills, which will eventually lead to Canadian control of these companies over the years, need have no fear of being blocked by discussion or debate in the House by members of the NDP. I should like to point out, as one of the members has done already, that this is one of the few remaining bills which will be debated in the House.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I understand that under the amendments to the Canada Corporations Act this task will be passed on to a board, and I am a little apprehensive that a board will not give the same amount of consideration to the desire for Canadian ownership that members of this party have supported. This is one of the amendments to the Canada Corporations Act which I view with some apprehension, because I believe it has been good, for Canada and Canadians, to have people stand up in this House and review legislation of this type.

That is about all I have to say, Mr. Speaker. We welcome the formation of Canadian companies, although not all insurance companies. In this particular case, we have no objection to the formation of this company, and we welcome second reading of the bill and its reference to the finance committee for discussion and questioning.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make about Bill S-10 entitled "An Act to incorporate Pitts Insurance Company."

I have heard the sponsor of this bill say that the House seems unanimous in wanting to pass this bill. Perhaps the hon. member has never heard about the general agreements which are made in the House from time to time and personally I am a little hurt by his attitude. Besides, this is not a reason to stop that bill since we recognize that a Canadian entreprise is involved. But when he says that a general agreement has been reached in the House, I would remind him that he spoke as if the members of the Ralliement créditiste did not exist, as nobody asked us if we agreed.

Mr. Jerome: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that there had been any such agreement as described. What I did say was that I hoped the contents of this legislation were such that members of the House would not find much with which to disagree. I did not refer to any agreement because there has been no agreement among parties in the House that this legislation would pass today.

Mr. Fortin: In any event, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I misunderstood what the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) meant. So, I wish to apologize to him. However, it seems I am not the only one who did.

However that may be, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, on behalf of my colleagues, that we support the principle of that bill. However, I want to stress the fact that it is a thoroughly

Canadian undertaking, with Canadian capital, controlled by Canadians, and this pleases us very much.

I realize that many foreign companies come to Canada to obtain capital, and that they do not necessarily reinvest this capital in our country, not even to a very small extent.

If we, personally and as Canadians, do something to promote private enterprise and economic expansion in our country, we shall be doing our duty. That is why we should vote in favour of this Bill.

Insurance companies and private firms in other fields in Canada never fail to report annually to the House on their operations. They are under no obligation to submit their annual reports to the House and to the newspapers, but members of Parliament greatly appreciate their doing so, because this allows us to realize all they do for the development of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the directors of Pitts Insurance Company to send us every year the report of their activities as well as their financial statements, not necessarily in order to control their operations, but to obtain some information and convince us further that this Canadian insurance company is serving the Canadian people.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House to pass the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

PITTS LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Sudbury) moved that Bill S-11, to incorporate Pitts Life Insurance Company, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to speak at length on this bill. It is identical with the previous one. I just want to say to hon. members opposite who have spoken, particularly the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) and the hon. member from Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) that I will see to it that today's *Hansard* will be placed in the hands of the directors of the company. Since some of the directors of the company were present at the committee meetings previously held on this bill I would expect that they would return to the standing committee meetings, to which I would invite the hon. member for Moose Jaw so that he could ask his questions of them there.

Mr. Skoberg: Let me know when.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

McOUAT INVESTMENTS LIMITED

Mr. Robert-B. Major (Argenteuil) moved that Bill S-15, respecting McOuat Investments Limited, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to revive the charter of the company known as McOuat Investments Limited. The McOuat brothers live in and operate a rental and wholesale agency in Lachute for outboard motors, chain saws and allied products. The purpose of the bill is to clearly spell out the ownership by various members of the McOuat family. By the way, Bill S-16, which is also before the House at present, concerns the company known as Buccaneer Industries Limited, which is actually engaged in the running of the family business. Both companies are owned by the same family. They are small companies which forgot to file the annual reports required by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

The McOuat family is an old Lachute family of United Empire Loyalist stock and has operated this business successfully over the years. The failure to file the proper reports was clearly an oversight on the part of a small company. I therefore propose, seconded by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome), that this bill be referred to committee.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, this problem has developed a number of times. While I agree with the hon. member who introduced the bill that there probably is not anything sinister about it, yet I must point out that according to the bill the notices given on June 20, 1968, and May 7, 1969, which were published on June 22, 1968, and July 12, 1969, in the *Canada Gazette*

instructed the company to file certain returns under the Canada Corporations Act, and obviously it did not do so. When the bill is examined in committee, members of the committee should be very interested in knowing why it failed to do so.

It was not exactly an oversight. It had been a matter of government discussion with the company at a fairly high level. During the period set forth in those *Canada Gazette* notices these companies could have retained their incorporation by filing the reports. As I say, I know the hon. member probably has an intimate knowledge of the companies and the people involved, and knows there is nothing sinister about them, but since there have been several such instances over the years we would be remiss in our duty if we did not inquire into the failure of these companies to file the required reports over a two-year period of time.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The refusal to make the returns demanded by law should, I think incur some penalty. These returns should be made or the companies should not be reinstated. I think the companies should be forewarned that when they come before the committee they had better be prepared to give some good explanation for this oversight and an assurance that it will not occur again. We have now modified the Canadian Corporations Act to allow the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) to examine each company's activities under its licence. Though it may have been an oversight on the part of the company we are dealing with, it was not an oversight over the whole period. A number of notifications were given to them and, knowing some of the government officials concerned in inspection, they were probably hounded over the two-year period. Unless they are prepared to meet the requirements we should be skeptical about re-issuing their incorporation and they should know that we are concerned on this point.

Mr. Major: Mr. Speaker, may I answer the member?

Mr. Speaker: If the member answers, he will be closing debate. Is it agreed?

Mr. Major: May I point out to the hon. member that I am not familiar with these people; I do not know them. All the information I got was from the solicitor and what I gave to this House was given in good faith. I agree with the member that the government has perhaps been remiss in not pursuing these people, but I understand that in the new department this is not done. They do not notify and if a report is not filed apparently the charter is annulled.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Mr. Speaker: Carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

BUCCANEER INDUSTRIES LIMITED

Mr. Robert-B. Major (Argenteuil) moved that Bill S-16, an act respecting Buccaneer Industries Ltd., be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I presume that the hon. member relates his remarks to both bills. Sometimes it is fortunate that we have these bills in pairs as we do not always get sufficient time for rebuttal. If what the hon. member said in respect of the company being notified is correct, then in these two bills we may have an opportunity to ask officials of the Canadian Corporations Act about the methods used in requesting information. It may be that we should look at the question of notice of request for information and with these two bills before us perhaps we will have an opportunity to see how it works. We should be concerned with the method of notification, ensuring that companies understand it and their responsibility to comply with the regulations. The committee is going to look at this and we appreciate the opportunity the company will have of bringing this to our attention. I wonder if there is any relationship between the two, Mr. Speaker, because this company is operated by United Empire Loyalists?

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

ICG TRANSMISSION LIMITED

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River) moved that Bill S-17, to incorporate ICG Transmission Limited, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Peters: Is the sponsor going to indicate what the bill is about?

Mr. Reid: Mr. Speaker, this bill to incorporate ICG Transmission Limited will be an affiliate of Inter-City Gas Limited, a Manitoba company in the business of distributing natural gas throughout the province of Manitoba. The company has signed a contract with Boise Cascade Corporation to fulfil its requirements through a plant to be built at Fort Frances, Ontario.

Because of the particular terrain in the northern part of my constituency, it is less expensive for the line to drop down south from Falcon Lake, Manitoba to the United States than to cross over at Rainy River, Ontario and go the 50 or 60 miles to Fort Frances, cross over at International Falls and also provide service for the Boise Cascade operations, one at Fort Frances and the other at International Falls.

The contract signed by this company is to run for 20 to 25 years and will provide an alternative source to a company which has been using lignite coal and which produces a great amount of air pollution in the town of Fort Frances. I might say the sponsors of the companies are all Canadians. I anticipate this will be the condition in which the company remains.

Mr. Orlikow: Could I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker? To what areas does this company distribute natural gas?

Mr. Reid: My information is that it distributes natural gas throughout the southern part of Manitoba and parts of the city of Winnipeg.

Mr. Skoberg: For the record, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the member a very short question. When he concluded his remarks, he referred to the Inter-City Gas Company. I presume this is a company formed within the province of Manitoba and that shareholders are throughout the province of Manitoba or are they throughout the country generally?

Mr. Reid: This is a publicly held company, Mr. Speaker, and I understand the shareholders are concentrated in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Reid: May we call it six o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of hon. members that we call it six o'clock or that we go on with other business?

Some hon. Members: Six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

• (8:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

WATER RESOURCES

PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, 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, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, we believe the legislation now before the House falls far short of what the country expected and what this Parliament expected as a means of dealing with a serious and growing problem. We believe the government of Canada has already set the necessary constitutional precedents involved in the use of the Fisheries Act, so the constitutional complexity of effectively dealing with pollution is no longer relevant. I believe the Fisheries Act clearly establishes the precedent that the federal government does in fact have a well-defined responsibility in this area, covering the entire country. What concerns me is that this bill would make the application of the government's anti-pollution policy more complicated throughout the whole area inasmuch as it envisages the setting up of ten separate

standards applicable to pollution throughout the country. It does not attack the problem of pollution in its entirety.

Reference has been made to the serious oil pollution threat not only to contiguous waters but to all our navigable waters, especially major waters such as the St. Lawrence River. In addition, we must consider the serious effect of pollution from an ecological point of view. At this point I would refer briefly to a paper prepared for the Canadian Wildlife Service by Professor Richard E. Warner of Memorial University in which specific recommendations are made for coping with the serious threat of oil pollution. One of the serious shortcomings of this bill is that it contains no reference to the effect of oil pollution on the ecological balance of nature. The paper to which I have referred calls for the carrying out of a national survey to identify sites of special importance preparatory to the development of special protection programs. The criteria suggested for the evaluation of these sites are as follows:

1. Their ecological significance to wild life and/or to man.

2. Their aesthetic, recreational and scenic values.

3. The presence of highly susceptible life forms, for example, Atlantic sea birds and inshore water fowl.

4. The presence of rare or endangered species.

5. The uniqueness of the area as representative of Canadian habitats.

The paper goes on to suggest that the survey should be linked with present Canadian activities in the international biological program and with whatever activities Canada is carrying out in an effort to obtain international agreement. I believe this is an important recommendation not only because of the threat pollution poses to man himself but because of the fact that many of our wildlife species are threatened with extinction.

• (8:10 p.m.)

We feel that the legislation should incorporate the government's total approach to this problem. All that this bill provides is some pussyfooting around the problem, and this notwithstanding the very eloquent speech of the minister in introducing the bill on second reading.

I am sorry that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang), who while the minister was ill carried the message of the bill across Canada and met representatives of the provincial governments, has not participated in this debate. Indeed, I am sorry he is not in the chamber, because I am sure that he would be able to confirm what in fact many of us believe to be true, namely, that there are no standards applied across the country in the matter of pollution. Each province will approach the problem of pollution in its own way, as best suits its own interests.

I suggest that is not the way to approach the problem of pollution. Pollution is a national problem and requires a totally national, federal approach. It has already been established that the federal government has constitutional authority to deal with pollution, and in fact has exercised this authority under the Fisheries Act.

The picture of pollution is a total one. There is pollution of our water by phosphates, industrial and human waste; there is air pollution by industry, and by probably the biggest polluter of the atmosphere of all, the automobile. We have environmental pollution, such as that posed by the introduction of the non-returnable bottle which is now littering the countryside. We have pollution of our contiguous waters by oil and industrial waste. We have the increasing threat that is posed by the advent of the exploitation of oil resources on both the east and west coasts of Canada and by the opening up of the Arctic oil storehouse, Alaska, and the transportation of its oil through the Northwest Passage; and lastly, we have pollution of the high seas. You cannot isolate one source of pollution from the others, and in order to make a total approach to the pollution threat all these factors must be taken into consideration.

The bill now before the House is a very sad attempt to meet the challenge presented. It is a very sad attempt to live up to the expectations of Canadians who are very concerned about the threat of pollution. They are concerned not only with the destruction of this natural environment but, indeed, the threat to their very survival. We in North America are reaching the stage where pure water, like pure air, is practically as rare as some of our wildlife species that are threatened with extinction.

We believe very strongly that the government should reconsider this bill with a view to making pollution an offence in Canada as a whole, not just in the designated water management areas which this legislation will set up if agreement can be reached with the provinces. I believe water quality standards

for the whole country should be defined and enforced. We are concerned that none are set out in the bill, with the exception of the standards to be applied in the water management areas.

This legislation should spell out the federal government's jurisdiction in water policy control. The federal government should be prepared to enforce this jurisdiction, as it has already as evidenced by the Navigable Waters Protection Act, the Fisheries Act and the agreements that we are negotiating to try to obtain some meaningful international control of pollution of the high seas.

Further, we believe that the bill should be strengthened by co-ordinating all federal water efforts in some manner, and we suggest there be a more precise definition of how the total federal approach to the problem can be co-ordinated. In addition, the bill should spell out the terms of federal financial support. We in Parliament should be told exactly what will be the cost-sharing formula. We also believe the bill should indicate that where new local water boards are necessary, a lot of the bureaucratic red tape in connection therewith should be removed. We believe that in this way the bill could be strengthened and made much more meaningful and effective than it is in its present form.

I feel very strongly that before the government concludes the legislative passage of this bill it should convene a national conference among representatives of provincial governments, the Northwest Territories, the Canadian Wildlife Service and other similar organizations, and scientists from our universities and research centres across Canada who are continually preoccupied with the grave problem of pollution.

Surely it would be logical to expect that from such a meeting of minds and expression of opinion as to how to deal with the problem there would evolve, first of all, a recognition of the federal government's responsibility meaningfully to legislate for pollution control for the entire country; and second that the provincial governments for their part would, as they have in many other cases, be prepared to yield whatever jurisdiction they feel they may have. Only in this way do we feel that the government will be able to bring in meaningful legislation which would be able to cope in the coming decade with this new challenge of pollution which poses a threat not only to our environment but to the environment of the entire world.

If, in fact, the government is sincere in its intentions, this bill is a misrepresentation of those intentions. We strongly believe that the minister should reconsider the bill and should be prepared to do so when it gets to the committee. The minister should be prepared to call witnesses from across Canada, such as learned scientists, scholars and wildlife experts, who would present papers to the committee. The government, as I say, for its part should be prepared to enter into discussions with these groups before finally concluding the legislative passage of the bill. In its present form this bill, in my submission, is not only a disappointment to this House, but will prove to be a disappointment to the entire country.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that even the issue of pollution must be converted into a political football by some of the opponents of this government. If ever an issue existed which confronts Canadians it is the issue of pollution, which should be met on a non-partisan basis. Beyond that, we must not only meet it nationally on a non-partisan basis but we have reached the point in our human existence on planet earth where we have to meet it on a non-political, non-ideological and international basis.

The statement is made that there has been federal failure, yet members of this government have explored the situation and initiated action designed to overcome some of the very real constitutional problems inherent in the pollution problem. I look back on the years when our friends to the left had the responsibility of governing this country and call to mind all the excuses that were cited for their inability to fight pollution in Canada.

An hon. Member: Two wrongs don't make a right.

Mr. Perrault: The hon. member admits there was something wrong with the preceding government and many Canadians thought the same way. One of the reasons this government was elected to power was that the Canadian people were concerned about the do-nothing, lack-lustre policy with respect to pollution which was a feature of that preceding régime. The last thing I want to do is become political tonight.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Perrault: The important measure before us reflects the concern of Canadians of all parties. We are all concerned about it, because we are all affected by it. It does not matter whether we vote Liberal, Conservative or NDP, we are all concerned with the quality of our environment and the pollution of that environment in recent years. We are concerned with the pollution of air, water and soil because this costs Canadians an estimated $1.175 billion per year, or $72 per capita. About $22 per year per capita is attributable, we are assured by experts, to water pollution; yet there are people parading around this country, some occupying responsible positions, who say the smell of pollution is the smell of money. That is the old theme song. In terms of the cost to Canada today, we are all losers even on the economic side, let alone the sociological and health side.

When our environment is threatened by industrial wastes, sewage, chemicals or by any other agent, we know we are on a collision course with disaster unless we act now to guard our heritage of natural resources. Increasingly the problem of pollution threatens to render this planet uninhabitable. Some regard this kind of statement as scientific fiction—you meet these people every day in Canada—and a vast overstatement of the fact. They say the "in" thing now is to talk about pollution; everybody is talking about it and you might as well join the parade, but don't believe what you hear, Charlie! In their hearts they still regard the smell and sight of pollution as one of the inevitable byproducts of industrial progress; they still see in Canada a land with limitless possibilities for further damage to the environment without any measurable harm being done.

The fact is that man's technical ability to create and destroy, combined with a rapid increase in world population, has been associated with alterations in the environment which are not only unpleasant and harmful to health, but which may be altering, quite irreversibly, man's natural habitat. It is no longer true to say that the effect of mankind's activities on his environment are minimal.

The Canada Water Act was attacked here tonight and earlier during the debate as being insufficient and lacking the power to stop pollution in Canada. I do not think anyone on the government side suggests for a moment that this legislation is an end. We say it is a beginning; it is one step in the national effort to arrest this trend before it is too late.

We are blessed with the largest freshwater supply in the world, and the Canada Water Act expresses Canada's determination to protect that water. The days of unlimited exploitation are over: that is the message of this bill. We are seeing the beginning of a cooperative attack, with the provinces, against pollution and a joint program for comprehensive water resource development based upon the most modern management methods available.

The Canadian Water Act reflects—this was touched upon by the previous speaker—the limitations of confederation under the BNA Act. Some have been critical of the federal government for failing to end pollution a long time ago. We all know the BNA Act gives the provinces jurisdiction over water resources; the federal government's powers have been limited. Despite this fact, previous governments have enacted legislation dealing with water resources, fisheries, pollution of the sea by oil, navigable waters and harbours, protecting waterfowl from oil and other harmful wastes. This is hardly the record of a party not concerned about the problem.

The Boundary Waters Treaty signed in 1909 provided for the establishment of the International Joint Commission, which apportions control of the Great Lakes between the United States and Canada. The commission has recommended action to compel industries and municipalities to treat their waste before dumping it into the lakes and river basins.

A major step foward is to be found in this measure, that of greatly broadening the scope of federal action in conservation and pollution control. This measure can work to the maximum benefit of Canadians only if cooperation is forthcoming from other levels of government. There is no reason to suppose that most of the provinces and municipalities are not thoroughly alarmed about the problem of pollution. Unfortunately, because of the lack of a clear definition of lines of responsibility, pollution has been the pathetic orphan of Canada, shuttled from one jurisdiction to another.

The effort of the federal government at this time should not be condemned but should be encouraged as a step in the right direction. With the full knowledge that a great many people have said much about pollution in recent months, and said it very well—many important things have been said—I suggest that the Canada Water Act and similar measures are vital in the context of worldwide efforts to protect this planet.

Many issues were discussed at the recent session of the United Nations in New York. Almost all the debates were featured by disagreements in respect of different ideologies. This is characteristic of debates at the United Nations and in this Parliament, and there is nothing unhealthy about it. Significantly, on perhaps one of the rare occasions in the history of an international assembly of nations—capitalists, communists, yellow, white, black and brown races—all were thoroughly aware of the threat which hangs over the world. There are few illusions left about the future of mankind unless we protect the environment. The feeling of all nations is that during the generation of which we are a part, planet earth could be converted into a tragic graveyard unless we get together on the problem of pollution.

We may succeed in solving the Middle East crisis and the hundreds of disputes, large and small, which threaten nuclear war; but beyond that lies the very challenge of survival. I should like to quote to members of the House part of a report which was prepared by world scientists and made available through the Secretary General's office at the last session of the United Nations. This is the kind of report which has seriously disturbed not only the United States, Canada and South America, but Soviet Russia, South Africa and all black and white nations throughout the world. In this work entitled "Problems of the Human Environment" the Secretary General—and he is not given to overstatement—said this:

• (8:30 p.m.)

—for the first time in the history of mankind, there is arising a crisis of world-wide proportions involving developed and developing countries alike, the crisis of the human environment.

He continued:

It is becoming apparent that if current trends continue, the future of life on earth could be endangered. It is urgent, therefore, to focus world attention on those problems which threaten humanity in an environment that permits the realization of the highest human aspirations, and on the action necessary to deal with them.

He then said:

The need to provide food, water, minerals, fuel and other necessities for such increasing numbers of people will place pressures upon virtually all areas of the earth and demand the most careful planning and management of natural resources. No nation can any longer be isolated from these global pressures. It has become clear that we all live in one biosphere within which space and resources, though vast, are limited.

Some people may say these are just words and that the Secretary General himself is given to overstatement. But let us not exclude scientific evidence about the possibility of the world running out of oxygen, and the possibility that in 40 years' time we may not be able to breathe. I quote directly from the United Nations report:

Some agricultural chemicals have side effects on the environment that we are now only beginning to comprehend. Thus, the maintenance of both atmospheric oxygen and the productivity of marine environments depends upon photosynthesis by marine plants, mostly the floating algae of microscopic size. Minute amounts of such pesticides as DDT have been found to inhibit photosynthesis in these algae by 75 per cent.

These are the algae which produce the oxygen for the people of the world to breathe. The report continues:

Nevertheless, we have dumped an estimated billion pounds of DDT into our environment and are adding an estimated 100 million pounds per year.

This DDT has found its way into the waters of the earth, some of it from Canadian rivers which drain into the oceans.

The total world production of pesticides is estimated at over 1,300 million pounds annually. The United States of America alone exports over 400 million pounds per year.

Based on the scientific evidence produced by scientists, if anything, the danger to our environment from pollution has been understated. This is relevant to what my friend from Newfoundland said about air pollution. The scientists of the United Nations tabled this evidence during the discussions of the General Assembly at the 23rd session. I read from the report at page 5:

—the reliance of modern technology upon the combustion of fossil fuels has brought a 10 per cent increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide over the past century. With increased rates of combustion, this could rise to 25 per cent by the year 2000 A.D. The consequence of such an increase upon world weather and climate are uncertain, but could eventually be catastrophic.

This report was not prepared by the National Liberal Federation, by the Conservative Party or by any other party; it was produced by the scientists of the world who in the gravest possible terms say that we are in danger of ending life in the biosphere unless we end pollution.

The increased use of modern technology has brought major increases in the amount of waste products which serve as environmental pollutants. It has been stated that in the United States of America alone, this amounts each year to 142 million tons of smoke and noxious fumes, 7 million automobiles, 20 million tons of paper, 48,000 million

cans, 26,000 million bottles and jars, 3,000 million tons of waste rock and mill tailings and 50 trillion gallons of hot water along with a variety of other waste products. Other industrialized nations make their comparable contributions of debris and toxic materials.

I give the undertaking tonight that I will try to obtain copies of this report for members of all parties in the House who wish to have a copy, because this matter goes far beyond party lines. We talk about the deaths in Viet Nam. Today in North America more people are dying from emphysema, caused by air pollution and cigarette smoking, than are killed in Viet Nam each year. Some may say that these scientists are nothing but alarmists. Those who say that have not taken into account the fact that there are dangerous levels of nuclear radiation which, depending upon the type of radioactive material in the radiation will be in the earth's biosphere for the next 1,000 years.

The report I have quoted was tabled in the United States. Representatives of all parties were there and they will know of it. Fifteen of the world's leading scientists, including Canadian and Soviet scientists, produced absolute evidence that nuclear radiation causes carcinogenesis in man, genetic defects and birth defects. These have been among some of the early, clearly identifiable byproducts of the nuclear age. Through the statistics being made available from all over the world we now know that nuclear pollution, let alone everything else, is a terrible threat.

The clean water act, in its own modest way, does not claim to solve these problems. It does not say it will end pollution in Canada. Solving this problem clearly calls for co-operation by municipalities and provincial governments. We cannot be successful unless there is this kind of co-operation. But the clean water act and counterpart measures adopted by other nations of the world—Britain, Soviet Russia and the Scandinavian countries—can do more than just confer national benefits upon the citizens of these countries. Measures such as this are for all mankind. These are measures which may serve to preserve a healthy biosphere for generations to come.

Water from Canada which flows to the sea burdened with pollution and harmful waste containing everything from DDT to human effluent, industrial pollutants and nuclear pollutants, contribute to the death of the earth just as surely as clean water from Canada gives hope for a new and better earth in the future. Pollution control measures in Ontario and British Columbia confer a benefit on those provinces. But beyond that a benefit is conferred upon mankind. A clean water program and a clear air program will cost money, but it is a price we must all pay.

A short time ago 26,000 questionnaires were sent to every home in my constituency. The replies overwhelmingly called for tough pollution control measures. The people are fed up with raw sewage being dumped into the sea, the belching smoke of oil refineries in their back yards and the ominous chemical wastes from industries and homes which in one instance at least killed all plant growth in an area of Burnaby. The growth of algae is killing beautiful lakes in British Columbia.

I think we all realize that as elected members we must establish the basic laws and guidelines under which we want to operate in Canada. We must have the courage to bring in more bills like the clean water bill, as imperfect as they may be.

• (8:40 p.m.)

The tidings we must bear to the people and the industries of Canada are that pollution control will cost money but the end benefits will confer untold blessings on all of us.

Some industries in this country are acting as good corporate citizens; other industries belch forth noxious fumes and dump industrial pollutants into the water, oblivious of the harm they are doing. They are bad corporate citizens and have to be made to clean up or close down. We cannot afford to destroy the environment. Our health is in danger; upper respiratory infections are on the increase from coast to coast. The photochemical reactions which take place are a deadlier killer than war. Incinerators, heating and process furnaces, automobiles, buses and trucks—they are not directly relevant to the bill but I refer to them because they were first touched upon by the preceding speaker—all constitute problems with which we have to cope.

In the short run, some products that we buy may cost more, and more public funds may be required. In saying this, I subscribe to the growing view that the cost of dumping industrial waste in the water should be placed on the people who are responsible for it. Is this unfair? A prominent leader in public life in North America said:

> But this is a proper cost because there are a lot of alternatives to dumping waste in the water ... These alternatives range right up to relocating the plant.

There must be heavy penalties imposed on those who dump waste in natural waterways. Pollution must be traced to its source. We must tax until it costs more to pollute than it does to clean up. Pollution can be controlled at levels consistent with the greatest good of the community. If water quality is lowered by an industry, that industry must pay for the deterioration.

Let us all hope this measure will be but the beginning of a whole range of enactments which, as was said by my friend in the official opposition a few minutes ago, will place Canada in the forefront of those nations determined to protect and to preserve the biosphere of this planet. Beyond the borders of this country there must be international punishment for pollution of the environment. We need international machinery that would be empowered to propose, prepare and execute common, co-operative plans of action.

When the tanker *Manhattan* came into dry dock in New York—and I was there—people were shocked to find gaping holes in the hull. They said, "Isn't that interesting. That ice is really hard". What if the *Manhattan's* tanks had been loaded with oil instead of sea water, and the oil had seeped into our Arctic seas? There has to be punishment for the violation of international principles in respect of pollution control, and these must be established on the international level. The time to do so is now, not some time in the future when a tanker like the *Manhattan* will have ruined the ecology of some sections of our Canadian coast.

As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, we invite the international community to support our initiative for a new concept, an international legal régime designed to ensure to human beings the right to live in a wholesome environment. This is just one step in the government's program to battle pollution in all its forms in the face of difficult constitutional obstacles.

The record of the government has been clear. In essence, we have established a program of support for conservation in its broadest sense—a shift in purely economic thought to include consideration of social capital and profit. That is an enlightened attitude. We have established a program of support for research and development to fight pollution and to emphasize environmental conservation. That is an enlightened attitude. Our aim is the integration of pollution-control planning with regional, river basin and district planning and land, water and air conservation and development, use and management at all regional levels from local to provincial to international and global. This is an enlightened attitude.

This bill is not perfect but it is a step in the right direction and deserves the wholehearted support of all members of this House, regardless of party.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this bill I should like to say that I think it is like a bulldog without any teeth. It pretends to be an effective answer to water pollution, but it will not impress either industry or the provincial authorities. Most important of all, it will not meet adequately the challenge of rapidly accelerating pollution.

It is appalling to me that this government should have hesitated so long before acting, and once having decided to act has produced only this one, anaemic piece of legislation. It will be a tragedy if the bill is passed in its present form because it will lull the public and the executive into lethargy and the belief that an adequate pollution measure has been passed.

Surely, it is not necessary at this stage in our national development to have to demonstrate the need for control of pollution. Surely, even this government is conscious of the urgency of solving this problem. For months now various ministers have been promising quick action to control existing pollution and to prevent future pollution. They trumpeted their determination to wage all-out war on pollution of our land, air and water to whoever would listen. What have they produced? They have produced a bill that attacks only one part of the complex, over-all problem and attacks it half-heartedly. This is merely shadow-boxing. As I described the bill before, it is like a bulldog with rubber teeth, no bite, and not even much of a growl.

The imperative nature of the fight against pollution has been brought home to all of us in recent months in numberless examples of the pollution of every facet of our environment. The previous speaker, the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), documented many of these. Those who read in the recent issue of the *National Geographic* magazine the struggle for the conservation of Lake Baikal in the Soviet Union against the industrialists and their pulp mills, will find that situation duplicated many times on this continent. This problem exists in many countries. The latest, of course, was the discovery

of mercury in remote lakes and streams in Manitoba, an area which up to that time most Canadians thought to be beyond taint.

What has the government done while faced, as it is, with such an urgent challenge? It has produced a bill that utilizes none of the powers at the exclusive disposal of the federal authorities; a bill which, to be effective at all, requires the full consent and co-operation of the provinces. This government has always been very exact and meticulous about its exertion of power and financial assistance in the area of personal health care services. Why are they not so aggressive and positive in meeting a social problem which I believe to be of far greater proportions and of even greater urgency?

As far as I can see, this bill simply provides that certain action may be taken in some restricted areas, and only after agreement is secured from a province to act jointly. Its provisions apply only to a river basin for which a joint federal-provincial water control board has been established. Aside from the fact that the establishment of such a board will be a long and cumbersome process, the bill fails to provide for the essential financing of the work of the board once it has been established. I presume the intent is that the province or the community affected, or both, will be asked to foot the bill. I can well imagine the speed and effectiveness of any action when three levels of government are left to haggle over the bill.

• (8:50 p.m.)

This bill only permits federal action by agreement with the province. There is no provision for the federal authority to act of its own volition. In other words, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in the bill that will permit the federal government to provide the aggressive leadership and set the pattern for comprehensive, anti-pollution action that this critical challenge demands. Above all, the bill fails to stipulate any financial backing for action that might be contemplated under its provisions.

One of the greatest gaps in the bill is its failure to prescribe any standards of water purity or any standards of control and prevention methods. There is no national code; there is no national goal. The ideal of pollution-free waters is not even hinted at in this shockingly defective piece of legislative drafting. Reading the bill leaves me with the distinct impression that the federal government has deliberately shirked its responsibilities to protect Canada's natural resources and environment, and the health and well-being of her people. This bill is a legislative mirage; it appears to tackle the problem but in reality avoids it. The ball has been successfully tossed back into the lap of the provinces.

There is clear authority in the provisions of the British North America Act for federal leadership and action in the area of a national anti-pollution battle. Within its constitutional jurisdiction the federal government controls vast areas of land, water and air, certainly sufficient for a determined federal government to establish anti-pollution procedures, standards of purity, a pattern of public behaviour hostile to pollution, and a clear example to be followed by other governments.

The federal government does not have to wait upon the provinces in starting the fight against pollution. It has more than ample scope to go it alone if necessary. So far it has failed dismally to give a lead or inspire action. It could make a good start by co-ordinating anti-pollution action in all federal jurisdictions, departments, agencies, and under all federal statutes. Pollution is a national problem requiring national leadership and national co-ordination.

The bill permits the federal government to act only in the restricted area of water pollution control and to act alone, free of provincial agreement, only in the very restricted area of inter-jurisdictional waters. This, I presume, means such waters as the Ottawa River, which constitutes a provincial boundary. Even here, stinking as it does under the very noses of Parliament, the Ottawa River has not been tackled by the federal authority. The bill provides only an endless array of federal-provincial commissions, boards and other agencies, each with its own program tailored to the needs of the locality in which it may be situated, and each with its own standards and procedures.

An attempt has been made to give the bulldog the illusion of teeth by providing for a penalty of $5,000 a day for committing the offence of pollution. But where are the standards set out, the violation of which would constitute an offence punishable by a fine of $5,000? What, indeed, is water pollution according to this bill? Under the provisions of the bill it is conceivable that an industry discharging effluent into a body of water common to two or more provinces could be guilty of pollution in one and not guilty in the other. There is no national standard. I

wonder what is the intent behind this suggested fine of $5,000. Is it a deterrent, or is it a punitive measure? Has the accumulation of such fines been designated for financing anti-pollution work, or will the money simply go into the general fund of a province?

I am of the opinion that the bill should be withdrawn and redrafted to give it a national purpose and some hope of being an effective instrument. As it stands, it will do very little in only a small part of a very large, very complex and very urgent problem that affects all Canadians and, indeed, the whole future of the Canadian people.

This bill should be only one of a series of bills designed to wage determined and vigorous war on the pollution of our natural environment. Environmental control is not something that can be divided and sub-divided between elements of our environment and between various governmental jurisdictions. The enemy is one, and must be fought as one by all Canadians.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is the constitutional and moral duty of the government of Canada to prepare, lead and sustain the fight. In my opinion, this bill is hopelessly inadequate. What provisions it has are weak and full of future pitfalls. It is notable chiefly for what it does not contain. Let us kill it and then work together to prepare a proper measure that we will find useful in the coming years.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, we are now studying Bill C-144 entitled: "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."

As far as this bill is concerned, I have in hand a statement made by Mr. Richard Nelson, a well-known citizen of Hull, urging us to look seriously into this problem. At the very beginning of my remarks, I should like to quote his statement to show you that pollution reaches into every corner in Canada, and even right here in the Canadian capital area. That statement appeared in the July 4, 1969 issue of *Le Droit*, and I quote:

> And as if to back up our scientists, two sad or downright tragic pieces of news were reported in the newspapers during the ensuing days: the first one, the poisoning of the Rhine waters over a distance of 150 miles, All aquatic wildlife actually perished because of damage caused by an insecticide. Two countries, Germany and Holland, had to resort to their water reserves because of the potential effects of water pollution on humans. For her part Holland considered the event a national disaster.
>
> The other no less disturbing fact is the pollution of the waters of the Rideau River. For the past week, according to Dr. Nelson, it has been impossible to use the beaches because of slime. Would-be bathers would have come out black with oil. And the worst of it all is that the source of this evil is not known, "at least officially". For the city of Ottawa, this is a major disaster, unthinkable in a region that is not industry-saturated and where lakes and mountains are a mere bicycle ride away. The Ottawa, into which the Rideau flows, is in no better condition. Polluants discharged into it also spoil the waters all the way to Lake St. Louis in Montreal. Where, then, is that pure water our forefathers drank?

Mr. Speaker, I could also add that in this region of Lévis and Quebec City, the St. Lawrence river, where small fishermen used to increase their revenue by fishing, is so polluted, in particular because of oil waste dumped in it by ships, that fishing is no more possible, even at Rivière-du-Loup. Fishermen are therefore obliged to forget about this revenue which allowed them to make ends meet.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, it is true that most governments have fairly well succeeded in their fight against water pollution. The federal government itself can say that it has passed four different pieces of legislation in this respect, namely the Fisheries Act, the Navigable Waters Protection Act, the Canada Shipping Act, and the Criminal Code.

In Newfoundland, the Minister of National Health and Welfare is the prime responsible for the control of water pollution under a section of the health and welfare act.

The Nova Scotia water act has been amended so as to give the government the power to approve the building of water and sewer systems. On the basis of what had been done in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia has created a water administration whose jurisdiction includes all water bodies in the province.

As for Prince Edward Island, no special step has been taken against water pollution.

The Ontario Water Ressources Commission, which is responsible for control and regulation of water pollution by industries and municipalities, must approve all sewer and water installations.

Since its inception in 1957, the Commission has assisted more than 200 municipalities in the construction of sewage treatment plants.

The Provincial Hygiene Control Board, established as far back as 1935, is responsible for the implementation of water anti-pollu-

tion measures in Manitoba. The standards are spelled out in the Water Pollution Prevention Act enacted in 1954.

In Saskatchewan, the ministers of Health and of Natural Resources are responsible for control of water pollution. They must approve the construction of sewage treatment plants and the disposal of industrial wastes.

The Minister of Health in Alberta has the necessary authority to compel municipalities to instal sewage plants.

In British Columbia, under the anti-pollution legislation, a five-member committee was created to approve the discharge of sewage water into the Columbia and Fraser Rivers basins as well as on the East coast of Vancouver Island.

In the province of Quebec, the Quebec Water Board is being reorganized with a view to give it full authority in matters of surface and underground waters. Under the new legislation, municipalities may allow private companies to build and operate sewage treatment plants.

The Quebec Water Technology Association has been studying for several years the various aspects of the water question in the province.

According to the studies which have been conducted, it does not follow that it is compulsory nor even desirable for the federal government to take upon itself the responsibility of the whole water problem but that it should take a strong interest in all the aspects of the problem with regard to the whole country.

In my opinion, the water problem may be divided into three parts:

(A) Supply of municipal and industrial waters.

In this regard, it is recognized that provincial jurisdictions have been adjusted and that they are generally accepted in Canada.

(B) We should consider waste treatment.

It is a relatively new problem the solution of which rests mainly on the collective will to take the necessary action.

The total cost of waste treatment remains essentially the same, whether the means to do so are provided by federal, provincial or municipal governments and private industry.

From this point of view, the federal Government can and must contribute financially to eliminate certain regional disparities and provide the required incentives.

Water as a basic environmental element.

[Mr. Dumont.]

I feel that the quality of the environment must go with the way of life of all Canadians. There may be some different concepts from one province to another. However, a general concept of the minimum requirements is necessary and the federal government can and must play a constructive role in channelling objectives.

With regard to all these aspects of the management of water resources, each government level must take its own responsibilities within the framework of Canada's political institutions, and that in a spirit of co-ordination and co-operation.

Any federal initiative or action liable to interfere with the provincial jurisdictions would have effects contrary to those which are sought. Furthermore, any more by Quebec to refuse federal co-operation would also indicate short-sightedness and regression.

Bill C-144 clearly shows the federal government's intention to establish new administrative methods of water management in co-operation with the Canadian provinces. I fear, however, that the measures suggested go beyond the legislator's intent. From our experience with the evolution of administrative methods with regard to water, we are led to believe that in practice the rigid enforcement of this act may result in the complete control of water by the federal government and in the consequent lapse of the provincial powers.

Besides, the Quebec Water Association, comprising the titular heads of state Health Engineering Services in the U.S., has clearly expressed its disapproval of the American government's intention to replace the states' jurisdictions in the fields of supervision and inspection. Its point of view is shared by most experts in the field of water management and sanitation on the North American continent.

The action taken by the federal government ought, on the one side, to be very energetic in the fields where it holds an individual role and, on the other side, to be complementary only in the fields pertaining by tradition to the provincial jurisdiction.

Therefore, we strongly oppose the establishment of Crown agencies to operate in mixed federal-provincial undertakings in the fields of services operation or water quality management. We cannot see any benefit deriving from direct or indirect participation of the federal government or its representatives in these fields.

Incidentally, we once opposed a project to set up provincial agencies in which the state would have usurped the role of private enterprise, because we of the Ralliement Créditiste are and will always remain in favor of private enterprise in the field of planning as well as implementation.

However, the interest of the provinces is to use all financial and technical assistance the federal government is willing to grant them. In our opinion, initiatives and planning should come from the provinces. On the other hand, the federal government can and must act as—catalyser of opinions in promoting the direction of national objectives and in adopting measures which will create a collective urge towards action and eliminate regional disparity.

For this purpose we suggest that federal government action at first be concentrated on research, information, technology and public education. There must be co-ordination in research and information. Canadians should be made to realize in a rational way the problem of water and environment.

Secondly, minimum standards should be set up concerning quality of water and sewage in cooperation with the provinces. Progress has already been made by proposing Canadian standards. All that remains is to improve these standards and incorporate them into our legislation.

Thirdly, an inventory of our Canadian water resources should be made in cooperation with the provinces because every province is interested in such an inventory, yet without overlooking the overall viewpoint.

Fourthly, mechanisms for federal financial participation should be set up on the basis of long term financial liabilities. In other words, we suggest that a cost study be undertaken for each province and for Canada as a whole. The distribution of costs among levels of government and the mass of consumers should be established on the basis of those estimates and within the framework of a financial program tailored to the estimates. Every effort should be made in order to devise fairer and more reasonable financing methods. At the present time, municipalities and industries are faced with a financing problem which impairs the implementation of the necessary programs. We think the federal government can give without delay the required financial assistance.

Finally, I feel that setting up a Canadian water commission to plan the overall, long term management of water in Canada is a must. We are convinced that the federal government must assume its role in the field of water management. Its presence in that field must generate more co-operation than friction, more efficiency than administrative complications, and stimulate rather than impede present means of action.

Finally, and I feel this is one of the most important points, I suggest that the Bank of Canada should grant low-interest loans to municipalities and cities to enable them to deal with those problems themselves. If low interest rates can help foreign countries, namely developing countries, it seems to me there is all the more reason for the Bank of Canada to be allowed to use them in the case of the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, some Canadian citizens want to help solve the problem of water pollution. They see the problem but, led as men are today by filthy lucre, they will die of poisoning tomorrow, victims of their own cupidity, unless they use the methods we advocate.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale). I mean, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt).

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) and I have occasionally been mistaken for each other, so I can understand Your Honour's temporary confusion in the matter.

Mr. Pelletier: You can't play the trumpet!

Mr. Nesbitt: I appreciate the remark of the minister in that regard. A great many remarks have been made on this bill this afternoon and this evening, and I have no desire to be repetitious. There is one thing on which we are all quite clear. I am quite sure every member of this House, regardless of which side he or she sits on, is very anxious to make sure that not only the water, but the air, soil and other elements in our country are free of pollution as much as possible in years to come.

I do not think there is any disagreement as to the objectives in this matter. The only question is how best to go about achieving them. As has already been indicated by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) and others, it is the feeling of this party that the legislation presented to this

House by the government is quite inadequate to accomplish the objectives and purposes that are intended.

Ordinarily, I do not take time to reply to members who have spoken, but earlier this evening the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) made some of his customary non-political observations. I sincerely feel that some of the observations he made should not be left completely unanswered inasmuch as he referred to the previous Conservative government with which some of us were associated. The hon. member said nothing whatsoever had been done at that time with regard to pollution control. A great many things were done, including granting loans to municipalities for sewage disposal.

There is one matter I feel should be brought to the attention of the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour and other hon. members who were not in the House at the time. I refer to what the government of the day did at the United Nations in connection with worldwide pollution. I believe we were the first government in the world to take steps at the United Nations to control pollution. In the early sixties, as I am sure many here will recall, there was a great fear throughout the world about fall-out from nuclear testing. All of us remember movies like "On the Beach," and the general apprehension throughout the world about what would happen because of the constant testing of bombs by the major powers, the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France. There was great concern about what would happen to nuclear fall-out. People asked: Where does it go? Does it fall uniformly around the world? What will happen to the soil, air, basic foodstuffs and the like? We were very concerned about this problem.

At that time I had the honour of looking after our country's affairs at the United Nations. We put forth a resolution at that time requesting the United Nations to insist that all member nations take samples of soil, water, air and basic foodstuffs for analysis so that the effects would be known throughout the world. There was a great deal of opposition to our resolution. The Soviet Union objected to it. As a matter of fact, even our good friends to the south, the United States, were not very enthusiastic about it. Many other countries were enthusiastic. We received great support after long and prolonged negotiations and we finally succeeded in obtaining unanimous passage of the resolution at the United Nations. I believe this fact should be remembered.

At that time the then Leader of the Opposition, who later became Prime Minister, the Right Hon. L. B. Pearson, was very enthusiastic and supported our project. I think it had the support of all Canadians at that time. I mention that in passing because I do not think it is fair to say that the former Conservative government did nothing with regard to pollution. I think it took a major step at that time.

I now wish to deal with the details of this bill. It is always interesting to look at legislation that is placed before Parliament to see what is really intended to be done. As is often said, Mr. Speaker, you can lose sight of the forest when looking at the individual trees. It is necessary to take a good look at legislation such as this to see what is expected.

This measure was vigorously promoted and received much publicity. Nice green pamphlets were sent out stating what was to be done. The measure received all the publicity available from the government's publicity resources. Naturally, we expected a great deal would be accomplished. There were some misgivings. Many of us found that very little action was proposed. Other of my colleagues have already pointed out many of the shortcomings of the legislation and the reasons we feel the government should withdraw this bill, reconsider it and present to Parliament a bill that has some teeth in it, not one that has all the appearances of a propaganda effort.

One of the implications inherent in this legislation is that in matters of pollution the government does not have jurisdiction, and therefore it has to make agreements with the provinces with regard to water. This is getting into the legalistic aspects of our constitution. I am rather surprised the government would present this point of view. All that is necessary is to look at the Fisheries Act, the Navigable Waters Protection Act and the Canada Shipping Act to see that the government has already assumed complete jurisdiction in all sorts of matters which, from a *de facto* point of view, affect pollution.

In the first session of this Parliament legislation was presented with respect to amendments to the Navigable Waters Protection Act. At that time I had a responsibility on behalf of my party to look after these matters. I remember the highly detailed discussions that went on in committee. I have the committee reports in front of me, but I will

not take up the time of the House to refer to them; they are readily available.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I point out that the federal government has absolute jurisdiction over any kind of navigable water—"navigable", apparently, being defined as anything upon which one can float a canoe—and with respect to any matter affecting those waters. One of the amendments imposed severe penalties upon people putting sawdust and other pollutants into the water. Then again, the Canada Shipping Act provides for the imposition of penalties in respect of those who allow oil to get into the waters.

The excuse used by the law officers has always been that the presence of oil, sawdust, and so on, in the water might affect its navigability.

The Canada Shipping Act covers the ships which carry the oil, so for all effective purposes the federal government has already assumed control with respect to the direct aspects of pollution in all the waters of Canada. This being so, I completely fail to see why the government, in bringing forward this legislation, did not take bold steps to take the lead in presenting strong legislation which would put teeth into the fight against pollution.

If anyone wants to challenge the federal jurisdiction, let them do so in the courts. It may well be that one or two provincial institutions will do so. But let them try it. The federal government should take the lead. It has every right to do so. If there are jurisdictional disputes, let the courts settle them. If any provincial government sees fit to take responsibility for objecting to federal control of pollution, let it do so. The government had a good chance to take a lead, but it has completely missed this splendid opportunity to set an example by leading the attack against pollution. Everybody in Canada wants to see this problem solved.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nesbitt: Members of the opposition are always suspected of looking for the worst possible motives on the part of the government. Their fears are not always justified, but one cannot help coming to the conclusion that this piece of legislation is designed largely for propaganda purposes; that it is intended mainly to escape responsibility in this field, particularly in relation to the cost of pollution control. This, when one gets down to dollars and cents, is what counts. The present government, not only in this legislation but in other measures, has done everything it can to avoid responsibility for paying anything, and to throw the burden on the provinces who simply do not have the financial capacity to bear it.

Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that this is a broad charge and ask whether I can substantiate it. There is legislation on the statute books which provides for payment by the federal government of 37½ per cent of the cost of water conservation projects. This has been of particular importance in provinces such as Ontario. I refer, of course, to the Upper Thames Conservation Authority, the Grand River Conservation Authority and others. These projects have been financed jointly by the federal government and the provincial governments, the federal government paying 37½ per cent, the provincial governments 37½ per cent and the municipalities 25 per cent. Great benefit has resulted from the multi-purpose projects which have been developed for flood control, conservation, recreation and the like. They have been highly successful all over Ontario.

When this legislation passes, the federal government will no longer be obliged to pay 37½ per cent of the cost of these projects. There is nothing to say the federal government could not pay anything; I suppose it could pay something toward this type of project, if it chooses. But there is nothing to insist that it do so. The legislation is silent in this respect. Again, it is a case of sloughing off federal responsibility on to the provinces while trying to gain propaganda kudos without putting the money where the mouth is, as the saying goes.

From time to time the federal government has tried to weasel its way out of paying anything toward these projects. In the past their capital cost was paid in part by Ottawa. When requests were made by Ontario, for instance, for assistance in meeting some of the maintenance costs, the federal government refused on the grounds that such a responsibility was not specifically spelled out. The question was raised as to whether the federal government should pay something toward the capital cost of the land which was acquired for recreational purposes. On this point, the spirit of the legislation as explained by a former minister, my hon. friend from Brandon-Souris, is clear.

It is interesting that Your Honour should have confused that hon. member with myself. My hon. friend, when he was minister, made a statement in the House making it clear that federal participation in these conservation projects covered conservation and recreation. The spirit and intent of the legislation were made clear at that time. Nevertheless, subsequent administrations failed to honour that intention.

Although the conservation authorities have sought to obtain federal moneys to improve parkland and the like, the federal government has on every occasion declined to provide any money on the ground that authority was not specifically given in the act, despite anything the minister may have said or whatever commitment had been made. I blame this entirely on the senior civil servants of the department. One is not supposed to mention these people; they are faceless, sacred cows who should never be criticized. I do not think that is a valid attitude. We have plenty of information to indicate that senior officials of the department are always opposed to any contribution being made by the federal government for recreational purposes, and they have been able to persuade subsequent ministers to adopt this point of view.

The federal government has succeeded in welching and weaseling out of paying its share of these conservation projects. With the advent of this legislation, welching and weaseling will be a little simpler. No argument will be necessary, because it will not be obliged to pay a cent from now on if it does not wish to do so.

For this reason, as well as for others, many of us are entirely opposed to the legislation in its present form. The federal government is anxious to project a good image as a government which is taking the lead in conservation and opposing water pollution. I am sure everybody in the country would support it in taking such a position. But now the legislation is before us it is clear that its main purpose is to gain all the kudos it can from the point of view of public relations, without putting up a nickel—while abdicating most of the financial responsibility it has undertaken in this regard in the past.

The minister is a man for whom I have high regard and with whom I have enjoyed a very pleasant association over the years. I sincerely hope he will give consideration to the suggestions made by members of the opposition; that he will withdraw his bill and incorporate some of our proposals in a new one. We cannot all be wrong, you know! I am sure that should he do so, he would receive a great deal of acclaim and support from all sides of the House, particularly if he would put a few teeth into the legislation he presents.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, it has been rightly and justly said that we get the government that we deserve. It can be rightly and justly said that we are getting the pollution we deserve. We are moving from an affluent society to an effluent society. When we think of the spewing out into our lakes, rivers, soil and air of vast quantities of waste and spent products that pollute and poison our air and water and impair our ability to feed ourselves, is it any wonder that we are moving from an affluent society to an effluent society?

We have been graced this evening with the speech of the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) who put the debate on a very high level. He put the question into the international sphere and spoke well and ably about it. We also heard from the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), who gave some credit to his party for initiating action in the United Nations and set forth some problems with which we may be faced if this legislation passes.

I hope that when the bill goes to committee, or perhaps when the minister closes the debate, he will answer some of the questions put to him by the last speaker, particularly the point about the 37½ per cent contribution in regard to conservation projects, which the hon. member indicated a former minister of the government had said included recreational projects. We are discussing a very important matter and I am sure we could have 264 speakers on the subject of pollution, because pollution affects all the areas that we as members represent. As the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour said, it has international implications of a startling nature.

I have had the good fortune of being a member of the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works. The committee has had before it the estimates and officials of the two departments. I gained the impression that their presentations to the committee and their answers to the question put to them by members were indicative of inaction on the part of the government.

Indeed, they indicated an attempt to study the problem of pollution without bringing forth any real solution.

I also had the privilege of visiting the Inland Water Centre at Burlington with other members of the committee, and I could not help being impressed by the work that that centre is doing. It is up to us as members to translate into effective action some of the projects being developed by the centre. This we must do in legislative form; we cannot just tinker with the problem of pollution.

I have an uneasy feeling that this bill is no more than an administrative framework to deal with the jurisdictional problem that exists in the matter of pollution between the federal government and the provinces. This point worries me in view of the necessity of immediate and direct action. By that I mean a joint, co-operative effort with the provinces and municipalities to study the problem, find solutions and raise money to implement those solutions.

I have read the bill. I have read comments in periodicals in regard to the bill. I feel that I should bring to the attention of the House the comments made by the Minister of Energy and Resources Management for the province of Ontario. In an interview reported in the *Executive* magazine for the month of November, 1969, which we have all received, George MacKinnon put to that minister the effect the new water act would have on the province of Ontario. In order to save time I shall summarize some of the answers given, because I think the views of the Ontario minister responsible for pollution should be known by this House.

In this regard, I hope that when the bill goes to committee representatives of provincial departments will appear and give their views on the operation of the act and its effect on the different provinces, because this is an important aspect of the whole subject.

The bill was presented by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang), who I thought made a rather stiff, sober and sterile introduction of it. We are very happy, indeed fortunate, to have back in this House the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene), because he carries with him a flair for speech. He is the Abe Lincoln of the House and carries with him a vast store of ideas as well, I think, as the determination and initiative to carry those ideas into effect. I hope that when the bill reaches the committee the minister will listen, and listen hard, before making the appropriate changes.

When the Ontario minister was asked about the announcement of the introduction of this legislation by the Minister without Portfolio, he said:

> I think that the idea of federal legislation dealing with water quality across the country is a good one. However, I am disappointed in the way it was presented to Ontario and the way it was presented to other provinces. I think that there has been too great an attempt to impress on the people of Canada that no one has been doing anything about the pollution of water and the treatment of waste ... and now the federal government is coming in and will solve all our problems.

Then he said that the Ontario Water Resources Commission had been in operation for 13 years and had done a very effective job in this particular area. The point was then raised about having so many different federal agencies concerning themselves with water quality, and the minister set forth 17 federal agencies involving at least nine different departments of the federal government. There was the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Transport—which was involved with commercial shipping—and the Department of Public Works which was involved with harbour installations. He said the dumping of waste into our harbours was the responsibility of the federal government. The Department of Fisheries is also involved, as is the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

The minister went on to point out that it is very important that there be only one federal agency dealing with water pollution and water quality control in areas of federal jurisdiction, rather than nine departments and 17 different federal agencies. Then he said:

> This is why I welcome the suggestion that the federal government is finally planning to do something about its role in combatting water pollution.

His next point is well taken:

> The disappointing aspect of the federal government proposals and the way it was made and the comments in the background notes and in their press releases is that they are involved almost directly in areas of provincial jurisdiction. It is important that the federal government not worry about municipalities and not worry about establishing river basin agencies which would control the various watersheds. These are things which, as far as Ontario is concerned, the OWRC and our Conservation Authority Branch are already looking after.

He claims that federal jurisdiction involves—

> —our lakes...our navigable waters...commercial shipping and our harbours have been neglected

and not properly looked after. This is where I would like to see the federal government involved and working in concert with the Ontario government to eliminate pollution. They have their areas of responsibility. Let them do something about it. If there is to be an overall policy on water—

• (9:40 p.m.)

This raises the problem of jurisdiction. The Ontario minister is pointing out that there appears to be an evasion, as far as he is concerned, in respect of Ontario government projects in the municipalities; the federal government has neglected its responsibility. There should be a shift to assuming its responsibility, working in co-operation with provincial governments, to take care of some of the problems of municipalities.

His next point is with regard to the question of uniform standards across Canada. He pointed out that the federal government does not recommend uniform standards across Canada—this, of course, concerns the provinces—and said:

I realize that the same standards should not apply to some small lake or stream in northern Ontario as, for instance, Toronto harbour—this is something for the experts to decide. But if there are too many variables, too many different standards, this will lead to trouble. You will give certain areas of the provinces, because of the nature of their waterways, an advantage over others.

He gives an example as follows:

—in other words industry which is polluting may say, "well, if the waterway that we wanted to establish our plant on in Ontario is class A...we had better look for a class C one...as defined by the Canada Water Act".

This is a problem in not recommending uniform standards across the country, and it is certainly of concern to the minister. The Ontario minister's final point was that there were no incentives given industry by the federal government. He suggested that there should not be any imposition of federal sales tax in respect of pollution equipment. He went further and said there should be no municipal taxes on buildings that house pollution equipment. He stated on behalf of the province of Ontario that he was prepared to recommend this to his government, and hoped the federal government would take another look at the suggestion of lifting the 11 per cent sales tax on pollution equipment and buildings that house such equipment.

Hon. members have seen, from the short analysis I have given of this interview with the Ontario Minister of Energy and Resources

Management, that there are four or five points with which he is very concerned. These include the lack of national federal standards, the lack of incentive and the existence of so many federal agencies with not one federal authority dealing with the problem of pollution. I hope when we get to the committee the minister will consider these problems and solve them to the advantage and benefit of all Canadians.

I suppose at the very basis of the problem is money. The federal government has been very cautious in respect of committing itself to contributing any money toward the implementation of its ideas. The minister should come clean, so to speak, and give us an idea of how much money the government is prepared to spend to meet this problem. I hope the minister will have at the committee meeting a representative of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. It is very commendable that we advance moneys to municipalities for sewage treatment and disposal plants. In September and October of this year there was a directive to CMHC not to accept any more loan applications for sewage treatment plants.

I should like the Minister without Portfolio to assure us that if we are really going to deal with this problem and battle and solve pollution, he will guarantee so many million dollars to municipalities for sewage treatment projects. Therein may lie the key to the solution of this problem. So much for the attitude of the minister of Ontario regarding this bill.

May I now direct the attention of the House to the attitude of the Canadian Wildlife Federation. This short statement was made by Mr. R. C. Passmore on November 21, 1969, after this bill was introduced in the House:

Although the Act seemingly bristles with defences against water pollution it actually nips only cautiously at the periphery of the problem.

Then he set forth some of the salient features of the Act in this way:

It would allow the minister of Energy, Mines and Resources to enter into arrangements with the provinces and form joint committees which would consult on water resource problems, develop programs and co-ordinate their implementation.

It would allow establishment of regional federal-provincial boards wherever there is a "significant national interest" in water resources; collect information on their quality, distribution, and use; conduct research and undertake programs designed to conserve and develop water resources.

It would allow establishment of joint federal-provincial water quality management agencies in regions or water basins where water quality

management has become a matter of urgent national concern. The agencies would design, build, and operate sewage treatment plants; conduct continuing surveys of water quality and potential sources of pollution; and set water quality standards for the area.

It would make water pollution an offence for which a polluter could be fined up to $5,000 for each day that the release of polluting substances occurred, but only within an established water quality management area.

This is his approach to this measure:

All of which adds up to a piecemeal geographic approach to solving what is now a full-scale national emergency. Is this another case of pussyfooting through the jurisdictional maze of our "co-operative federalism"? Surely, the magnitude of the problem requires bolder action.

He then indicates that Canadians would welcome more meaningful participation by the federal government. He points out that there are insufficient resources available to provincial governments with which to make full use of any program to solve the problems of pollution. He states:

People everywhere would welcome comprehensive multipurpose water resource management. But the need is everywhere, not just where "there is a significant national interest"—

He then states:

—success will depend on massive inputs of capital through loans, grants and shared-cost programs. But the Canada Water Act in its present form, is extremely cautious about committing the federal treasury.

He ends by saying:

Unless the Canada Water Act can be given a stiffer backbone, Canadians will still be looking for ways to curb pollution.

He suggested that we are entitled to the human right of a clean, healthy environment and that this right should be part of Canada's Bill of Rights, thus giving any Canadian legal backing in his search for a high quality, unpolluted life. I hope the chairman of the committee will invite a representative of the Canadian Wildlife Federation to set forth its ideas in respect of this problem.

I am going to become very parochial and discuss the Toronto scene. In Toronto we have two main rivers, the Don and the Humber. In metropolitan Toronto we also have the Credit River. The industrial and human waste that flows down these rivers is a disgrace to the fair city of Toronto. The beaches along the lakefront are unusable. There is no swimming in the summer. This fall, ducks died as a result of the pollutants in the water. The commission was not able to prove this, but the evidence did not indicate that they did not die from the drug called diacid.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The air in Toronto is polluted by the emission of waste from the factories and industrial centres. At times this makes Toronto a very unpleasant place in which to live. In fact the people in my constituency have had to put up with pollution from the Consumers Gas Company for many years. They have had to put up with having a glue factory, and the emission of ash from a project which produces electricity in the west end of Toronto. These are three ways in which the people of my riding have suffered.

I recall that when we had the minister and officials before us in the committee, the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Deakon) spoke strongly and urgently about the government taking action concerning the pollution which prevailed in the south end of his riding. I recall the former mayor of Toronto, the member for York West (Mr. Givens), speaking in his usual flamboyant and eloquent way about the pollution problems in Toronto. I would think the former mayor would get up and tell us just what he thinks of this bill and the remedies he thinks should be taken.

Just the other day we heard the news that the Ontario Water Resources Commission had laid a charge against Gulf Oil of Canada for having polluted the water of Lake Ontario as a result of its operations at the lakeside. I would think the hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell) would get up and tell us what he believes the government should do with regard to this pollution caused by Gulf Oil on Lake Ontario, because there in that area are many other oil companies. The people in the area have the right to have their member ask whether this bill will be an effective instrument to control pollution.

I do not like to continue being colloquial and speaking of the problems in my constituency and the city of Toronto, because the problem of pollution embraces the Great Lakes of Ontario. The Great Lakes probably represent the largest natural water resource in the world. This area is quickly becoming polluted to the point that a crisis is occurring. In 1964 the International Joint Commission, composed of three Canadian and three United States representatives, studied pollution in the Great Lakes. That commission has been very active because some people have said that Lake Erie is now a dead lake and that Lake Ontario is quickly becoming the same. It

has also been stated that Lake Superior, Lake Michigan and Lake St. Clair are in danger of becoming much like Lake Erie.

It behooves us to take immediate action in this House. Just recently I saw an article entitled "Lake Ontario Program" which appeared in a periodical I obtained. I believe it is interesting and indicates how much Lake Ontario is polluted. It states:

> To preserve the usefulness of Lake Ontario and other waters in an 18,000-square-mile area of upper New York State is the objective of a program now being conducted by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

That is in the United States. It continues:

> The threat comes from municipalities and industries—mainly pulp and paper mills, food processing plants, and chemical plants. While requiring enormous amounts of water, these industries at the same time are discharging wastes which in quantity and complexity inevitably damage water quality and make further use of the waterways difficult if not impossible.
>
> More than 40 pulp and paper mills are operating on tributaries to Lake Ontario. The food processing plants—more than 240 in number—freeze, can, grind, package or otherwise process meat, dairy products, fruit, vegetables, beet-sugar, and wines. Chemicals and allied products are manufactured in about 20 large plants, mainly in the Lockport, Syracuse, and Rochester areas.
>
> Few of the pulp and paper mills treat any of their process wastes. The discharged material is extremely demanding on the oxygen resources of a stream. Deposits of one to two feet of fibrous pulp material, to cite one example, have been found as far as two miles downstream from some of the mills on the Black River.

He points out that wastes from chemical plants are toxic to fish. This indicates the enormity of the problem with regard to Lake Ontario. This is a report by a federal commission of the United States. I am sure we could indict ourselves with regard to the pollutants from factories and the human waste which enter Lake Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to continue tomorrow morning. May I call it ten o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CRIMINAL CODE—PROCLAMATION OF REMAINDER OF AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BREATHALYZER

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, on November 19 of last year the

[Mr. Gilbert.]

government proclaimed a portion of the omnibus Criminal Code amendment dealing with the breathalyzer provisions, but it adopted the curious course of specifically omitting in the proclamation one subparagraph, one clause and one paragraph of the breathalyzer provisions. The government omitted in each instance a portion which dealt with the right of an accused to receive, in an approved container, a sample of the breath that had put him behind jail bars.

My curiosity was aroused when I found this out, for several reasons. The first was that in the debate and the disputation which led up to this provision being put into the Criminal Code, many lawyers had a doubt about the breathalyzer clause because, after all, people were being asked to incriminate themselves out of their own mouths. However, the Members of the Bar felt the sting of their criticism blunted because there were these three safeguards in respect of the breathalyzer test. It puzzled me that the government should take this step, flying in the face of the Bar. I was puzzled because I had never heard of a proclamation in this form.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I note that it has been accepted over the years that certain sections of acts can be proclaimed, and indeed have been proclaimed, without the whole body of the act being proclaimed at one time. But I have never heard of a package within an act being proclaimed and little snippets and pieces of that package being cut out and held-up until a future proclamation.

My understanding that this was a very unusual course was reinforced when I spoke to two members of the class of 1940 in the House, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). In their vast parliamentary experience—and nobody is their equal in that regard—they could not recall such a course being adopted. So I think it is a very fitting and proper subject to be raised. If my research leads me further into it, and I think it is serious enough, I suppose a motion will have to be presented to the House so that we can in some way obtain the opinion of the House on the unusual course taken by the government. What particularly hurts about this action is that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), a man sworn to uphold the laws of Canada, should adopt a wholly new approach

by selecting the method of proclamation that he did.

There was a third member of the class of 1940 with whom I might have checked when I was trying to find out if this procedure had ever been used before, and that is the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith). But I suggest that he is an accessory to this rather dastardly crime, and so I did not go hunting for advice in that direction. Besides, sometimes he can be a very persuasive fellow and he probably would have overwhelmed me with a lot of words which would add up to nothing but which might have kept me off the case.

There are three sections that are withheld from the proclamation of November 19. Section 224A (1) (c) (i) reads:

> at the time the sample was taken, the person taking the sample offered to provide to the accused a specimen of the breath of the accused in an approved container for his own use, and, at the request of the accused made at that time, such a specimen was thereupon provided to him.

I think this is a pretty substantial right which the government has seen fit not to give an accused person. The second part that was held up concerns a qualified technician taking a sample of the breath. It contains wording which is similar to that which I have just read, and is again a substantial right.

The third one is in subclause 6(b), which is the definition of the approved container and reads as follows:

> "approved container" means a container of a kind designed to receive a sample of the breath of a person for chemical analysis and that is approved as suitable for the purposes of this section by order of the Attorney General of Canada.

I suppose the whole difficulty was that they have not yet, and never could, come up with an approved container. But because this is such a substantial part of the right that is given to an accused within this part of the amendments to the Criminal Code, I suggest there has been a very serious breach of what we regard as the practices of this House in dealing with legislation.

I do not think anyone in this chamber, at the time we gave the government the right in the last paragraph of that omnibus bill to proclaim certain provisions, ever thought that little bits and pieces would be hacked out of one part of the Criminal Code. I suggest that no matter what the expression of the will of the House of Commons is as we set it forth here—and the only way we can express our opinion is by putting it down in writing—our will is not what we say but what we put down, as best we can in words, in legislation. No matter what our will is, if the government can use the proclamation approach to proclaim certain parts of the act and leave out others and perhaps never proclaim them, it means that the government itself and not Parliament has the say in what legislation comes out of the two Houses of Parliament.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, before getting into the substance of the matter I might say to the hon. gentleman that in consulting the class of 1940 representatives on the question of drinking he might have introduced a little more balance than just consulting the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) on this question.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He wanted a sober opinion.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will not say that necessarily my colleague the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) would have provided an equal balance on the other side, but I am sure he would have had a viewpoint on this question.

In the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) who, I regret to say, had a previous engagement this evening, and the illness of the parliamentary secretary, I have been asked to exhale a few remarks on the subject raised by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave). The hon. member said that he had thought, when the law passed, that this part of it would be proclaimed. But I am advised with reference to section 224A, subsection (6)(b), which deals with the approved container in which to provide the accused with a sample of his breath, that it was dealt with at length by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs on March 18, 1969. The Attorney General at that time indicated to the Justice Committee that evidence given to a previous standing committee dealing with Bill C-195, that is, that a suitable container was available, was in fact inaccurate.

The Attorney General explained to the committee that at the time of their considering Bill C-150 no suitable container had been developed and that in fact the Canadian Forensic Society, which was working on a suitable prototype, did not expect to have a container ready for production until later this year. In view of this, the Attorney General

undertook to the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee that he would not proclaim the section dealing with an approved container until such a device was available for distribution and use at a reasonable cost.

The Minister of Justice has kept that undertaking, and it is the view of the law officers of the Crown that the legislation in question affords enough protection to an accused as it now stands, through strict control over the type of breathalyzer machine which may be authorized. It is still open to an accused person, if he so wishes, to request a urine or blood sample in addition to being required to take a breathalyzer test. This, of course, would be a voluntary act on his part and would be dependent upon the appropriate facilities being available to accommodate such evidence. For that reason I would demur to the comments of the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants as to the propriety of this procedure, since it was predicted before the bill was carried into law, but I shall be glad to convey his remarks to my colleague, the Minister of Justice.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS—CHARGES RESPECTING OPERATIONS OF COUNCIL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on December 3 of last year, as recorded at page 1548 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs:

> In view of the serious charges by members of the Canadian Consumers Council that the council has spent a year in almost total idleness, is torn by bitter internal dissension and is gagged by the chairman, will the minister investigate these charges and inform the House of his findings?

The minister replied that he had written the members of the council and asked each of them for their views on the role and structure of the council, and said he intended to discuss these views with them when he got them. I thought it was rather frivolous when he said:

> I have read the report to which the hon. member refers and from reading the report all I can say is that one can only have some sympathy for the chairman in view of the divergent views which were expressed.

I thought it not only frivolous but a mild way of putting it, because one member of the council had told the press:

> The public didn't know what we were doing, which was nothing. But they should have been told we are doing nothing.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Another, a former president of the CAC, said:

> The council is certainly not effective at the moment. After a year of fruitless meetings next to nothing has been accomplished.

The chairman, referring to the minister's original request that the council produce a charter of consumer rights, said:

> We have got no tangible results on this so far.

Another member, referring to the minister's request that the council look into ways to help the low income consumer, said that "nothing meaningful" had been done about this.

In view of all this, I asked the minister, as a supplementary question, whether he would now consider appointing to the council representatives of low-income consumers. He dodged that question and said he was going to weigh the views of the council members as to whether there should be a change in the role and structure of the council. Later I asked, through a motion for the production of papers, for the full correspondence on the matter between the minister and the council members. Yesterday, January 14, the minister refused my request saying that this correspondence was "of a confidential nature and therefore it would not be in the public interest to release it."

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that last year the taxpayers of Canada paid $100,000 for the operations of the Consumer Council of Canada, I do not think council could be considered the private property of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford), nor even of the government. Also, in view of the opinions which council members gave to the press, it seems to me eminently reasonable that there should be an investigation into what has been going on in the council and that the elected representatives of the taxpayers, the members of this House, should have access to the full text of the correspondence between the minister and members of the Consumer Council.

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the hon. member. I should point out that when a decision was taken to appoint a council with members drawn from various economic sectors, consumers, manufacturers, the advertising industry, labour and the universities, it was

expected that there would be vigorous discussions and differences of viewpoint. The task of the chairman could not have been easy, and we are grateful to him for the leadership he has given in the council.

As the minister indicated last month in answer to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), he is engaged in a review of the role and structure of the council. This review has not yet been completed, but the results will be announced when it is. I will, of course, draw the minister's attention to the remarks made in this debate.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, January 16, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Fifth report of Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, in French and in English—Mr. Clermont.

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

SUSPENSION OF INCREASE BY EATON'S AND SIMPSON'S IN CHARGE ACCOUNT INTEREST RATES

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, members will have noticed a news item in the press yesterday to the effect that two major retail establishments in Canada were planning increases in their interest charges on certain charge accounts. I wish to inform the House that I have been in touch with the two companies and that each has agreed to suspend its decision in this matter until March, pending the outcome of the Prices and Incomes Commission's current discussions with the business and professional community aimed at limiting price increases. I wish to express the government's appreciation of the co-operative response of these two companies.

[*Translation*]

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

TABLING OF WHITE PAPER ON CONVERSION TO METRIC SYSTEM

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, before tabling it, I would like to comment on the white paper entitled "Proposal for Metric Conversion in Canada". In this paper the government sets out its proposed general policy for conversion to the metric system of measurement from the traditional inch-pound system. To quote from the white paper:

> The government believes that adoption of the metric system is ultimately inevitable—and desirable—for Canada. We also consider it appropriate for the government to assume a leading role in the planning for and in the implementation of this change.

This matter is of direct concern to all Canadians, to our industry and to all levels of government.

Today in Canada, although the metric system and units such as metres and grams are being used in many important sectors, it is the inch-pound system which predominates. In the world at large, however, the great majority of countries have already adopted the metric system or are now in the process of converting to it.

The white paper addresses itself to the importance of timing in connection with metric conversion in Canada and to the complexities involved. For example, in a modern industrial country such as ours, there will be costs associated with a move to the metric system. These costs will be offset by benefits which are expected to accrue from metrication. They will also be reduced to the extent that the change takes place over a reasonable period of time in relation to the real needs in the various sectors of activity in Canada. We must be aware of the possibility of incurring even greater costs if we do not start to plan now for the ultimate adoption of the metric system.

[*English*]

Metric units today form the accepted basis for international measurement and standardization. A country employing the metric system is, therefore, in a favourable position in an increasingly interdependent world economy. The countries of the European Common Market are long established users of the metric system. Both Britain and Japan, two of Canada's leading trading partners, have already embarked on a changeover. The United States, our principal customer, is now conducting an extensive study of this subject.

As a matter of fact, just four countries—Canada, United States, Australia and New

Zealand—are still using the inch-pound system at this time. Canada's ability to maintain and expand its vital export trade with countries in the metric sphere will directly benefit from the move we have decided to make.

Changing to the metric system will have important benefits for the Canadian consumer. These benefits will derive principally from the inherent simplicity of the system and its convenience in general use. The ease in converting from one metric unit to another —from kilograms to grams, for example,—will simplify the arithmetic in making value comparisons of competitive consumer products.

• (11:10 a.m.)

For these reasons and many others which are indicated in the white paper, as I have remarked earlier, the government believes that the adoption of the metric system is ultimately inevitable and desirable for Canada. However, no legislative action is contemplated which would make mandatory a general use of metric in place of inch-pound units.

The white paper outlines what is the start of a long process on the road to metrication. It proposes certain organizational arrangements to plan for and encourage conversion. For example, the government intends to appoint a preparatory commission which will act at the federal level to co-ordinate the study and planning. A mandate will also be given to the proposed standards council of Canada—a bill on this subject is now before the House—so that it may fill a similar role in the more limited area of its responsibilities, that is, the industrial sector and physical standards. Planning and preparation will be encouraged so as to obtain the maximum benefits at the minimum cost to the consumer, to industry and to government at all levels.

Our intention is to study and consult extensively and so to determine what is the best process for this transition. It will be necessary, for example, to decide on the timing of changes appropriate to each individual sector of the economy. In issuing this white paper the government is inviting comments from all interested parties. We hope to obtain the widest possible involvement and co-operation of the community as a whole. Participation of other levels of government, of industry, and of the public at large in this effort will be welcomed and will be of the greatest importance in the attainment of the ultimate objectives for Canada in this area of measurement and standards.

[Mr. Pepin.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to table, in both official languages, under Standing Order 41(2), copies of a white paper entitled "Proposal for Metric Conversion in Canada".

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am appreciative of the courtesy of the minister in providing this statement to members of the opposition early enough so that, with their natural ability, they can become instant experts and make a reasonable reply. I say quite seriously that these statements on motions should really be commented on with light rather than with heat, and to receive a document in ample time to make an adequate reply is much better than receiving it, as we sometimes do, just five minutes before the time for making a response.

In keeping with the objective of non-partisanship I might properly say that we on this side feel very much as the minister does. I think I am entitled to get in a little commercial for the hon. member for Malpeque who has tabled a private member's bill calling for a metric system inquiry commission. I thought I might be entitled to say that at this time, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say at once that we will co-operate in our approach to the suggestions contained in the statement by the minister. There is no question at all that there is a movement in the world toward the adoption of the metric system, or the international system as it is more correctly defined. This is part of a whole movement toward international co-operation and I think we would be foolish if we did not recognize this and attempt to do something about it. I think it is correct to say, in the same spirit of non-partisanship, that the previous government under the leadership of the Right Hon. member for Prince Albert did undertake certain studies in this regard.

There have been a number of problems associated with this matter and I will deal with them very briefly. While there is no question that the jurisdiction lies with the federal government, I think we have to bring the provinces in from time to time because of the educational and other situations which will exist if we are ultimately going to change over to the metric system. Those of us who remember our school days when we were exposed to the metric system only to abandon it when we left school will realize how important it is that the educational systems of the

provinces be adapted to keep pace with what this government and the governments of the world are doing.

There is a division in the countries of the world today. By far the greatest number of countries have adopted the metric system, but we cannot forget, of course, that the countries which have retained the inch-pound system have by far a preponderance of the world's trade. We should think particularly of our trading relations with the United States, which of course is and has for some years been examining its position with regard to adoption of the metric system. Whether we like it or not, what we do must to a considerable extent is keep pace with what is being done in the United States. I think it might well be suicidal for us to adopt the metric system without considering what is being done in the United States. It is in connection with the dangers and difficulties with relation to trade that the greatest problems will be generated. In the world of pure science and academic research I think we can say that the metric system has largely been adopted and has world-wide ramifications now.

I agree that there must be a continuous and detailed study. We are prepared to co-operate with the government in this regard. Shortly after 1951, when the matter first came up for discussion in the United Kingdom, there was a considerable amount of examination and later the minister of technology submitted the whole question to a standing committee. I recognize that a committee of the House might not be best equipped from a technical standpoint to make a decision, but from the viewpoint of keeping the public abreast of what is going on I would strongly urge the minister to give some thought to having the white paper he tabled today submitted either to a special or to a joint committee so that there might be a continuous study and reports from time to time to this committee by the boards the minister proposes to set up.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for Peace River I should like to thank the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce for having given us an advance copy of the white paper which he has now tabled and the statement he has just made to the House. Also like the hon. member for Peace River, I might indulge in a brief commercial by drawing the attention of the House to the fact that Bill C-42 on the Order Paper in the name of my colleague from Timiskaming calls for the introduction of the metric system. If my friends on our left have a similar bill, that will make it unanimous.

Speaking of the minister's courtesy in letting us have a copy of the paper and of his statement in advance, I think everyone knows that when this courtesy is extended to us it is usually extended to our friends of the Press Gallery as well. When I sat at the coffee table with some of our friends at ten o'clock this morning I found they were already applying their special talents and their superior intellect to some of the problems which would arise if we switched from the inch-pound system to the metric system. I did not understand all the things they were talking about.

An hon. Member: Neither did they.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Maybe not. One of them told me that when we switch to the new system a perfect figure, instead of being 36-24-36, would be 90-60-90. I gather some hon. members know what that means. In my own way of figuring things I thought about my friend the hon. member for York West and the hon. member for Edmonton Centre who, once this system comes into effect, will no longer have to give their weight in astronomical figures but will be down to 150 or even less, and some of us, of course, may disappear altogether.

• (11:20 a.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: When we ski in Europe we will know what the measurements mean.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I assure hon. members that even if I am a ghost I intend to stay here.

Mr. Baldwin: As long as you do not get too holy.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am trying to inch into this subject, Mr. Speaker, but I seem to be having difficulty.

Speaking seriously, however, as one of my colleagues at the press coffee table said this morning, whatever system we use the dimensions of the government's failure will be extreme. I think it is generally agreed that this is the kind of step Canada will have to take, and we agree with the statement made by the minister, both in the white paper and in his words to the House, that the decision is not one that can any longer be postponed.

It is quite true that there will be difficulties. Great expense will be involved and, as the hon. member for Peace River said, the change will reach right down to our educational system. Our children and grandchildren and those who come after them will have to spend not just a day or two on the metric system but will have to learn it all the way through. But even though there are difficulties connected with such a change, it is obvious that the advantages outweigh the difficulties and the cost and that we should move in this direction. Therefore it is good that some planning for it is being done.

As has already been said, very few countries in the world are on the inch-pound system, but it does happen that one of them is the giant alongside us, the United States of America. We in this party frequently suggest that we should not be influenced in certain matters by what they do in that country, but I think that in this matter we and our American friends will have to act together. I hope that the kind of public action being taken in Canada will be viewed by them as a lead and a suggestion to them that they should step up their studies and activities in this field as well.

We welcome the fact that, as the minister has said, there will be liaison with the provinces because they will be involved not only in the changes generally but with their particular effect on education. All told, we shall be glad to co-operate with the government in hastening the day when this change can be made with as little confusion as possible.

While we are making this kind of change, perhaps we might also do something about our cold temperatures. We might shift over from fahrenheit to centigrade. Some thought might also be given to a simplified world calendar that would make many of our computations much more comprehensible.

In general terms we thank the minister for giving us the information in advance, and we shall be happy to do what we can in connection with the work that needs to be done in preparation for a change to the metric system.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to repeat the comments of the previous speakers concerning the new policy of the federal government in connection with the metric system, but I would like in my turn to thank the minister who was kind enough to send us in good time copies of the white paper on the conversion to the metric system, in order to enable us to study it in both languages, had any of us wished to do so.

The advantages of the metric system are known throughout the world. On account of its coherence and other recognized advantages, as, for example, its accuracy, the metric system is the only valid system for the measurement of values based on decimals.

As this system is the most exact there is and as it is becoming more and more widespread, I believe that, as it is proposed today, Canada should adopt it.

In North America, according to the white paper, the commercial gallon has two different values. The same difficulty arises in a number of other fields. The United Kingdom has recently adopted the metric system. Most countries of the world use it.

As a matter of fact, only four countries, as it is said in the white paper, have not yet officially adopted this system but are considering doing so in the near future.

The conversion to the metric system would bring problems. The government will have to act very carefully in this respect, because we could not adopt this system at a moment's notice. Yet, the government proposes to us this morning the creation of a commission with a view to preparing the Canadian economy to this conversion so that the transition will be so smooth as can be.

On page 8 of the report are indicated the disadvantages that would result from converting to this system too rapidly. It is also mentioned that this system should not be introduced without the provinces being consulted, and more especially the industrialists, for they will be the most affected by this change.

Here is an excerpt from page 8 and I quote:

—that it is not essential that conversion should proceed equally and evenly in all sectors.

—To do so permits each sector of industry to assess the problems of conversion and consider practical solutions, including timing, without the inhibitions which compulsory immediate changes in physical standards would involve. Metric conversion may be conceived as a variety of programmes extending over periods of years as determined by the needs and problems in different sectors of the economy.

If the government wants to adopt the metric system by complying with these recommendations, we fully agree since it would permit all the sectors of the economy to adapt to the new situation and to carry out

the conversion process as soon as possible which is as necessary to Canada as to the other countries.

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

TABLING OF SPECIAL REPORT ON PRICES OF TRACTORS AND COMBINES

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table copies in each of the official languages of a "Special Report on Prices of Tractors and Combines in Canada and Other Countries." This is a report of the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery. The importance and thoroughness of this report and its implications for Canadian farmers are recognized by the government, and it is the intention of the government to consider the report and its recommendations most carefully.

Since the report covers matters that are the concern of or fall within the jurisdiction of several departments, an interdepartmental working group has been formed, the function of which will be to make recommendations to the government. Already this group has initiated discussions with officials in the United States and Britain. It should be noted that this special report covers only one phase of the commission's investigations and that the final report will be available in late summer.

In the meantime the government would welcome the views of organizations, firms or individuals in respect of this important matter.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal with the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture to the House this morning because I think it reveals to the House and to the country as a whole the actual capability of the government in dealing with this major problem.

Some years ago it became apparent to those in the agricultural industry as a whole that they were in difficulty in trying to make an economic living, and since the government was little disposed to increase the prices that farmers could receive for their produce the emphasis of farm groups was placed on in-put costs, the major proportion of which, other than that of land, lay in the realm of farm machinery.

• (11:30 a.m.)

As long as four years ago the agricultural industry in Canada found there was a great deal of difference between what Canadian farmers had to pay for their equipment compared with what farmers in other nations had to pay. As a matter of fact, farm groups in this country took the initiative and found that it was possible to procure farm machinery in Great Britain at a much lower cost than in Canada. As a result, representations were made to this government to such a degree that the government appointed a commission to study the cost of farm machinery in other countries.

This morning the minister has tabled a special report, and he indicates it should be noted that it only covers one phase of the commission's investigation. Without having seen the report, Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to believe that it is perhaps an edited or elaborated version of what was presented to the agricultural congress almost 12 months ago. Now we have it presented to Parliament.

It is an interim report, Mr. Speaker, and the government says it is going to take it under consideration. But before it does so it is going to set up another committee to study the report's ramifications in respect of various departments and this committee is to make a report to the government. This is just further procrastination and it shows, to my mind, that the government has no initiative, no aggressiveness and very little appreciation of the problem facing the agricultural industry today.

The real attitude of the government was amply portrayed by the minister in his statement. This commission was set up on the basis of representations made to the government by the agricultural industry of Canada, but his last words were that "in the meantime the government would welcome the views of organizations, firms or individuals in respect of this important matter." Mr. Speaker, in four years all this government has done is go round in a full circle.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, while we were supplied with a copy of the minister's statement, for which we thank him, we would have also appreciated a copy of the press summary supplied to the news media.

It has been so long since the Barber Commission held its first hearings that farmers were beginning to wonder whether a report would ever be filed. Since farm machinery capital and repair costs represent such a proportionally large percentage of total farm expenses, great interest will be aroused by the filing of this report. Farmers have long felt that Canadian farm machinery prices

are exorbitantly high. Ontario farmers have proved this by importing British-made tractors at a considerable saving. If the Barber report suggests action under the Combines Investigation Act, we trust the government will act promptly in this regard. Because of the awkward financial situation of farmers in western Canada, we are very concerned whether there are going to be any farmers left to offer service to or any dealers left to offer it, since the companies have and are withdrawing service from many points.

The minister mentioned the forming of an interdepartmental committee to deal with the report and make recommendations to the government. We trust that somewhere in the process an opportunity will be provided to farmers and other interested groups to make recommendations to the government, because the farmers want and need action now, not ten years from now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture advised us this morning that pious wishes would be expressed once again by a Royal Commission on the prices of tractors and combines.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind you that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. Since the final report will not be available before the end of the summer, companies selling their products at exorbitant prices will continue to exploit the Canadian people. Needless to say that manufacturers of farm implements—who contribute to election funds—will welcome this two-and-a-half-year postponement granted them by this government—who was to bring about a just society—for they will be able to keep on exploiting the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, Canadians want action. They are fed up with royal commissions. Reports slumber in desk drawers under a two-inch coat of dust. To give an example, last spring we met with representatives of all the farmers' organizations of western and eastern Canada, and we have still received no reports because the briefs submitted at the meetings were detrimental to the reputation of the government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we hope the investigations will not end up with just reams and reams of reports, but rather by the adoption of energetic measures to prevent man from exploiting his fellow men.

[Mr. Thomson.]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO CHANGE NAME OF CONSTITUENCY

Mr. Robert-B. Major (Argenteuil) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-178 intituled "An Act respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act".

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Major: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to change the name of the riding of Argenteuil into that of Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes, in order to avoid confusion between the provincial county of Argenteuil and the federal electoral district of the same name, and also to pay a tribute to the Iroquois people after which the area was named hundreds of years ago.

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

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

GRAIN

FINAL PAYMENTS FOR 1968-69 CROP YEAR

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. When will the minister be in a position to announce the final payment for the 1968-69 crop year for wheat, oats and barley?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I do not at the moment have a specific date for the announcement. The hon. member knows the pattern of the past and it may well be that the timing will be about the same as in past years.

Mr. Ritchie: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government any other plans to assist cash-short farmers in the event that there is no final payment for this crop year?

Mr. Lang: That, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of policy for consideration by the government, and any such decision will be announced at the appropriate time.

Mr. Baldwin: Do not hold your breath.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

When the minister is able to report on this point and announce the final payment, if any, would he consider advising the House what additional costs there were to the Canadian Wheat Board for that crop year for the drying, extra shipping charges and handling costs of tough and damp grain?

Mr. Lang: I shall be glad to look into the question of whether that particular statistic can be isolated, Mr. Speaker, in the course of the Wheat Board's operations. It may well appear in the Wheat Board's annual report, or earlier if possible.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): In view of the fact that barley is being traded on the export market at approximately 20 cents below the domestic price, has the government in fact established a two-price system for barley?

UTILIZATION OF LAKEHEAD TERMINAL SPACE

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell the House if a special agreement has been made between the grain handlers union and the Wheat Board to trickle grain into Lakehead storage facilities, thus cutting down lay-offs of grain handlers between now and the spring shipping season?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, as I said to the House on an earlier occasion, the arrangement which has been arrived at for moving grain from the prairies to the Lakehead is one which, to my mind, is the most effective and efficient way of taking the grain there and ensures that the handling system is in the best possible shape to handle the very large amounts of grain which will have to be handled after the opening of navigation. The plan was arrived at without discussion with the grain handlers at the Lakehead, but in subsequent developments of the plan members representing the union were in discussion with us and we were able to explain to them the objective which we had in mind in dealing with the scheme alluded to.

PROPOSED FARMER SUPPORTED SALES AGENCY PLAN

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Now that the Canada Grains Council has considered the proposed farmer supported sales agency plan and given its approval to it, can the minister indicate when this excellent idea will be implemented, under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, there are, I know, very good ideas being developed within the Canada Grains Council and we are in constant touch with them about these ideas. Of course, the implementation of any specific ideas and the work that has to be done by the government in preparing to meet any of these proposals may be complex matters, and any decisions of this sort are matters to be announced by the government in due course.

Mr. Baldwin: The minister loves the phrase, "in due course".

APPOINTMENT OF LAKEHEAD MOVEMENT CO-ORDINATOR

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's statement a few days ago to the effect that a grain handling co-ordinator will be appointed for the Thunder Bay region, when will he be making an appropriate announcement to the House?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): When I am ready to make it, Mr. Speaker.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's explanation in such optimistic terms of how well wheat is moving, why is it that only 100 boxcars a day are being unloaded at the Lakehead when there are facilities for 400 box cars a day to be unloaded. Why is this failure being explained as a success by the minister?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not have before me figures regarding unloadings. The pattern has been maintained at a fairly constant rate of about 400 boxcars a day in all the reports I have had to date. The target is between 400 and 500 boxcars a day for the immediate future, and it will of course rise to over 500 in later stages. We want to be in a position to work on over 1,000 boxcars a day once navigation resumes.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I bring to the minister's attention some information that apparently he has not obtained from the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize for interrupting the hon. gentleman but he knows, of course, that at this point of the proceedings he cannot bring information to the attention of the minister. He may only ask questions.

Mr. Trudeau: Send the information over.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to ask a question when one meets with such evasion as this minister constantly practises in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I ask him this: Is it not a fact that up to the fourteenth day of this month and in the last few days especially only 100 boxcars a day were being unloaded, whereas there are facilities for 400 being unloaded. Is that a fact or is it not? Let the minister answer without evasion. Let us have the truth.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the fact is that approximately 4000 boxcars to be unloaded are on the way to the Lakehead at the present time. The last figures I saw, and they are up to the day before yesterday, show that unloadings are running at more than 400 cars a day for the Lakehead region. I will be very glad to produce these figures and these daily reports so that the right hon. gentleman may obtain his facts accurately.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that is not the first time the minister has misled the House with false information.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Some hon. Members: Withdraw!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Solicitor General had better stay with marijuana.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The right hon. gentleman cannot suggest that the minister has wilfully misled the House.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, no, Mr. Speaker. I did not say wilfully.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the point the right hon. gentleman is trying to make. He did not suggest that the minister had wilfully misled the House. I appreciate that point. Perhaps we might go on.

Mr. Diefenbaker: One moment please, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: I understand the point of order the right hon. gentleman is seeking to raise.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I do not know whether Mr. Speaker does. I will never charge deliberate misleading of the House when stupidity affords an excuse.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I note that a number of other hon. members are anxious to ask questions about the same subject. Perhaps we might allow two or three further supplementaries, after which hon. members might agree to go on to another subject.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, before I ask my supplementary question perhaps I could resolve the present difficulty by saying to the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert that his figures are for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool terminal only.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is indulging in debate. Perhaps he might ask his question.

FINAL PAYMENTS FOR 1968-69 CROP YEAR

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate to the House what is the expected possible or probable level of final payments for Durum wheat and hard red spring wheat?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position at the moment to make a statement about this. I have in the past indicated that the prices for grain have been for some time running at levels below the levels required to meet the initial payments which were made to farmers for the crop year in question. Accordingly there is significant doubt about money being available in the pool, if it were to be closed at the present time. Of course, these matters can change. The actual closing of the pool itself will affect the final amounts. That, certainly, is the situation at the present time. There is no reason at all for us to be optimistic about the pool; indeed, the likelihood is that the treasury will be involved with fairly significant amounts in order to make up the difference between initial payments and amounts realized.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): A further supplementary question,

Mr. Speaker. In view of the minister's statement to the effect that quite possibly there will be no final payment for the 1968-69 crop year, would the minister and his officials and the government support the principle of making a substantial acreage payment to western farmers in lieu of the government's failure to make these final payments?

EFFECT OF COLD WEATHER ON MOVEMENT

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as last year it was stated that grain deliveries could not be maintained to terminal elevators because of cold weather and inasmuch as today the temperature at Camrose, Alberta, is 50 below zero, at Fort Qu'Appelle, 35 below zero and at Winnipeg 27 below zero, a factor that may jam up the working of the master plan that has been arrived at, will the minister indicate whether for the present year plans have been made for contingencies such as cold weather so that the terminals will be filled by the time the shipping season opens this coming spring?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The problem last year in connection with unloading at Vancouver, Mr. Speaker, was more complicated than one simply involving cold weather, because at that time it involved the clogging of the system with damp grain, as well as the cold weather which extended not only throughout the prairie region, where it is expected, but also throughout the mountains and other areas where it is not expected. The position at Vancouver is that there is in storage about the right supply of grain for the ships that are expected. We do not foresee any difficulty with regard to the movement of the grain required to meet the needs of the ships which are expected.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Chair might be allowed to grant one more supplementary to the hon. member who brought this question up in the first instance.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): In view of the fact that Saskatchewan Wheat Pool terminals are receiving 100 cars a day and say they can handle 400, and since more than 200 grain handlers have been laid off, would the minister seek to persuade the Wheat Board and the railways to increase immediately the number of cars arriving at the Lakehead each day?

Mr. Lang: I have explained to the hon. member why the number of cars arriving is, in fact, an appropriate number of cars, and I do not think I need give that explanation again.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question relating to the dairy policy.

Would the minister indicate to the House whether the total amount of dairy subsidies will be increased this year in order to provide for the re-adjustment of a certain number of quotas which are inadequate and raise a great deal of criticism from many farmers?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): There are a number of ways in which the net return to producers of dairy products could be increased, and one of the most important would be a reduction in the cost of exporting surpluses. The standing committee of this House is addressing itself to the matter now and we are holding discussions with the dairy farmers of Canada and many of the other producer organizations which have a direct interest in this subject.

COMBINES

ACTION TO PREVENT TAKEOVER OF CANADIAN COMPANIES BY FOREIGN FIRMS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he would take the first opportunity on motions to outline to the House what action his department and the government intend to take to deal with the problem of the very large number of Canadian companies which are being taken over each year by United States interests? The minister advised the House in December that his department had been studying this problem very hard for some time.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will appreciate, I am sure, that the information he is seeking now should normally be given by way of a statement on motions.

Mr. Hees: With great respect to Your Honour, I began my question by asking the minister if he would consent to advise the House at the first opportunity on motions. I am just asking him to say yes or no.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): In due course, when our studies are complete, I shall make the House aware of our decision on this matter.

Mr. Hees: In the meantime, is it the intention of the minister to become a modern Nero who fiddles while large sections of the Canadian economy are absorbed by United States interests?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: If we have a Nero, you have got a zero.

Mr. Hees: I just asked.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—REPRESENTATIONS FROM ORGANIZED LABOUR CONCERNING VOLUNTARY RESTRAINTS

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): My question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Has he received any direct representations from representatives of organized labour concerning his proposed temporary voluntary curbs on prices and wages?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Does the minister intend to meet with representatives of labour in the near future, shortly, or at some time, to discuss this matter?

Mr. Benson: As I explained to the House, Dr. Young of the Prices and Incomes Commission has indicated he hopes to be able to hold a conference in February at which industry, business and the professions will be represented. I believe his next step would be consultation with organized labour. Although I do not report for this commission and I am not in continuous contact with Dr. Young, I believe he is in touch with organized labour from time to time in this regard.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—ACCESSIBILITY OF WAR ZONE TO OBSERVERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Having regard to the fact that the military observer team in Nigeria has stated in the course of a recent conference that it was only able to spend about three hours at Owerri and several other towns on the periphery of the former Biafran-occupied territory before returning to Lagos, will the govenment request the Nigerian government to enable observers to visit immediately the areas formerly occupied by Biafran forces in order that they might be in a position to observe and report from the areas in which the main threat of massive starvation is believed to exist?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I shall ask the minister to take that suggestion into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Has the Prime Minister received any response from the President of Nigeria to the message the right hon. gentleman dispatched to him?

Mr. Trudeau: I have had no answer yet, to my knowledge.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS

STATUS OF PAST AND INTRODUCTION OF NEW AWARDS

Mr. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Is it the intention to introduce new Canadian awards for bravery and, if so, can the minister give the House an assurance that awards granted to Canadians in the past will not be considered as falling within the same category as foreign awards?

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what they were described as in another department.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Consideration is being given to adopting new Canadian awards for bravery. It has been realized that the single award now authorized, the Medal of Courage, does not cover the whole range of courageous acts by civilians and members of the forces. I would assure my hon. friend that there is no intention whatever to downgrade the awards which gallant and brave Canadians have received in the past from the Sovereign on the recommendation of the government of Canada. It is unthinkable that these would ever be regarded as foreign awards.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): You had better tell that to Pelletier.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Secretary of State said they were foreign awards.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St Georges'-St. Barbe): Would the minister tell us whether a report has been prepared on the reclassification of military awards and, if so, would he be prepared to table it in the House?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I am not aware that such a report has been prepared. It is intended to prepare such a report when the new awards are decided upon.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Will these awards come under the auspices of the minister, as we hope, or under the auspices of the Secretary of State?

An hon. Member: As we do not hope.

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I think it is likely to develop this way: the decorations committee would look after the civilian side of awards and I would hope that the Minister of National Defence would deal with the military awards.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marshall: I should like to direct this supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister aware of a report prepared on the reclassification of military awards and would he be prepared to table such report?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am not aware of such a report, Mr. Speaker. I do know, as the Minister of National Defence has said, that work is being done to establish awards which would supplement the present ones and which would be tied in with the Order of Canada awards instituted some time ago. As far as I know this is being done under the auspices of Government House and not of any particular minister.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): The Secretary of State is not here today, being on the official absentee list. He gave us to understand yesterday that the report was in the hands of the Prime Minister. Is there any basis for that statement? The chairman of the committee is the Undersecretary of State.

Mr. Trudeau: I am not aware of the precise nature of the report to which the right hon. gentleman refers. I repeat that work is being done by officials under, I believe, the titular supervision of Government House rather than of any minister. Of course, the Undersecretary of State and other officials are members of such a working group. If they have produced a report and have sent it to my office, I have not yet taken cognizance of it.

ENERGY

POLICY RESPECTING INTEGRATION OF U.S. AND CANADIAN RESOURCES

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources whether, since his original discussions in Washington with Secretary Hickel, there have been further communications which would have the effect of varying the original proposals discussed in Washington?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have been in communication with Mr. Hickel since that date, but there have been no specific proposals with the exception of my specific proposal to Mr. Hickel that it would be in the interests of the United States as well as Canada that we be afforded a wide-open market for our crude oil in the United States.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister table in the House any relevant documents that are made available or issued in regard to this matter either by the Canadian government or the United States government? Is the minister also prepared to table now the studies that were carried out by the Canadian government relating to energy policy, particularly the feasibility study on an oil pipeline from western Canada to Montreal?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, such documents will be tabled by me as are in accord with the rules of the House as well as in accord with the public interest. With respect to studies of pipelines from the west to Montreal, I believe the Borden report is a public document and is a fairly comprehensive study dealing with that issue. I would refer the hon. member to it.

Mr. Burton: A further supplementary question. In view of the fact that the minister has established an advisory team consisting of oil industry executives to advise him on oil policy, would the minister consider expanding this committee or establishing a separate committee composed of people who will be able to advise him on matters affecting the public interest?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I think the committee as constituted is an extremely good one, and the country is very fortunate that men of this calibre and capacity are willing to serve on this advisory committee. For the present, I have no thought of enlarging or expanding that committee.

PUBLIC SERVICE

COMMENTS BY TRADE MINISTER ON UNILINGUAL FRENCH-SPEAKING UNITS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. Was the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce flying a kite or was he giving us a peek at government policy when he is reported to have said in Toronto yesterday that unilingual French-speaking units within the public service "are second best" and "one of last resort which I hope and believe will not materialize"?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am not sure whether the hon. member's choice of words is procedurally correct. The hon. member can ask the Prime Minister whether a minister's statement is an expression of government policy, and I assume that that is what the hon. member is asking the Prime Minister now.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister was not stating government policy in this regard because government policy has not yet been established. This I said a few days ago. I have not read the speech in question, but from the part quoted by the hon. member it seems to me that it would not be a difficult position to accept that it is second best. I suppose first best would be to have everyone in the country speaking both languages.

Mr. Nowlan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I quite agree with what the Prime Minister says, and in view of his answer to me yesterday I did not intend to ask him any further questions about the matter since I understood that government policy was under review. However, in light of the speech made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce yesterday, and in view of the statement made in the House by the Secretary of State, who expressed the opposite point of view that it would be a logical extension of existing bilingual services to have French unilingual units in the public service, is it the policy of the government to allow other ministers to contribute their thoughts in a personal way, as in the case of the NATO debate, so that we may obtain a full expression of cabinet opinion before government policy is actually defined?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I believe we received applause and encouragement from the members of the opposition with regard to this form of dialogue, and we intend to continue it when it is opportune to do so.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

USE OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for whoever is responsible for fielding questions to the Minister of National Health and Welfare in his absence. In asking this question I run the risk of being branded by my wife, but I ask it since many Canadians are interested in the subject. Can the minister tell the House what the government is doing to assure the public that no danger exists, if such is the case, in the use of oral contraceptives?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker I should like to assure the hon. member that the minister recently reviewed the reports relating to the adverse effects of oral contraceptives. Steps have been taken to check further into the latest reports of the adverse effects.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In asking this question I assure the House my interest is purely objective. Can the Parliamentary Secretary advise whether the department has made any study of the drug known as L-dopa which is reputed to have amazing rejuvenative powers?

Mr. Haidasz: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Approximately 13 neurologists have been given permission to carry out an investigation of the drug known as L-dopa and its use in relation to Parkinson's disease.

Mr. Macquarrie: A further supplementary question. May I ask the Parliamentary Secretary whether he is asking for volunteers from his own party in this regard?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bell: Refer it to the Senate.

ENERGY

GLACE BAY HEAVY WATER PLANT—LEGAL ACTION AGAINST NOVA SCOTIA

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the inability of the Glace Bay plant to deliver heavy water to the government of Canada, is the government considering legal action against the government of Nova Scotia for defaulting on its contract with Atomic Energy of Canada?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member referred only to the inability of the plant. To date there has been no government decision that I know of in this regard.

[*Later:*]

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is really supplementary to an earlier one. In view of the fact that the heavy water plant in the Maritimes is not making very substantial progress, is the minister considering reviving plans for a heavy water plant at Estevan, Saskatchewan?

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In the interest of showing some government initiative in its so-called fight against inflation, will the minister suspend until March 1 the increase in the price of cigars in the parliamentary restaurant?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have given up smoking cigars.

WATER RESOURCES

AMENDMENT OF BILL TO PROVIDE FOR NATIONAL QUALITY CODE

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. It arises from a statement made last night by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry who proposed a national water quality code with regional guidelines. Is it the intention of the government to propose such an amendment to the Canada water bill?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have not read the speech, if speech it was, of the minister referred to. Under the aegis of the Canada Water Act I think we will achieve, if the Act is effective—and we believe it will be—national standards by the introduction of water quality management areas under the Act.

Mr. Aiken: A supplementary question. In closing the debate on the water bill is it the intention of the minister to outline the changes that the government is proposing to make in the bill?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me this is the kind of question which might be asked later during the debate when the bill is being considered.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, the reason I raise this now is that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has made a statement and probably other ministers will be doing so also. At this time I think it essential that we know whether these various statements are to be consolidated at the conclusion of the debate, so that we will not be asking questions all the time.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—CONSERVATION AND LAND USE REGULATIONS

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I am not certain whether this question should be directed to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development or the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the recent oil discovery by Imperial Oil in the Canadian Arctic and the statement by Stewart Hodgson, one of the commissioners of the Northwest Territories, about the urgent need for the federal government to establish adequate conservation and land use regulations in the territories, I should like to ask the minister whether such regulations are lacking and when the department will lay down adequate policies to meet the situation?

Mr. Speaker: I have serious reservations as to the form of the question but perhaps the minister might wish to reply.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I think there is regulation now and it is the intention

to take an over-all approach to pollution in the North which will no doubt include provisions in respect of assuring the well-being of the ecology in the event of oil exploration.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—RESPONSE OF ORGANIZED LABOUR TO REQUEST FOR VOLUNTARY RESTRAINT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he has any information he can pass on to the House regarding the success the Prices and Incomes Commission is having in persuading the leaders of organized labour to keep wage demands within agreed-upon guidelines?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker; the commission does not report to me in any sense. I had one meeting with them and that is all, to my recollection.

Mr. Hees: Would the Prime Minister ask his colleague, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, to take the first opportunity on motions to report to the House on this matter?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, I will ask him, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

EFFECT OF REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent eruptions by the volcanic Mr. Fullerton of the National Capital Commission, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to resign and make way for Mr. Fullerton?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I doubt it, Mr. Speaker. The minister is in Quebec city on other business.

GRAIN

MALTING BARLEY—DENIAL OF SHIPPING PRIVILEGES

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio, now that he has had a bit of a break during the question period. In view of the fact that producers in some areas of central Alberta are being denied shipping privileges for certain varieties of malting barley because of unfavourable freight rates, will the minister conduct an investigation of this matter, particularly in relation to the Alberta Wheat Pool and Canada Malting, in order that these producers may enjoy a fair and equitable share of the malting barley market?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I have been looking into the complaint to which the hon. member refers to see whether there is any substance to it and what solutions may be required. I hope to be able to make a report soon.

INDUSTRY

POTASH—PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH EXPORT BOARD

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether a decision has been made in respect of the proposal to establish a potash export board to deal with potash marketing problems?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker, as a result of conversations that have been taking place between this government and the government of Saskatchewan, we have reason to believe that changes will be made to the present system as defined recently by the Saskatchewan government. I should not like to preclude the success of this operation and I will not comment further.

Mr. Burton: Did the Premier of Saskatchewan inform the minister or the federal government of the nature of the discussions to be held with potash officials in Germany, or was he acting in any way on behalf of the government of Canada in respect of these discussions?

Mr. Pepin: Personally, I did not need any explanation, Mr. Speaker.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFF OF GRAIN HANDLERS AT THUNDER BAY

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Wheat Board whether he has had discussions with his colleagues who have responsibility in respect of problems anticipated as a result of

a number of lay-offs of grain handlers at Thunder Bay occasioned by the inability of the government to maintain and sustain an adequate flow of grain?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Of course the very premise of the question is false, Mr. Speaker, because in fact a sustained and steady flow of grain is planned. However, notwithstanding that there have been discussions concerning this whole situation between myself and a number of my colleagues.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MEETING TO DISCUSS BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as Government House Leader. I wonder whether the hon. gentleman is yet in a position to meet with other House Leaders to discuss possible terms of reference under which the question of broadcasting the proceedings of the House by radio and television might be considered by a committee?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): No, Mr. Speaker. I expect that probably next Thursday afternoon I will be able to talk about that.

GRAIN

PICKING UP OF QUOTA BOOKS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, whether or not orders have gone out to discontinue the picking up of quota books which has become a source of deep concern and resentment, as he knows, in western Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): No, Mr. Speaker. The enforcement of the rules concerning the orderly marketing of grain is going forward in the usual way, and where these enforcement procedures require the collecting of evidence that evidence is collected. Normally, of course, this involves the picking up of permit books. According to the Wheat Board Act, as it has stood since I believe 1947, these permit books must be returned or a duplicate issued to the farmer within 15 days. In fact, the Wheat Board is able to get them back much quicker than that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Did the Wheat Board get his quota book back to the Premier of Saskatchewan within 15 days?

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST RESIDENTS OF TOWNS AND VILLAGES

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister answering for the Minister of Labour. Is the Unemployment Insurance Commission practising discrimination against residents of towns and villages by refusing to pay unemployment insurance benefits to claimants residing in these communities unless they are prepared to accept jobs in cities, which often entails many miles of travel?

Mr. Jim McNulty (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): I would be glad to take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member for Sarnia has a specific case in mind, I would be only too glad to talk it over with him after the question period.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, will the Parliamentary Secretary discuss with the minister the possibility of investigating the lack of efficiency in a number of unemployment insurance offices across Canada where many people, and I am sure all hon. members agree, are not getting a very efficient response to their claims and consequently are waiting months for legitimate payments?

• (12:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

WATER RESOURCES

PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed from Thursday, January 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, 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, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, last night in the course of my remarks I indicated to you that we are getting the pol-

lution we deserve because of our conduct and inaction. We cannot continue to dump sewage and industrial wastes into our rivers, lakes and streams and also emit pollutants into the air, without getting the results we are now obtaining. I said we should move from an affluent society to an effluent society. I mentioned that as a member of the Standing Committee on Energy, Mines and Resources, I obtained the impression from the presentation of the minister and the answers to questions by officials that they seemed to be dealing in the area of studies rather than the area of action. They seemed to be hung up with the jurisdictional problem when in fact they had adequate legislation before them to take effective action to deal with the question of pollution.

Then, I proceeded to outline to the House the reaction of the minister of energy and resource development of Ontario and pointed out that he was concerned about the lack of co-ordination between federal agencies in dealing with the problem of pollution. I mentioned that he was also concerned about the importance of having a single agency which would gather together the enforcement provisions of the different acts in order to make them really effective. This Ontario minister was also concerned about the lack of national standards and incentives related to pollution equipment. He indicated the willingness of the province of Ontario to give municipalities tax exemptions in respect of buildings that house pollution equipment. He also pointed out that the Ontario government is willing to forgo the 11 per cent sales tax with regard to pollution equipment and is asking for a response by the federal government on this important matter. He mentioned the lack of incentive forthcoming from the federal government.

Then, I referred to the Canadian Wild Life Federation brief which indicated that we are pussyfooting through the concept of co-operative federalism and providing an excuse for the federal government's inaction in respect of this important problem. The brief stated that Canadians want a meaningful federal participation by this government in combating this problem. It also indicated that the success of this legislation would depend on a massive input of federal funds. At that time, I said I hoped the minister, in his closing remarks, would meet some of these comments of the Ontario minister of energy and resource development and of the Canadian Wild Life Federation.

[Mr. Gilbert.]

I suggested that when the bill is referred to the committee we should have an opportunity to call witnesses from the different provinces and different organizations to give their views in respect of this important bill. Then, I became slightly parochial and set forth the situation in the city of Toronto where, as a result of sewage disposal and industrial waste, there is a pollution problem in respect of the Don River, the Humber River and the Credit River. A disgraceful situation has developed in the city of Toronto. The beaches cannot be used for swimming and in the fall of the year ducks die as a result of pollutants in the water. I pointed out that in 1964 a large program in respect of pollution in the Great Lakes system was referred to the International Joint Commission which is composed of three Canadian and three United States representatives. At the close of last evening I pointed out, by reference to a United States commission report, the number of pulp mills, chemical plants and food processing plants that are pouring their industrial waste into the Great Lakes in Ontario.

When we appreciate the fact that the Great Lakes in Ontario are the main pure water source in the world, it certainly behooves us to take immediate action. I mentioned that Lake Erie is now considered to be a so-called dead lake. In Biblical times we had the Dead Sea and now in modern times we have Lake Erie referred to as the dead lake. There is an imminent danger of the term "dead lake" being applied not only to Lake Erie but to Lake Ontario and the other Great Lakes.

I should like to refer to an article by Mr. Peter Calamai which appeared in the Montreal *Gazette* for October 13, 1969 under the heading "Pollution: point of no return?". In this article Mr. Calamai is commenting on the pollution report released by the International Joint Commission with regard to the health picture of Lake Erie and Lake Ontario. The article reads:

> The deciding factor will be how fast and with how much enthusiasm governments and industries seize the one last hope which the joint U.S.-Canadian research committees left for them.
>
> To save Lake Erie all these groups should take multi-million dollar action within three years; to save Lake Ontario they have six years.

The main problem in respect of the lake is the deposit of phosphates. I continue quoting:

> While the pollution report outlined a whole series of water quality objectives and recommendations it offered one, fast and sure method of curbing the gross pollution of the lakes.

"Stop phosphorus going into the lakes", the researchers said, and they will be healthy as can ever be hoped by 1986.

Failure to stop phosphorus inflow into Lake Erie within the three-year limit, the report warns, will bring the prospect of the lake regenerating its own pollution from phosphorus in the bottom muck.

While the report continually uses the word "phosphorus" the researchers made it clear they were referring largely to phosphorus compounds such as phosphates, which is phosphorus combined with oxygen.

These compounds occur in municipal sewage—coming largely from detergents housewives rinse down the sink—and in fertilizers and some industrial processes.

Four years of study by the pollution experts who wrote the report convinced them that phosphorus was the key to pollution in the lower lakes area where population has increased 100 times in the past 150 years.

The phosphorus—44,000 tons annually into the two lakes from all sources—is plant food for the algae rapidly coating lagoons and beaches. The more plant growth there is in the lakes the less oxygen is available for fish and for the biological processes necessary to neutralize other sewage.

Then, the report continues and points out the following:

Even more vital, one of the researchers commented, is that the same process is taking place in all Canadian lakes. Within this century the same point-of-no-return could be reached in Lake Superior or Huron.

How to stop the phosphorus?

Cut it off at the source, says the report.

About 67 per cent of all the phosphorus input into the two lakes comes from municipal sewage; another eight per cent comes from industrial wastes. Of the municipal share anywhere from 50 to 70 per cent is directly related to the phosphates in detergents.

So the report recommends an immediate reduction to minimum practical levels of the phosphorus in detergents and the complete elimination of such phosphorus compounds by 1972.

How practical is this?

Phosphates make up about 30 per cent of a box of detergent.

• (12:30 p.m.)

One U.S. manufacturer already has a brand on the market with 25 per cent less detergent than other products and sales are going well, according to one researcher.

The article concludes:

If the detergent companies do replace their harmful products by 1972 that action will probably save Canadian taxpayers $5 million annually in sewage treatment costs alone.

This indicates that the problem we are having is phosphates, the main source of which is the detergents used by women.

I think I should relate to members of the House that just recently one of the research experts at the University of Toronto has come forth with a phosphate free detergent. I should like to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) to call that expert before the committee to give us the benefit of his findings. I ask that the minister contact that professor, if he has not already done so, so that we could have the joint cooperation of the professor and possibly of the Polymer Corporation of Canada to produce this phosphate free detergent because the main source of the phosphate in the detergents comes from ERCO, the Electrical Reduction Company. Just this week that company was fined $40,000 for infractions to the Combines Investigation Act. It seems to me that we have a public duty, if a professor has found a phosphate free detergent, to use a crown corporation like the Polymer Corporation which would be suitably geared to produce this detergent and make it available.

Mr. Speaker: I have to interrupt the hon. member to remind him that his time has expired. He may continue if he has the unanimous consent of the House to do so.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Gilbert: I will not trespass on the generosity of hon. members any longer than about five minutes at the most.

As I said, I would like the minister to take immediate action with regard to the finding made by the professor from the University of Toronto, and also to delve into the feasibility of the Polymer Corporation, which I understand is looking for other lines to produce, developing this product.

I could go on ad infinitum on the problems of pollution in the air, but before doing so I should like to say that we also have a problem of oil pollution in Lake Ontario. The other day the Gulf Company of Canada was charged by the Ontario Water Resources Commission with polluting Lake Ontario. Again the International Joint Commission studied this problem very seriously, and in the *Globe and Mail* issue of December 3, 1969 the findings of that commission are reported as indicating a conflict between the Ontario and the federal officials with regard to the possible effects of oil in Lake Ontario.

The article reads:

Six submissions from the gas and oil industry argued against any curtailment of drilling. A thick brief from the Ontario Petroleum Institute Incorporated told of elaborate plans to deal with a leak should one occur—

In contrast to the industry briefs were submissions from the city of Buffalo, the town of Hamburg, N.Y., and Toronto Alderman Anthony O'Donohue, all of which called for a moratorium on drilling.

Harold Baumler, counsel for Hamburg, said the greatest danger posed by drilling "is not an oil spill such as recently occurred in California but an accidental leak of salt brine".

He said experts have warned that a spill of salt brine from an oil well "would be one of the greatest natural catastrophes that could strike the Great Lakes". Within 48 hours of a major spill all of Lake Erie would be polluted with salt.

"If enough salt water got into the lake it would kill every fresh-water fish and plant."

I am sure that the minister has jurisdiction in this area and I hope he will take immediate action to call an immediate moratorium on oil drilling in Lake Ontario and Lake Erie.

I cannot do better than to quote from the main speech by the member from our party who led off the debate. He said:

(1) There are no uniform water quality standards, nor a set of various plans to meet specific situations. This means that in areas of Canada where public opinion is not well organized, pollution control agencies will follow the path of least resistance and allow industry and hesitant municipalities to dictate policy.

(2) The bill will allow industry to pay a fee for the right to pollute. The people of Canada want clean water, not money.

(3) Many municipalities do not have the finances to make a serious effort at pollution control. The government's vague promises about loans are not sufficient if Canada is really going on a clean up campaign.

(4) There is little scope for the influence of citizens' groups and popular opinion generally to affect the plans of local pollution control agencies. Industry will maintain powerful influence and this should be balanced by the organization of public committees.

May I say in conclusion that my reading of this bill leads me to the belief that all we have really is a new administrative framework for overcoming federal-provincial conflicts, and that we have not taken a hard look and come forth with solutions to meet the problem of pollution. We have to help municipalities financially, tighten regulations applying to industry, set national standards and, above all, we have to have federal leadership in the enforcement of this act.

I look forward to having the minister before the committee to resolve some of these problems and come forth with solutions which will make Canadians proud of their clean air, clean water and clean environment.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the debate, it has been made crystal clear by the various members who have contributed to the discussion that there are great inadequacies in Bill C-144. I will not be repetitious at all in the contribution I want to make because I think that the inadequacies and deficiencies have been clearly defined. As you are well aware, the members of this group have felt so seriously about the matter that we endeavoured to have the bill referred back to the government, so that the obvious inadequacies and inefficiencies could be eliminated. It was because there have been such long delays in moving to deal in forthright terms with the problems of renewable resource management that we felt the most strenuous action available in this House should be taken. It is not for me to judge why the government has failed to come to grips with the vital aspects of pollution in our environment.

However, there is a new report that has become public which indicates that perhaps the explanation is that the government is not fully aware of the nature of the problem. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, the Hon. Jack Davis, speaking yesterday to the North Vancouver Chamber of Commerce—and I am reading from the press despatch—said that he does not subscribe to alarmist talk about pollution. Quoting directly from the speech, I read:

• (12:40 p.m.)

"I don't believe all that I read about dying lakes and sickening seas. Most of it is poppycock . . . written by novices who are reaching for headlines . . . "

Mr. Davis said there are pollution problems in Canada "but the ecological situation is still basically under control."

The minister called for a national water quality code, with regional guidelines drawn to meet regional needs.

In this statement, delivered as recently as yesterday, we have the reason for the half-hearted, half-baked approach to the problem of dealing with the control of water pollution outlined in the bill that is before us.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to repeat the problems in the legislation that have been outlined by earlier speakers in this debate. We shall have an opportunity to deal with those in some considerable depth when the legislation finally comes before the committee. But in the light of the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries, a minister who has basic responsibility in the field of our renewable resources, it is important to underline that the legislation will in no way deal with the fundamental problem that he has outlined, the necessity of establishing a national water

quality code. I have looked carefully through the legislation and I see no provision in it at all dealing with this major problem that was referred to by the Minister of Fisheries.

My purpose in speaking today is to refresh the memory of the minister responsible for conducting this legislation through the House, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene). In his statement introducing the legislation, he delivered a speech that was typical of the flowery Irish oratory to which we have become accustomed. Throughout his career in the House of Commons, the hon. gentleman has established himself as a Lincolnesque Irish sort of orator, who can best be described in the well-known phrase, "He has kissed the Blarney Stone." I do not think that kissing the Blarney Stone is the sort of solution that is required in dealing with the problems of pollution of our rivers. I sit right across the floor from the hon. gentleman, and I have known him from the days when he served in the Royal Canadian Air Force. He and I received those foreign medals that were referred to by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) the other day and we could make a good night-fighter crew—

Mr. Blair: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member would not wish to have the record misstate the facts. It has been made clear that the medals he and other gallant people have received will never be treated as foreign medals.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, I was merely quoting the statement of the Secretary of State, within whose department I understand this matter is being considered, and he did use the phrase "foreign medals", including those that were awarded for service in World War II. As I was saying, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources was a navigator and I was a pilot, so we could form a very good night-fighter crew. Maybe we are dealing in the dark with respect to the present legislation, and perhaps I can throw some light on the matter.

We should recall the public discussion and consideration of this subject that has taken place over the last 20 years. These discussions have brought us to the position where everybody is concerned. I am not just referring to novices interested in alarmist talk, but I include the most responsible people in the field of renewable resource conservation and development, those who have been in the vanguard in warning us, we are reaching the crisis point because of our failure to deal adequately with the problem not only in Canada but more particularly south of the border in the United States of America. I repeat that everybody is concerned.

There is another old Irish saying that the sweetest memories of life are the recollections of things forgotten. Obviously, the minister has forgotten much of what has transpired in the past, or has not been aware of it. Certainly, this would apply to the Minister of Fisheries in the light of what he said yesterday.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has stated that the decade of the 70's will be known as the pollution decade when at long last governments not only in this country but in other countries will come to grips with this critical problem. Actually, I think it was the decade of the 60's when governments and responsible public leaders became deeply concerned over the dangerous trends that were becoming all too obvious in the area of our natural resources.

The United States talked frequently about the necessity of conserving resources for the future. A private organization under that name emerged, with the intent of alerting governmental officials to the growing problem. The Secretary of the Interior under the former Democratic government, in fact under several Democratic governments, the Hon. Stuart Udall, wrote a very significant book that received considerable attention in the early 60's. Its title was "The Quiet Crisis," the crisis that had come upon us almost in the night as it were, and he was no novice who was trying to grab newspaper headlines. He was a man knowledgeable in the field, who had the responsibility of leading the fight for better conservation measures in the great republic to the south of us.

In Canada the study of the problems of renewable resources focussed around the Resources for Tomorrow Conference held in 1961, and because of the body of information brought together at that conference it was expected that remedial action would be forthcoming within a few years. We have waited until 1970 and, as hon. members have indicated, there is not much of substance provided in the bill now before us.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) indicated that nothing had been done in past years. Obviously, he has not read the three volume report that came out of the Resources for Tomorrow Conference. It is because of this that I want to review briefly the record of the past two decades.

Water Resources

● (12:50 p.m.)

We must give credit to the government of Ontario for early initiative in this field. It was because of that province's concern over what was happening to its natural environment that pressure was put on Ottawa for federal assistance in the late 40's and early 50's. Because of this pressure, ad hoc arrangements were made whereby Ottawa assisted with specific projects. There was some realization that this was quite inadequate, and in 1953 the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act was passed, which remained on the statute books of Canada and was not used to any great extent really until the latter 50's and the early 60's. This lack of use resulted from a general lack of awareness on the part of the general public to the crisis that was upon us. However, between 1957 and 1963 several major water conservation projects were undertaken which involved the direct participation of the government of Canada. I could refer to the greater Metro Toronto scheme, the Winnipeg floodway and water control project, the South Saskatchewan dam and the Passamaquody project in the maritimes as well as other similar projects in other parts of Canada. This was the first real attempt at federal government leadership in this field.

It was soon realized that the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act was quite inadequate because it placed the initiative on the provincial government in getting projects started. It had been felt that direct participation by Ottawa to the extent of 37½ per cent of the total cost of the projects would be sufficient incentive. We are fully aware that the management, conservation and development of our renewable resources is going to be an expensive proposition. However, in view of the remaining financial obligations, even the 37½ per cent was not sufficient to arouse provincial governments, who have the direct responsibility in this area, to take the necessary action. This experience of course arises from the fact that there is a fundamental jurisdictional problem, and it was for that reason the government of Canada, seizing the leadership responsibility which must inevitably devolve upon them, called the Resources for Tomorrow Conference in 1961.

The provinces own the renewable resources. Water moves from one province to another. There is interprovincial jurisdictional division. There are international complications that must be dealt with. It is obvious that the federal government had an obligation to provide encouragement and leadership in the resource development field, within the constitutional framework of course.

Fundamentally it was realized, because of the unhappy experience with the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act, there must be some federal financial assistance on a guaranteed basis, on the basis of a specific formula underpinning the scheme.

Notwithstanding the recommendations of the Resources for Tomorrow Conference, as has been pointed out by several hon. members in this debate, the basic ingredient of federal leadership in the wise management of our renewable resources, including water, is lacking. There is no provision whatsoever for financial participation. Instead, I would say this is a retrograde step and we are going back to the laissez-faireism and ad hocism, if I may use that phrase, that existed before the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act was passed.

The bill and preliminary publicity material issued in connection with it are full of "it is expected" and "we hope". There is no specific terminology to indicate that the government of Canada has decided to take a firm lead in this matter. It is designed to deal with the area of jurisdictional dispute. However, this area has already been adequately dealt with by the Resource Ministers' Council, which is very seldom referred to these days but does exist with a secretariat located in the city of Montreal for the precise purpose of overcoming the areas of jurisdictional dispute.

The Resource Ministers' Council has done excellent work, notwithstanding the relative neglect by the Liberal administration since they returned to power in 1963. It has reviewed all the cost-sharing agreements; it has collected all the basic data concerning Canada's water resources; it sponsored the Pollution of Our Environment Conference in the fall of 1966 and it has encouraged Canada's participation in the hydrological decade which is from 1965 to 1974.

It is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, to bring forward a piece of legislation now, which, in pious terms reinforced by Irish oratory, hopes to deal with the problem of jurisdictional division in the field of resource management. We have the machinery; what we need now is federal leadership in the renewable resource field.

In his speech the minister emphasized, and I must give him credit for this, that he recognized that the greatest source of inadequacy was the failure of the government to put its

money where its mouth is. There is no provision for financial support and I can assure him, on the basis of the brief summary I have made here, that if there is no promise of financial support from the federal level of government then there will be no action on the part of the provincial governments. They are concerned, they are greatly exercised on the matter, but the federal government has been withdrawing its financial support from so many areas of joint participation and co-operative federalism that I am sure it will be almost impossible, as it has been over the previous two decades, to get them to take leadership in the field. The leadership responsibility lies solely and entirely with the federal government. This was demonstrated beyond the shadow of a doubt at the Resources for Tomorrow Conference, Mr. Speaker, and this is the point I emphasize in bringing my remarks to a close.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being one o'clock, I do now leave the chair to resume same at two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I believe a water act could be one of the most important pieces of legislation to be put on the statute books of this nation. There will not be a dissenting voice in this House or in the country in respect of setting up an adequate water policy. However, there will be much resentment if this Bill C-144 is not amended so that it is meaningful and effective. In a few words, it lacks teeth, strength and direction.

Water pollution should be an offence in any part of the country by any person or company, and effective deterrent measures should be prescribed in the bill. Financial support to the provinces should be specified where joint programs can be arranged; and these should be uniform. In fact, our amendment pretty well covers this field and should be accepted. If we can proceed from there without undue delay some relief from the serious pollution situation might be forthcoming.

Time is of the essence and this has been forcibly brought home to us when we realize that DDT now pollutes all waters. It has been found in the penguins of the Antarctic and the polar bears of the Arctic. The Great Lakes are polluted with DDT to a point where the Cohoe salmon caught in Lake Huron were condemned for food because they contained DDT beyond the tolerance of the human body. The pollution in some areas of the Great Lakes such as Lake Erie has reached a point where some species of fish have been eliminated.

Much of the pollution, Mr. Speaker, in the Great Lakes could be corrected by the installation of sewage disposal plants in some of the cities. The city of Owen Sound in my constituency is one of those municipalities that values and enjoys a clean environment and is making use of such a plant. The Georgian Bay area, which constitutes much of my constituency, enjoys comparatively clean water when one thinks of the conditions in Lake Erie. We do not have large cities dumping raw sewage into the lakes in our area and our municipalities are progressively accepting and using sewage disposal systems.

The extreme pollution in Lake Erie is the result of run-off from the tobacco producing areas where large amounts of DDT are used, along with nitrates and phosphates which are used in fertilizers on all farm lands. Added to this, there is the sewage from several large cities on the United States side of the lake. The result is massive mats of algae covering as much as 800 square miles and fouling most of the beaches of Lake Erie. These conditions are not conducive to the production of fish or clean water. Georgian Bay is not plagued with the growth of algae. However, it is not free of DDT, as we have over 3,000 acres of orchards bordering the south shore which use pesticides in their operations. The residues no doubt find their way to our water. We have other pollution, but to a minor degree compared to the country-wide picture.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Water is undoubtedly the most important of the four renewable natural resources because the other three namely, soil, forests, fish and wildlife, are dependant on it; but all four are inter-related. For example, forests and good farming practices prevent the carrying away of the topsoil which silts into the lakes and reservoirs. It is, therefore, obvious that conservation work in all its phases should be co-ordinated, and the unit in which it can best be co-ordinated is the river valley. At this point the people are closest to their river. They know its vicissitudes best and, helped

by some technical advice and financial assistance, they are the ones best able to ensure that the water in its fresh water lakes is used to the best advantage for all.

We in the Georgian Bay area have a beautiful country which attracts tourists by the thousands both winter and summer. For many years now we have come to the realization of the value of clean air and pure water. Our people began conservation projects of various kind with a view to preserving these great assets. We were given encouragement and financial support by a provincial Conservative government and a federal Conservative government to the tune of 37½ per cent each. The result was the establishment of two authorities, the Sauble Valley Authority and the North Grey Conservation Authority. These authorities are extremely active and have completed many conservation projects. We feel their accomplishments have made our area a virtual tourists' paradise. All water can be improved and no doubt Georgian Bay and Lake Huron are no exception. I know our people will co-operate in any way possible, but they will need direction and financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, DDT presents this nation with the biggest threat to our health as it is the most powerful of the water pollutants and is reputed to be killing the vegetable plankton in our lakes and in the sea, the source of 80 per cent of man's oxygen supply. Some scientists estimate the oxygen supply contained by the sea will last only 40 more years at the present rate of wastage. It has been authentically stated that since creation every drop of water has been used by someone at some time. There is no such thing as pure water. It has all gone through the normal natural cycling process. It is an accepted fact that since the turn of the century the population explosion and the industrial revolution have upset the normal recycling process..

As long as things were found in nature, bacterial action could take care of them. Man has developed thousands of compounds which are not found in nature and these cannot be broken down through natural action. In many parts of this continent as well as in Europe people are living in oxygen-deficient atmosphere. More oxygen is being used than is being replaced and we continue to destroy the oxygen-producing parts of nature.

Hydro-carbon pesticides are claimed by scientists to be similar to atomic wastes. DDT is 50 per cent effective after 15 to 20 years of exposure. Of the billions of pounds of DDT used in the last 20 years, 90 per cent is still active. If any one of us were sold as food we would be labelled unfit for human consumption because of the pesticide levels in our bodies.

It is now evident we have been careless about our environment, and the position in which we have placed ourselves is almost as catastrophic as the migration of the lemming into the sea to destroy themselves.

We may ask what is being done about present supplies of DDT which are to be disposed of. Are people being warned not to pour it down the drain or dispose of it in some other way which would make a further contribution to the problem which exists? In Owen Sound we have alerted our people by radio to bring any DDT to be disposed of to a central collecting point. This is an area in which I feel the federal government has an immediate responsibility. Advice should be given to all the provinces as to what is the proper and safe method for the disposal of DDT. I would suggest that if unused stocks were exposed to a high degree of heat in a smelter the harmful effect would be neutralized. There may be other methods which would be just as effective.

I pay tribute to the minister for the finely polished phrases he used in presenting Bill C-144. He gave the impression that this legislation would cure all our water ills, but this is not so. In plain words, this bill lacks guts and leadership and contains no commitment regarding financial assistance. If passed in its present form Bill C-144 will nullify the federal assistance of 37½ per cent now provided in the statutes and would foist all financial responsibilities on to the provinces. Nevertheless, the government would hope to bask in the sunshine of popularity for its water policy but in reality the bill in its present form is only another exercise of the government's austerity program.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, the water bill now before the House is perhaps the most important piece of legislation we have tackled in 20 years. This is a sweeping statement, but facts are available to prove it.

The explosion of an atom bomb is something which happens in a moment; we can all see the mushroom cloud and we all know its devastating effect. Pollution, on the other hand, is something which is creeping up on us day by day. It is creeping up at an increasing speed. I do not think that even those who appear to be exaggerating realize the terrible danger which confronts the whole human

race, the whole animal kingdom and even, perhaps, the trees and the grasses of the planet on which we live.

This water bill at least opens up the subject. That is about all it does. I shall not spend much time criticizing the bill itself because there is nothing in it which comes to grips with the real problem. The real problem is the destruction of the water resources of the planet and I suggest we are not thinking big enough, if hon. members will pardon the pun, when we try to tackle it. It is an international problem of immense proportions. I understand the nations of the world intend to hold an international conference on water pollution in 1971. That is just a year and a half too late.

We have no need to be modest about water in Canada. We are one of the nations which is still blessed with vast reserves of pure water. But we are going about destroying this great resource at an alarming rate. The old excuse is trotted out that we do not have the money to control pollution. I shall not run down the list of directions in which we have been wasting money. The number is legion. I maintain that money does not need to be an obstacle in this case. If we attack this danger with half the enthusiasm with which we attack lesser matters, such as putting out new medals or building art centres, we should get to the root of it.

The root of this menace is international, and its solution lies through international co-operation. There is no sense talking about international co-operation unless we are first willing to set our own house in order. We are destroying Canada's lakes and rivers. Not only that, but we are destroying the land which surrounds these water resources. I do not think we can entirely separate one form of pollution from the other because if we pollute the land in Canada with insecticides and detergents it is obvious that the rain will wash this material into our rivers which, in turn, will carry it to the lakes and to the seas.

• (2:20 p.m.)

The first thing to do to solve the problem is immediately to outlaw pollution of our streams, rivers and lakes. I do not think there is any constitutional problem involved, and not only can it be done but, if we are to survive, it must be done. As I said before, Canada has what is probably the greatest fresh water supply in the world, and consequently it is our duty to conserve it.

If we take quick action that is successful, then we might even have the answer to the problem of finances. After all, we have a resource that is saleable. If we plan properly and do not give away our water to some other country in perpetuity—in other words, if we sell it by the gallon rather than give concessions—then we can finance the whole deal.

In this regard we cannot escape our duty by passing the blame on to the provinces. Nor can we expect the provinces to handle the prevention of pollution piecemeal because it is too big a job for them to tackle. I started by saying that this problem is an international one that affects all mankind. However, we cannot wait for all mankind to become alerted to the danger. Those who have no fresh water left are too late to solve the problem, but we are not.

I suggest as a fair and concrete proposal that the federal government call now a conference with the provinces to inform the provinces what the federal government is going to do and the standards it is going to insist upon to conserve our fresh, pure water, not in 1971 or 1981 but as of January 1970. I can assure the government that it would receive no opposition from us if this were done.

In light of the speeches so far in this debate, it seems to me that all the prodding is coming from members on this side of the House. I am very disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the House are not rising to their feet to flay their own government for the inadequacy of this bill. I know there are many talented members on that side, and I should like them to tell us their ideas with regard to taking effective steps not only to protect the water of Canada and North America but the water resources on this planet.

If this sort of thinking is too big for them, then let them resign their seats and abdicate their responsibilities. They have abdicated practically everything else already; the only thing remaining is for them to move out. I suggest there is a vacuum in this respect that must be filled; and if hon. members opposite have not thought about it till now, then it is time they did.

If hon. members do their homework, they will discover a great deal of thought has already been given to this subject. A magnificent article, which arrived in the mails yesterday, has been written outlining the horrors

of pollution. Although it does not propose many answers for dealing with it, the answers are fairly obvious.

The first action we must take is immediate and effective steps to stop pollution now. In this regard we must give leadership. Let us not wait for Peru to tell us what to do; let us tell them what to do. Let us tell the great American republic to the south, which is getting a lot of criticism these days in every other regard, that they are failing in their international obligations.

What are we doing to meet our obligations? I think the republic to the south of us, which has the money, is willing to buy fresh water if we have a sensible plan for supplying it. I suggest in this way we will be able to finance the very measures that I am suggesting.

A lot of research has been done on which, as yet, no action has been taken. However, we need a great deal more research. Why not give our young men an opportunity to study water control and proper methods of conservation? In order to do this we need more money devoted to research in this country. We require additional scholarships at Canadian universities. If we have no diplomas in water control, then let us beg our universities to open up schools to teach our young people about water and water conservation.

The problem of pollution is so great that I suggest we require hundreds of trained people to tackle it. Having trained our young men, let us give them something to do. We have the water resources and the need to preserve them; we have young men of ability and brains, with sufficient drive to take on this responsibility. What they are expecting from us is leadership. These young men want to cut their hair and go back to work. They do not want to loaf around as they think we do here. But they are fed up with the lack of leadership being shown by the government, and so am I. I could not go down to Yorkville and tell these young men that they are wrong and that we are right, because in this respect I think we are wrong.

It is not the responsibility of the provinces to show leadership in this field, but it is their responsibility to co-operate with the federal government in devising a national plan of water conservation which is acceptable to the provinces. Certainly, we cannot shift the financial responsibilities to the provinces and municipalities, which are already carrying a back breaking burden of debt. Although we have not given leadership in fields like housing, intercity transportation, and things like that, let us take responsibility here. The field is wide open.

As I have said, there are no constitutional hurdles in fighting pollution. The main hurdle is raising the money. If we first have a sensible plan to deal with pollution, then I suggest the very water resources that we wish to save and conserve will foot the bill for the job that we have to do. Water is probably the most important national resource that we have next to men; and we have the manpower. Let us put our young people to work helping to clean up our streams and stop further pollution. If this is done the government will find it will receive more co-operation than it dreamt was possible.

This is not a partisan matter but something in which every member of the House should be vitally interested. It is also something that every department of government should concern itself with. It has been said by several members who preceded me that the Department of Fisheries and Forestry has a sufficiently wide interest in the subject to police anti-pollution laws without in any way running into constitutional difficulties. To claim that such difficulties would exist is to drag in a red herring; and red herrings are a specialty of the fisheries department. So, let hon. members stop that kind of talk.

Unemployment in Canada is rising, 6 per cent of the national labour force being now unemployed. Let us put to work about 3 per cent of the labour force to deal with water conservation. This would be a direct answer to the unemployment problem and is the kind of thing that should be done. This would be a national investment, though it would take courage to follow such a course.

I do not pretend to be some sort of Jeremiah standing alone in the wilderness. I am reinforced in my views by some words of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and I think they should be on the record. He said:

• (2:30 p.m.)

> We all know how easy it is to dissipate our natural heritage by a short sighted attitude towards industrial and commercial development. In recent years many members of the public, certain industries, and all levels of government have become more conscious of the dangers of resource mismanagement and pollution.

So, it is known by the Prime Minister, and I presume by every member of his cabinet, what pollution will eventually do. This should be known by every member of this House. If it is not hon. members need do nothing more

than read this supplement on pollution published by McMaster University, which I am sure all members received in the mail. I do not think it exaggerates the situation. I think it understates the facts.

After reading this publication I was reminded of something I first read many years ago. I went down to the table of the House of Commons and drew a book in which this whole situation is very vividly described. I refer to the Holy Bible, and particularly the book of Revelation. That is worth reading. There is a reference to God pouring out his wrath. There is a pretty accurate description of air, land and water pollution in the book of Revelation. If that book has any validity in this day and age, then we should know that this pollution will end civilization unless we smarten up and do something about it.

This is the same old challenge and we still blame money or the lack of it for the present situation. The book challenges us to follow the suggestions contained in it. Are we unselfish enough to take the bull by the horns and master it? Are we willing enough to dig down deep enough in our pockets and pay the taxes necessary to at least get this plan on the road? Are we brave enough to talk turkey to the provinces, having set our own house here in order, and brave enough to tackle this problem on an international basis? If the world wants fresh water we have it, but we expect international co-operation, particularly from our great neighbour to the south and the other great nations of the world. Fresh water is not the only thing Canada possesses. If we are going to pollute our oceans with DDT and oil slicks as a result of digging into the bowels of the earth below sea level, allowing wildcat oil wells to spew their venom, as I call it, into the ocean, killing all the fish, then co-operation is of a great significance.

It has been pointed out by a man with a great deal more scientific knowledge than I have that life on earth lives on a very thin but evenly balanced rhythm. When you interfere with that rhythm by polluting the air and water you upset the whole system. It might well be that the book of Revelation is much closer to what is going to happen to us in a very few years than one might think, unless one takes note of those things told us not only in the Good Book but by our own well-trained and well-qualified scientists.

Most of the articles I read in this paper have been backed up by men with doctorates in biology, chemistry and engineering. These are men we have trained under our free educational system. They warn us of the difficulties we face. What is the point of sending these people to university and on post-graduate courses when we completely ignore the warnings they bring to our doors?

There has been a great campaign throughout the country in the press and over the radio about what I would refer to as some of the small aspects of this matter. It has been suggested we are poisoning our song birds. The situation is much more serious than that. I believe these people when they say we are not only poisoning our song birds but poisoning ourselves by the very food we eat from the Safeway stores and the corner grocers. These foods contain a great deal more pollution than any man would willingly take if he could see the amount of poison he is taking into his system three times a day.

The same people who are complaining about the loss of our song birds like to point to certain industries, like the E. B. Eddy Company, and say they are poisoning us with refuse. However, those people refuse to stop using the dangerous commodities which they put down their sinks every day and which poison our rivers and eventually our oceans. They should stop waving this flag of horror and pointing to the other fellow. They should ask themselves what they are going to do in their own homes and what the government is going to do with the taxpayer's dollars to stop this enemy of mankind before it stops us.

I have only one main criticism of this bill and that is it just contains a pious hope. It does not do anything significant. It does set guideposts. That is all very well, but the guideposts have been there for at least 2,000 years. We have been warned about what is going to happen if we abuse the soil, air and water which God gave us free and unpolluted. It is not good enough to put up a flag and say we believe in non-pollution or in pure water unless we give strong leadership.

I do not agree with the suggestion that because we built these factories we cannot stop them from polluting the air. At least we can see that no more factories are built without proper cess pools, smoke stacks and electric machinery for taking these poisons out of the air, water and waste products before they are dumped into our rivers or left on the hillsides to be washed down at a later date.

In order to appreciate the amount of pollution taking place one need only take a trip through the Crowsnest Pass. Only 50 years ago it was one of the most beautiful mountain

areas in the world, equal to the Alps. If you travel there today you will see that it is blackened like the Ruhr Valley. You might think you were in Birmingham, England on a foggy day. You cannot see the sun for the smoke. All the rivers have been polluted from the mines and the fish in the creeks are dead. The trees on the mountainside are dying and turning brown because of the polluted air.

We have done this and I think we are going to continue to do it unless we solve this problem before 1971. One university professor suggested that we could not get around to doing anything significant about this problem until 1981. One of the articles I read contained the statement that, because of the increasing tempo of pollution, we may not have ten years of reasonable life left on this planet unless we do something about it.

I am told that the DDT we are putting into the ocean today has already made serious inroads on the existence of plankton. As most of you know, this is the microscopic green plant life floating around in the ocean. It is responsible for renewing the oxygen we breathe. As we cover more and more square miles of our planet with concrete this process of renewing the oxygen is being left almost entirely to our oceans. If we continue to destroy our forests by covering the surface of the land with concrete buildings, we will double the burden of the plankton of the ocean. We are already wearing down the ability of the plankton of the ocean to reproduce that green material which in turn produces food for the fish and oxygen to replenish the air we breathe.

Some scientists say we may not have ten years left at the present rate of pollution. Last week I drove through Pittsburgh. About five miles out of the city the air was not fit for human beings to breathe. I wondered that my automobile operator could even see the road through the smoke, sulphur and fumes. This was a foggy, overcast day and all the poisons going into the air were trapped between the cloud banks and the earth. We were coughing and sputtering and we had to turn on the headlights at two in the afternoon. It was difficult to see the road. This is what we are doing to our atmosphere.

• (2:40 p.m.)

This pollution in the atmosphere is going into our plants. We are putting these poisons into our sewers and eventually into our oceans. I thoroughly approve of the idea of attacking the pollution problem, but this bill represents only a bit of flag waving. At the present time a non-partisan and non-political attitude is required. This is a problem in respect of which every province of the country will have to co-operate and one in respect of which the Prime Minister will have to give leadership. This is not a situation in which we should find it necessary to sit here and make fun of the Prime Minister. The bill may have to be strengthened, completely revised and brought up to present standards. It is not necessary that we should wait until we have all the knowledge and information available. Let us use the information and knowledge we do have, and use the power we have, to stop pollution and to bring the provinces together to work on this problem immediately. If we cannot obtain agreement from the factory owners and shareholders, then we will have to be tough and tell them they will no longer be in business unless proper action is taken.

I am one of the strongest free enterprisers you are ever likely to meet, but I do not believe free enterprise should be permitted to destroy the air I breathe and the water I drink. The air and the water which support the trees, the game and the marine life in the provinces of Canada are very vital to their survival. It would be a very short-sighted premier of a province who would not co-operate with the minister in respect of this water bill if it were a bill which would offer a real solution. He would find he would be very popular for having given this kind of leadership. I, for one, would say "Good luck, Mr. Minister". If he can make this bill work I will be one of the first to stand up and give him the proper kudos. However, I want to make sure that he does not take a wooden attitude toward Pollution Control. I want him to convince his colleagues in the cabinet that this bill is far from being adequate in its present form.

We should welcome aid from every source. We should welcome every ounce of co-operation in order to prevent a national and international disaster. If we think big enough we may well be able to do this. We still have the water resources here. The task involved would not be an impossible one but would require a good deal of courage in the initial stages. The very factories and industries which may have to be disciplined, and perhaps taxed, in order to make this scheme work would thank the government in the end because they would then have a chance of being around on this planet for another 100 years or so. Many people are thinking about this. I like to think some of them are here. I

do not even know who put out this pamphlet to which I referred because I was so busy reading the suggestions and some of the answers contained in it. A suggestion has been made that we should have a new bill or revamp the present one in order to put some teeth in it. We should not wait for someone else to do this. It is further suggested that we should present the firms with a plan to prevent further pollution of any lakes, rivers or other water supply source.

I believe high priority should be given to this matter. I believe we should spend a significant amount of money on pollution control measures. It may be necessary to set up a special branch in the department for this purpose. I know in the great United States of America they are seriously worried about the water problem. In the next 25 years they will have to supply water to great cities like New York and Chicago. With proper planning, I believe we could supply that water. If the plan were well worked out I believe we could sell that water on a gallonage basis and not seriously lessen the supply of water in this country. I think we could sell the United States a great deal more water than they are getting at the present time. I think we could do this at reasonable prices and it would be a source of income. Some of this income could be used to train people to take more of an interest in this subject. This income would also help pay for some of the dams and hydro systems which are necessary for the transportation of this water from one part of the country to the other.

I think if we use our natural resources properly we will also have more water for our power network. Here again, cheaper power would mean that our industries might be able to afford to contribute more money to help pay for the over-all plan. The Prime Minister has assured us of his direct interest in this matter. The minister made a very fine speech in which he said what a wonderful thing it would be if we had lots of fresh water and could give this blessing to the rest of the world as well. I think we should get on with the job and stop hiding behind the excuse of no money, no co-operation or the problem of the constitution. We should send this bill to a committee composed of members who could keep an open mind about it. We should take the suggestions which I know will be made by members of the committee and then with courage, imagination and grit put this plan into effect. The type of popularity the minister and Parliament will end up with in a very few years will be well worth while, and probably the industries and the taxpayers will welcome the amount of dollars appropriated in the next budget to handle this problem in an efficient manner.

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I very seldom refuse a challenge. The hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg) challenged us on this side of the House to stand up and speak up. I should like to outline a few observations I made while he was speaking. I like to listen to the hon. member for Pembina. He is always colourful and always has some purpose in his remarks. What struck me, Mr. Speaker, was that he did not look at you for two minutes during his speech. He watched his own colleagues. He turned around and, noticing there were only two or three members on the Conservative side, insisted on watching them during the whole of the speech in an effort to convince them that this is a very good bill and that they should be here to support the government at this time rather than somewhere else.

The hon. member challenged a member on the government side to get up and speak out. At the same time he said what we need is action and leadership, not talk, not discussion, not haggling and all this kind of thing. I can tell the hon. member that we have studied the problem. We have had our own ad hoc committees. We have discussed the matter with our ministers and their officials. We know what we are doing. We also think we need action now and not talk. We know the bill will be sent to the appropriate committee where we will have another opportunity to amend it. That is why we refuse to stand up here and talk for nothing. This would only contribute to wasting the time of the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, to meet the challenge put to us by a member of the opposition, I will merely lend my voice to the Canadian municipalities which are also greatly concerned about the problem of water and air pollution. However, because certain provinces refuse for various reasons to co-operate adequately with the federal government, the means to fight pollution are denied to them.

It is not necessary to review the whole history of water and air pollution to conclude that we have now reached a critical point. This is a national, a provincial and a municipal problem which this bill attempts to remedy. But before undertaking anything the municipalities, the provinces, the federal gov-

ernment and the neighbouring countries should reach an agreement. The problem of pollution may indeed concern more than one country.

This is an urgent problem and it seems to us that the time has come to act rather than to indulge in endless discussions and studies.

• (2:50 p.m.)

In the many letters I receive, people often write about this problem because my riding is affected by pollution. I am talking about central Quebec, one of Canada's most attractive regions; my friends will not resent these remarks because they too are proud of their constituency. Since we also have our problems, people write to me asking why the government has failed to take the necessary steps.

The reason is that the federal government is limited in its action as a result of some futile discussions on the distribution of powers. The difficulty does exist, but it should not be given priority over another, much more serious problem involving the health of an entire nation, of the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, I have in hand a letter which I shall not quote in full and this for two reasons: First, because the remarks are not all fair and then, because it is obvious that the author is not aware of how the governments of his province, his municipality and his country work. But I think that this letter is an alarm call. Therefore, the government should take concrete action rather than getting lost in endless discussions.

Here is an excerpt from that letter:

Why don't the governments do something—

This is an alarming alternative: either we wake up around the year 2000 in a world where mankind is poisoned through water and air or in a world in which it is still good to live. I come back to the quotation:

Why don't the governments do something besides setting up royal commissions?

Instead of doing that, they merely discuss things in the house. And I replied to my correspondent that it was precisely on account of those conflicts of jurisdiction and party politics that nothing was being done.

The letter says further, and I quote:

What are they waiting for to make available to the automobile manufacturers the plans (which exist) for a hydraulic motor—?

I must say this is something new to me, which goes to show that the relationship between a member of parliament and his electors can be useful to him from time to time.

What are they waiting for to force, in the public interest on an international scale, all this country's industries to reduce pollution through the use of filters that would precisely eliminate most of the pollutants?

The writer of this letter may not know that this is about to be done and that we would have made much more progress without the conflicts of jurisdiction.

The letter says further on:

What are they waiting for to prohibit, again in the public interest, the use of detergents "re-enforced" with enzymes which keep on fighting against everything even once in our waters?

What can the U.N. do—?

Why are they still concerned about frontiers when pollution does not care a rap about it and attacks our whole planet without discrimination as to colour—?

As you can see my correspondent simplifies the problem. He is probably a candid innocent sould but who at last saw with his own eyes this urgent problem.

I continue to quote:

Why is the government always or nearly always late as far as its legislation is concerned—?

The reason of these delays is precisely that too many governments spend their time quarrelling with each other rather than achieving practical results. However, I must make a concession to my friends of the opposition. I said a while ago that they give us the impression that they want to protract the debate, but some of them are making positive interventions. I hope that they will continue to do so during the sittings of the parliamentary committee where the final touch will be given to this bill.

I continue quoting the letter:

Why do some people kill with "pleasure, indifference and pride" animals which do not harm anybody and which, on the contrary, destroy some of the pollutants, thus contributing to the survival of life on earth?

What can we do?

The writer speaks of bombs. He adds and I quote:

Is the status of a nation more important than the survival of the human species (4 billion people in the year 2000)?

He obviously forgets that Canada cannot solve the problems of all other countries, not even those of all the provinces in Canada without the agreement of these provinces.

Is it impossible for a supposedly rich country such as Canada to help efficiently two thirds of the population who—?

are treatened to be poisoned to death.

This letter appears like the alarm call now raised by the Canadian population as a result of the educational campaigns that were conducted in the country by magazines such as the one that was mentioned before by my friend and of certain studies initiated by technicians and scientists. The time has come for the Canadian people to call for better understanding between provincial governments, and better co-operation with the municipal authorities so that at every level of government everyone might be able to bring, as soon as possible its own contribution, for the problem is urgent indeed. It is all very well to complain because some people are starving or killing each other for reasons beyond our understanding but we had better stop our idle talk and take effective steps in order to convince the other governments that they ought to work in harmony with us so as to answer this pressing problem which threatens to annihilate humanity as a whole.

The present bill is a first step, and a very important one, in the right direction since it encourages peace and understanding between the provinces. The municipalities affected by pollution should also have their say and the provincial governments should stop considering the representatives of the municipal administrations as poor relatives or simpletons.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wish to make it clear that I am rising on a point of order, not to express my views on the bill.

I rise on a point of order and I want to draw the attention of the House to line 22 of the preamble of Bill C-144.

In order to explain my point of order, may I read in part the preamble of the bill. I quote:

[*English*]

And Whereas the Parliament of Canada is desirous that, in addition, comprehensive programs be undertaken by the Government of Canada and by the Government of Canada in cooperation with provincial governments,

• (3:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the French text reads as follows:

Et considérant que le Parlement du Canada souhaite, en outre, que des programmes d'ensemble soient entrepris par le gouvernement du Canada agissant seul ou en collaboration avec les gouvernements provinciaux...

My point of order is the following: in my humble opinion, the use of the particle "and" in the English text and the particle "ou" (or) in the French text gives more power to the minister in one case, and that raises a problem with regard creates some to the interpretation of the powers granted.

Mr. Speaker, people might say that the powers conferred under a bill do not derive from the preamble; nevertheless, the fact remains that the bill itself follows from the preamble and that both make up a whole.

My point is this: Regarding the particle "and" in the English version, it is conjunctive. If I say apples "and" oranges, I add up. The particle "and" does not really offer any alternative. One thing is not automatically excluded by another when the particle "and" is used; on the contrary it is added to the other. The particle "and" excludes nothing.

As for the particle "ou" (or) in the French version, Mr. Speaker, it has an opposite effect. It adds nothing. You can choose one thing or another: apples or oranges.

The particle "or" really offers an alternative. It is one thing or another and not both at the same time. However, the minister could interpret the English version differently. As for the particle "or", it excludes an entity, while if the particle "and" is used and if one of the entities is chosen, the other is not necessarily excluded.

I will undoubtedly be told that those considerations deal with linguistics and syntax, but it seems to me that this is important since it is one of the basic principles of the bill and it is especially important because it defines the government policy outlined in Bill C-144.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, the French text does not give the same definition of the power as the English text.

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that the words "by the Government of Canada" do not exclude possible participation by a third party which, non-officially or officially, could co-operate with the government in the application of this policy. In the French version, the exclusion is automatic. The words "par le gouvernement du Canada agissant seul" automatically exclude all provincial consultation or participation.

Mr. Speaker, it follows, in any event, that the minister, using one version or the other, could, to his advantage, work against the wishes of the provinces.

I wanted to rise on a point of order because, in my view, if one version rather than the other were invoked, this could

undermine federal-provincial relations, because the French version states, and I quote:

—comprehensive programs be undertaken by the Government of Canada—

That means that the minister, owing to that expression since it is followed by the particle "ou" (or), could neglect to consult the provinces and decide on his own accord to undertake something or implement any policy. According to the English version, it is not excluded that, should the federal government decide to act because that would be within its jurisdiction, experts or provincial counsels could co-operate in formulating or implementing the policy.

Consequently, without necessarily introducing a motion against the principle of the bill, since we agree with it, I feel that Your Honour should take the matter under advisement and give an opinion on the various possible interpretations of the two texts, so as to make them as identical as possible and avoid errors in their interpretation, and in order to have a uniform text in both the English and the French versions.

If we were dealing with a text of secondary importance, the interpretation of a sub-paragraph would not matter as much. But in this case we are dealing with the policy and the principles of the bill. Mr. Speaker, I want you to know we would greatly appreciate your intervening with regard to the interpretation of those two versions.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might say a word on the same point of order. I should like to make clear that it does not come by surprise so far as I am concerned; the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) was kind enough to inform me that he was going to raise this point of order, and I have been looking at the wording of the preamble. As a result, it seems to me that the hon. member does have a point that should be looked at by someone, and I know of no better place to look for protection around here than the Chair.

The British North America Act, in section 132, and the Official Languages Act in one section—I have not got it in front of me, but I know it is there—both make it clear that so far as the Statutes of Canada are concerned, both versions are authentic—the English version and the French version. I submit there is a danger that if we pass this bill in its present form we will have an English text that seems to say one thing, and a French text that seems to say another.

[Mr. Fortin.]

Like a good many other members of the House, I cannot claim to be very proficient in French, and I do not claim to be extremely proficient in English; but I do know the difference between the English word "and" and the French word "ou". One puts two things together, and the other gives a choice. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this should definitely be looked at as a point of order, and perhaps Your Honour can give a ruling on the matter either today or the next time this bill is before us.

What we are looking at is line 21 on page 1 of the English version where we have the words "government of Canada and by the government of Canada in co-operation with provincial governments," as opposed to line 22 of the French version where we have the corresponding phrase "seul ou." I submit they say quite different things. It is altogether likely that the hon. member for Lotbinière and I would disagree as to what we think the bill ought to say, but he and I would at least agree that the two versions ought to say the same thing. I hope Your Honour will take the point of order under advisement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): As far as the point of order is concerned, Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am prepared to hear further contributions on the point of order, but I might indicate right away that the point of order raised by the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) is a valid one and I am ready to agree to the suggestion that the Chair reflect on it over the weekend. However, if hon. members want to make further contributions, it I am prepared to hear them. The hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria (Mr. Corbin).

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief. I do not rise to—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have recognized the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) might have been justified to rise on a point of order in this connection, since, for all practical purposes, it is only a matter of construing in the

same way two versions of the same act. Yet, I do not think the French text means the same thing as the English text.

However, I did not rise on a point of order to discuss the syntax or the structure of the French or English wording. I can see that the two versions are at variance, and that is why I think that the hon. member for Lotbinière is probably right in rising on a point of order. But I do not believe that this is the right time or the right place to do so. This is now the debate on second reading, the purpose of which is to refer the bill to the appropriate committee.

I would suggest that such representations should be made during a committee meeting, in the presence of the department's legal advisers. Then, clarification of the meaning of the text can be given. At any rate, today we are not preparing to adopt the bill as a whole. There are other points which might have to be debated. However, I feel that this kind of point of order should be made to the proper committee.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, what my colleague has just said is substantially what I myself wanted to say. Obviously, there has been a mistake in the translation. Before I took the floor a while ago, a government member told me that he intended to bring up, during a committee meeting, the question raised by the member for Lotbinière. Whether this is in order or not, it is perhaps not the main point which, I suggest, is that the correction be made, because there is an unexplainable error in the translation.

• (3:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, just a word on the point of order. I think it is very well taken, because the whole fundamental objective of the bill is in question. Perhaps the wording of the main operative section of the bill is not affected, but certainly the difference between the two proposals that are mentioned in the preamble is of substance in the French version. Therefore, I concur in the decision to consider this matter further. I just add that I am very glad to see a number of Liberal members jumping up to speak when they can do so in the safety of not having to talk about the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) rising on the point of order?

Mr. Orlikow: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I might indicate, as I have already, that I shall be very pleased to reflect over the weekend upon the point of order raised by the hon. member.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make some comments on this bill. Today is January 16, and when the minister made his speech on November 20 he said:

> I begin the debate on this bill with a great sense of urgency, and with the knowledge that what we say and do here over the next few weeks will affect the lives of all Canadians for decades to come. We must act, and we must act today, to rehabilitate, to protect and to develop our priceless national heritage and our most important single natural resource, our water.

That was said on November 20. Then the bill disappeared from the face of the earth and we did not get it back until almost two months later. So much for the extent of urgency that the minister expressed. The minister was in his usual fine form and we got everything from poetry to philosophy—

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I might point out that the bill would have been passed long ago if the opposition had not wasted so much time obstructing matters that could have been passed much more quickly and much more effectively—

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. I suggest to the minister—

An hon. Member: He is just polluting the atmosphere.

Mr. Orlikow: —and to the House leader who has been expressing his views outside the House about the iniquities of members on this side holding up the business of the House, that if being a Member of Parliament is a full-time job we should have been back here shortly after Labour Day, rather than October 22. We lost six weeks when we could have been discussing matters of importance. We do not need any lecture on that matter from members of the government side.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Orlikow: Members on the other side call "order." They should have objected when the minister was speaking. The minister gave a very eloquent speech and dealt with the reasons why we need to act in the field of water pollution. At pages 1048 and 1049 of *Hansard* he summarized the things which this

bill will achieve, how the various forms of government will act, what their responsibilities will be, and what are the purposes of the bill. But he left out just one thing. At page 1051 of *Hansard* he raised the question, but did not supply the answer. He asked:

> Who will pay the gigantic costs involved? The answer to that is that just as everyone is responsible, so in the end everyone must pay.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention just how bad is the record of some of the largest municipalities in Canada and how necessary it is that the federal government do more than talk, more than pass legislation such as this, more than lecture provincial and municipal governments. The federal government, which is the major tax collecting agency in this country, must help the municipalities meet their obligations in the field of sewage disposal and the treatment of the water used in our cities. At present the municipalities are unable to do this because they simply do not have the money.

As other members have pointed out, pollution is prevalent in every province and virtually every city of this country. Just four days ago there was a report from my own province that in Red Sucker Lake water pollution is a growing problem. The effects on the Manitoba fishing industry—

Mr. Greene: Red Sucker Lake—is that an NDP lake?

Mr. Orlikow: This report reflects the effects on the Manitoba fishing industry as a result of mercury being found in fish caught in that province. It has now been established that the mercury is waste from industries in the province of Saskatchewan. What can the province of Manitoba do about that situation? Very little, I should think, although my former colleague, the Premier of Manitoba, has threatened to sue the federal government for its lack of control.

Every day in the newspapers one finds reference to pollution and the problems created by it from one end of Canada to the other. I looked at some of the newspapers of the last couple of days and found from British Columbia a report that the Utica Mining and Smelting Company wants to dump 9 million gallons of waste into Rupert Inlet. With regard to Nova Scotia there is a report that the Scott Pulp Mill is polluting the water in the Pictou area; and in Preston, Ontario, a potato chip factory is dumping waste into the Grand River. In Sudbury, International Nickel Company, one of the most profitable companies in Canada, is dumping effluent into the rivers and poison into the air. As I drive through that city I can imagine what the world will look like if and when an atomic bomb is dropped.

What are the federal and provincial governments doing about this tremendously wealthy company? Virtually nothing. Indeed, one does not need to go to Nova Scotia, Vancouver Island or northern Ontario; one needs only to walk 100 yards from this building to see the Ottawa River—one of the largest in Canada, if not in the world—becoming in effect an open sewer. It is so bad that scientists at the University of Ottawa suggest that in the very near future all forms of life in the river will die.

• (3:20 p.m.)

In the 80 miles between Ottawa and the mouth of the Ottawa River near Montreal, 14 communities, ten of them in Quebec and four in Ontario, are pouring raw sewage into the Ottawa River. Paper mills, four in Quebec and two in Ontario, are dumping an enormous amount of waste into the river every day; so much so that, as I have already said, it has been predicted that soon no life will be possible in the river. The city of Ottawa sewage disposal plant treats primarily only that sewage which Ottawa dumps into the river, the result being that only 30 per cent of the suspended solids is taken out of and removed from the sewage in the river. This means that a city with a population of 200,000 is dumping its raw sewage into the river.

On the other hand Hull, across the river in Quebec, with 57,000 people has no sewage treatment facilities at all. Only 8 per cent of 143,000 people in Quebec living along the Ottawa River treat their sewage. The paper mills on both sides of the river pour 130 million gallons of effluent into the river every day. Is it any wonder that when one steps outside this House sometimes the stench of the river is unbearable? That is the situation regarding the Ottawa River. In Montreal, a city represented in Parliament by the Prime Minister himself, 2.5 million people pour into the St. Lawrence River 500 million gallons of virtually untreated sewage every day.

The minister made a most eloquent speech; he is one of the most eloquent speakers in the chamber. But on analyzing his speech one realizes there is little meat in it and little indication that the federal government intends to remedy the problem of water pollution. From my reading of the speech it seems that the federal government is saying

in its proposed bill that the provinces now have, and should continue to exercise, the main responsibility in the field of water pollution control and water resource management. The federal government supposedly will help the provinces by providing research, advice and a communications network among the provinces in respect of water matters. Apparently it will do little else. The bill promises little action by the government.

We think that water pollution matters ought to be considered within a more comprehensive framework embracing water resource management; that national standards with regard to water should apply to all parts of the country and that the agency to introduce these standards is the federal government. From my reading of the bill, I do not think the government proposes to do this.

The bill is deficient inasmuch as many waters in the country are not covered by the legislation. The bill covers only those waters which may be considered interprovincial or international in nature. It does not set uniform standards and gives us no assurance of stopping wastes being dumped into the rivers and lakes of this country. We are told that the bill is to be flexible. I suggest, instead, that we shall see laxity of enforcement in those cases where it is against the interest of an industry or province to enforce the measure.

For example, it is conceivable that the Irving interests in New Brunswick, which are not noted for being overly concerned about the public welfare, could bring pressure to bear on the government of that province or on the local municipality, and in that way not be forced to clean up the pollution which is being created. It seems that this bill will allow industry to pay for its right to pollute. This is an iniquitous proposal. If we are serious about controlling pollution, we should not merely offer incentives to industry but we should make a decision collectively after consulting provinces and municipalities. We must insist that all bodies which permit pollution to occur, including municipalities, obey the law.

Although the government says that it wants to decrease the incidence of pollution, from my reading of the bill I doubt the seriousness of the government's intention. To illustrate my point, to apprize hon. members of what is happening and to show the extent to which municipal governments are guilty of permitting pollution to occur, I refer to figures contained in the Sixth Annual Review of the Economic Council of Canada entitled, "Perspective 1975".

The following cities have virtually no facilities for the treatment of sewage being dumped into rivers or the sea: St. John's is listed as having 100 per cent no treatment; Dartmouth-Halifax, 99 per cent no treatment; Saint John, 99.8 per cent no treatment; Quebec City, represented in this chamber by that great humanitarian, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), 100 per cent no treatment; Montreal, which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) represents in part, 91.6 per cent no treatment. Then Windsor, represented in part by the progressive new Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gray), 85 per cent no treatment; Saskatoon, represented by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) responsible for the Wheat Board, 93 per cent no treatment; Vancouver, represented in part by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford), 59 per cent no treatment; and Victoria, British Columbia, is listed as having 98.9 per cent no treatment.

This table indicates those few cities which have primary treatment facilities. Ottawa is listed as having primary treatment facilities to the extent of 100 per cent, that is, all Ottawa sewage receives primary treatment. This treatment affects only about one-third of the waste materials being dumped into the river. Hamilton treats its primary sewage to the extent of 100 per cent. That city contains the Steel Company of Canada and Defasco. Millions of gallons of polluted water from those steel industries are poured every day into Hamilton Bay. This is the record, Mr. Speaker. One finds that municipalities are well aware of their problems and have been calling upon federal and provincial governments to take action to solve them. If municipalities have failed to take action, it is not because they have been unaware of the extent of the problem they face.

I have before me a pamphlet prepared by Mr. Eric Beecroft, chairman of the Department of Political Science, University of Western Ontario, for the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities entitled, "The Municipality's Role in Water Management". On page 7 of the pamphlet Mr. Beecroft says the following:

> (b) Planning grants should be offered—by federal-provincial agreement—to encourage provinces and municipalities to make an early start in surveying their problems and preparing their

programs. Such planning grants should be generous enough to ensure that studies will be undertaken promptly, on a regional basis, wherever needed.

(c) There should be a long-term program of financial aid, guaranteed to last for at least five or possibly ten years, along the lines outlined in more detail in the main text. The aims of such aid should be:

(i) to give not only loan support but generous grant aid, to municipalities or regional groups of municipalities, to enable them to proceed with essential programs of general benefit to the health and economy of the nation as a whole;

(ii) to assure that no undertakings essential to pollution control (for example, projects to relieve the overload on combined sewers) should be omitted for lack of municipal financing—

At page 14, in discussing major obstacles to action, he says:

The second is that senior government financing, when offered at all,

(a) is not offered in a form which encourages regional cooperation;

(b) is limited generally to loans which only add to an already heavy municipal debt burden—

• (3:30 p.m.)

We know that the municipalities and the provincial governments are now paying an interest rate of 10 per cent and upward whenever they borrow money. Therefore, it is not surprising that faced with the prospect of sharp increases in municipal taxes and the opposition of local taxpayers they should be, to say the least, loth to proceed as rapidly as they should with the extension or construction of sewage disposal systems. It would probably cost Montreal $100 million or more to build the treatment facilities necessary to clean up the sewage which flows from a city of 2½ million people, and in the light of its financial difficulties it is hardly surprising that the city of Montreal has not been inclined to move in this direction. Mr. Beecroft goes on to say:

Senior government financing . . . is seldom effective in bringing industries into conformity with water quality standards and into co-operation with municipalities in their region.

He talks about the capacity of the municipalities to pay for this work, and says:

A factor to be taken into account is that municipalities do not have the revenue-raising capacity necessary to warrant a substantial enlargement of municipal debt and that furthermore to make matters worse for municipalities, other requirements of very high priority and very costly—education, transportation and traffic, and comprehensive measures of redevelopment—are competing with water supply and water purification for the limited revenue resources.

It is true that the minister in his speech in November spoke about the increased aid which municipalities could get from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. I do not know on what information the minister based that part of his speech, but a return on October 23, 1969, in response to a series of questions asked by my hon. friend from Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), gave an entirely different impression. We were given a list of municipal sewage loans approved under the National Housing Act and the applications received by CMHC from June 1 to December 30, 1969. Among the towns whose applications were refused were Halifax, Hamilton and Saskatoon. I mention them because they are among the largest cities in a long list of municipalities whose applications were turned down.

These are the facts. The municipalities have a major role to play if we are do deal effectively with the pollution of Canada's waters. The municipalities have made it clear repeatedly over the last ten years, in representations to the federal government, that they simply do not possess the financial resources necessary to play the part which they must play if we are to deal effectively with this problem.

What has been the government's answer? Partly, I suppose, because of the constitutional view taken by the Prime Minister that the municipalities are creatures of the provinces and that the federal government cannot, therefore, deal with them directly, hon. gentlemen opposite take the position that the federal government cannot do more than it is doing. For my part, I think the Prime Minister's view on this question is a mistaken one. However, I do not wish to discuss this aspect of the government's policy in detail. I would refer hon. members who are interested in this subject to the speeches made, unfortunately outside this chamber, by a former mayor of Toronto, the hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens) regarding the failure of this government to deal with the problems of the cities.

In addition to all this, we are faced with the determination of the government to follow a program of austerity. Mr. Speaker, we cannot follow a program of austerity, we cannot cut down the funds expended by the federal government, while attacking a problem of this magnitude. The federal government cannot follow a program of austerity while at the same time helping the municipalities to extend or build new sewage disposal facilities by means of generous loans or subsidies whose effect would be to lower interest rates for such work.

Because of the government's mistaken view of its responsibility in relation to the cities of this country, and because of its austerity program, the fact is that in the next few years the cities of Canada will not meet their responsibilities; they will not move with the speed with which they should in modernizing their sewage disposal and treatment facilities. This is a fact, and all the speeches the minister may make either in Parliament or across the country will mean nothing until the federal government gives to the municipalities and the provinces the kind of meaningful financial assistance which would encourage them to meet their responsibilities in this field. This has not been done to date, and I believe it will not be done in the coming years as a result of the mistaken and niggardly policies of the federal government.

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted with Bill C-144. Its main objective is to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada, their improvement, development and utilization. I am happy that the federal government has moved off the sidelines and that it will now be saying to the provinces, including my own province of Quebec, that it is prepared to enter into agreements to establish on a national, provincial, regional or lake or river basin basis, intergovernmental committees or other bodies which, among other things, would maintain continuing consultation on water resource matters, advise on priorities for research, planning, conservation, development and utilization based on the formulation of water policies and programs, and facilitate the co-ordination and implementation of water policies and programs.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I should like to direct a question to the minister in this regard. Perhaps the point does not require clarification, but I would appreciate some assurance when he replies. I presume that since no reference is made in clause 3 to national interest, these bodies could be established, in agreement with the provinces, in regard to any river covered by the legislation, which would include both boundary and international rivers.

There is a river in my constituency, the Chateauguay River, which crosses the international border as a stream but is nevertheless described as a river both on the United States side and on the Canadian side of the border. It develops into a river on the Canadian side, and in turn has a tributary or two, which themselves are called rivers and originate a few miles across the international boundary. I know that it is a matter of very immediate interest to the people in the counties of Chateauguay and Huntingdon, through which these streams and rivers flow, that the Chateauguay River basin be included under the terms of the act. I know that they hope it will be possible, by agreement with the government of Quebec, to establish a consultative body, as provided by the bill, for the Chateauguay River valley.

We have in the Montreal region a number of bodies of water associated with the St. Lawrence River and which I presume are of national interest in the same way as the St. Lawrence River. The Lake St. Louis portion of the St. Lawrence River was, until a few years ago, Montreal's major water playground. On the south shore, the major water recreational area has been the Laprairie basin. Both of these bodies of water which form part of the St. Lawrence River are now seriously polluted and unuseable for swimming purposes.

The pollution of Lake St. Louis and the Laprairie basin has been so serious over the last few years that we now find small craft navigation is being impeded by the growth of weeds, which have primarily been caused by phosphates entering the St. Lawrence River system from farm and industrial waste as well as from household detergents. Pollution has rendered these two most beautiful Montreal area sections of the St. Lawrence River practically unusable for recreation. It is a situation that we realize has required attention for a long time. Happily, this bill is finally going to provide the impetus for action.

This bill provides that the federal government may enter into an agreement with a province to establish an intergovernmental committee with jurisdiction for, among other things, river basins. The bill also provides that where there is a national interest in water resource management, the federal government can enter into an agreement with the provincial government concerned to establish and maintain an inventory of the waters, to conduct research, and to formulate comprehensive water resource management plans, including detailed estimates of the cost of implementation of those plans. It also provides for the designing of projects for the efficient conservation, development and utilization of such waters and, finally, for the

implementation of any plans or projects referred to in paragraphs (d) and (e) of clause 4.

This last provision is of particular importance because it clearly implies that the federal government is prepared not only to formulate plans but to implement them. There is the further implication that the federal government will pay for a substantial portion of that implementation. I hope the federal government is planning to make a substantial contribution—by "substantial" I mean at least 50 per cent—to the cost.

The dramatic feature of this bill is that, in cases of significant national interest, where all reasonable efforts have been made by the federal government to reach agreement with the provincial governments on water resource management and its ancillary aspects have been unfruitful, the federal government can then act on its own. Thus, we in the Montreal area can now expect action to be taken within the foreseeable future.

I both hope and expect agreement will be reached with the province of Quebec to establish the necessary anti-pollution programs for our rivers in Quebec, and more particularly for the St. Lawrence. It would be in the interests of Quebec, and especially the citizens of the Montreal area, if such action were taken soon.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The fact that there is a possibility of direct federal action if no agreement is reached with Quebec and Quebec does not move on it itself within a reasonable time, is an incentive to provincial action. I am singling out my province because I represent the most populated constituency in that province, but this indirect form of pressure applies to any province which is going slow on anti-pollution measures. The threat of possible direct federal action will give the necessary incentive to Quebec to devise and initiate, in collaboration with the government of Canada, measures to deal with pollution of this most important body of water in our province—a matter which is of vital concern to all residents of the federal constituency of Laprairie.

My constituency borders on Canada's major water artery, the St. Lawrence. For too long the citizens living in the Montreal area generally, and in particular those living in areas bordering the St. Lawrence, have been deprived of the recreational benefits of its use. I should like to hear a brief indication of what the minister considers to be significant national interest. I suspect this would not apply, for example, to the Chateauguay River which flows across the international boundary. It would be useful to the House if the minister today or next week gave an indication of how he will determine those matters which are of significant national interest. Will it be water flow or the non-recreational use which has been made of particular water bodies in the past? I should like clarification from the minister as to this definition.

[Mr. Watson.]

The other matter to which I draw the minister's attention is the desperate need which exists in Canada and throughout the world at this time for cheaper methods of sewage disposal. We know how to deal with water pollution of our rivers and streams. We know that several alternative sewage disposal methods are available to municipalities. We also know that up to now these methods have proven terribly expensive. Surely, with our advanced technology we in Canada are in a position to develop less expensive methods of dealing with pollution. Surely, there is a way of dealing with pollution without bankrupting ourselves in the process.

I will give an example of just how expensive an anti-pollution drive can be and how, if proper planning is not instituted, it can result in ridiculous situations. Five years ago, in a part of my former constituency a town built a sewage disposal plant on the recommendation of its engineers. It cost about $500,000. No other town bordering the Chateauguay River has since installed a sewage disposal plant. The result is that this town with a population of approximately 2,000 is saddled with a plant that costs $40,000 a year or more to operate. It is cleaning the sewage and pouring the cleansed water into a river which is polluted.

In my view there has been in this instance, a mis-allocation of public funds. The federal government is involved in that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation approved the loan to the municipality. Officers of CMHC have argued that once an application by a municipality has been approved by the municipal affairs department of Quebec, they are duty-bound to allocate the funds. CMHC has not fulfilled its duty to the public by simply accepting, without submitting any views of its own, a request from a municipality for a loan to construct a plant which is without question too expensive and which has proven to be an almost unbearable load on the taxpayers of the municipality.

This incident has demonstrated to me, and should have demonstrated to CMHC, that what is now needed in Canada, more than anything else, is serious research into the development of inexpensive sewage disposal plants. Less costly disposal units are desperately needed. I hope that when the minister responsible for the implementation of Bill C-144 decides on priorities, he will give first priority to the development of inexpensive sewage disposal plants. I hope he will at the same time establish an apparatus through which we can make available information concerning the least expensive type of sewage disposal facilities which can be made available to all the municipalities of Canada. I am convinced that this would be the best first step the minister could take in implementing the attack on water pollution which is the objective of this bill.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

SPORTS

MEASURE TO ESTABLISH LITTLE LEAGUE WEEK

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved that Bill C-22, respecting Little League Week, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced during the previous Parliament by my colleague, the hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray). He has since been promoted to a higher position but retains an interest in the Little League and is desirous that we do something with this Bill. I agreed that I would reintroduce it in this Parliament. In the city of Windsor, which we represent, many dedicated people are doing a tremendous job in connection with the Little League organization. We have watched this program closely and have seen the wonderful things they have done in helping young boys become better citizens.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Little League baseball is an avenue through which early training, teamwork, sportsmanship, discipline and character-building are instilled. The volunteer leaders in Little League baseball, certainly those I know personally in my area, have made the program part of our way of life. It does one's heart good to see the tremendous crowds that follow Little League baseball games and participate in the program.

Little League baseball boys have the opportunity to play the game under advantageous conditions. This contributes to their welfare. More than 750 Little Leaguers have joined the ranks of professional baseball players in the United States, and thousands more continue to play the game at high school and on the sandlots. These people assume leadership in all walks of life. I was a baseball player when I was young. I do not say that it gave me great leadership ability, but I know it helped me become a better politician.

Little League baseball not only fosters friendship among boys; it develops co-ordination and good health habits. It also breaks down social barriers and makes for a more closely-knit community. It knows no national boundaries, because leagues have developed in 27 countries and baseball is played with equal enthusiasm everywhere. Little League baseball also fosters the healthiest kind of father-son relationship. Through baseball father and son meet on common ground from which blooms companionship, respect and love. All parents strive to give their youngsters a happy childhood that will prepare them for the ups and downs of life. The Little League is only one avenue of reaching this goal.

The managers, coaches and other officials of the league who devote so much of their time, thought and energy to providing constructive direction for the boys, deserve our respect and gratitude. I do not think they are seeking too much when they ask that the second week in June be designated as Little League Week in recognition of the efforts of the Little League to help boys develop qualities of good citizenship and sportsmanship through baseball and to make them better citizens.

Over 2½ million boys take part in Little League baseball in Canada and in 23 other countries. Canada has more Little Leagues than any country with the exception of the United States. In Canada nearly 50,000 boys participate, with the assistance and guidance of over 7,000 adult volunteers. I would ask the House to favourably consider this bill.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, although not a heavy-hitter

like the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan), I should like to take part in this debate. My colleague just interjected that perhaps the heaviest-hitter in the government is the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). I should say for the record that I did try to get one of our athletes to take part in the debate this afternoon, but they are either too stiff to get around after the Governor General's skating party or are at home with the 'flu.

Seriously, as one who has had a very sincere interest in baseball all my life I give my full support to this bill. I think it is a very worth-while measure. Many of us have had a connection with Little League baseball in our constituencies. I suppose, like most members of this House, my interest is good but my ability to participate is diminished by my activities here.

Those who assist Little League baseball, the fathers and others who are community-minded, deserve a great deal of credit for this type of activity. I take the opportunity to personally congratulate these people for the work they do. They unselfishly devote many hours to the Little League. I know something about this matter. So far as the value of Little League baseball is concerned, one of its greatest advantages is that where there are Little Leagues, juvenile delinquency is probably at a rate lower than any other part of the country. In other words, this type of activity reduces one of the problems with which we are so concerned these days.

I am also pleased to take part in this debate because of the diminishing interest there now seems to be in baseball. It is not as popular as body-contact sports such as football and hockey. Television presents these sports to greater advantage. Nevertheless, baseball is deeply rooted in our lives. I think a measure such as this would not only help our young people but would cause more attention to be directed to a very honourable sport and one which has not quite the glamour of some others.

Some thought should be given in committee to the considerations in respect of declaring such-and-such a week to be an official week, because it may be that everyone who has a pet project would want to have it authorized as one of the 52 that could have a week of recognition during the year. With that one qualification, I should like to congratulate the honourable, heavy-hitter from Essex for bringing forward this measure. I support its referral to the committee and hope something will come out of this proposal.

[Mr. Bell.]

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to congratulate the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) for sponsoring this bill. I am pleased to support it. Like the hon. member and like many other members of this House, I am a ball player —but I come from the prairies, where we play more and better ball. There was no Little League baseball when I was of the age when I might have played it. I did not have an opportunity to play baseball until I was 20 years of age. I am sure I would have been a much better player had there been a Little League in those days. However, when one watches the efforts of the House of Commons team and the young PCs Allstars on the lawn of Parliament Hill each year, one realizes that the Little League would have been useful in earlier days.

I should also like to add to what the previous speaker said about the interest in baseball these days. Baseball has always been my favourite sport. It requires a great deal of effort and organization to promote and keep it going. It is a sport which requires modern equipment, facilities, grounds, and so on. I believe it also requires a greater degree of thinking while one is playing than most other sports. In my opinion this is needed in the sporting world as well as the physical training that goes with all sports.

The other point I wish to make also pertains to something said by the previous speaker. While I have nothing against pancake weeks or basket-weaving weeks, and so on, I believe a program such as the Little League is more deserving of this type of recognition than some of the commercial-product type national weeks and days we have all year, every year right across this country. Again I wish to congratulate the hon. member who is sponsoring this bill. We are pleased to support it.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I, too, am pleased to commend the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) who moved this bill. I hope he will not be disturbed if I contribute one or two matters which represent the sort of second thought that must be given to the bill before it is adopted. The hon. member has the office next to mine. He is known for the forthright way in which he expresses his opinions. I am sure that it will not in any way disturb him if I make one or two suggestions which are perhaps worthy of further consideration.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The Little League of Canada is an outgrowth of an organization in the United States. The Little League was incorporated in the early 1950s and has its headquarters in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. It is a very good example of an organized group which conducts research, maintains statistics and does its very best to promote the sport with proper regard to safety and the type of equipment that must be developed and provided. It also pays attention to public relations. The activities of the Little League leads to a Little World series which is held in the United States and which we also have in Canada.

The mover of the bill was kind enough to show me a few minutes ago the report on the Little World series which was held on August 20, 21, 22 and 24, 1968, in Williamsport, Pennsylvania. A similar program was held in Canada, and there are pictures of the team at Sherbrooke. The western team at Santa Anna, California, was declared the champion. The Little League is very well recognized. Its players are young people under the age of 16. It has extended into Canada and, I believe, involves 50,000 young people. In my constituency there is a very active organization, and the parents who donate their services to promoting baseball among the younger generation perform a service for which the community has every reason to be thankful. In other words, there is no question in my mind nor, I am sure, in the mind of any member of this House, that the program of the Little League is a wholesome and highly desirable type of activity.

I have several questions which I believe should be asked. The bill before us proposes to designate a Little League Week. About 40 national sports organizations in Canada have at one time or another expressed to the department their interest in a similar type of designation. The hon. member for Regina Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) suggested this would still leave open twelve weeks in the year. It would, but I am sure he would be the first to say that we must have priorities in this regard. It is possible that other worthy causes not related to sports will seek a similar designation. We all agree that there is a limit to how far we can go in designating weeks for this type of cause.

I wish to go on record as wishing that some recognition be given this group. I say that without reservation. But I do not believe our neighbours to the south have yet designated a Little League Week. They operate under a national charter and within the last two years they have sought to establish a similar type of organization in Canada. Until two years ago all the funds collected, entry fees, membership fees and insurance premiums, were paid in U.S. funds through the head office in Pennsylvania.

I believe they have taken steps to build a Canadian organization to meet the concern that at one time was expressed on that score. But apart from the basic question of how far we should go in designating the Babe Ruth League, the Little League or the various football leagues and other organizations, I suggest hon. members should think about policy before we make such designation by an act of the House.

The basic question that remains relates to the place of this organization and its structure in Canadian sport.

Parliament has established a National Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport. There have been discussions at various times to the end that the Little League organization be affiliated with a group which is known as the Canadian Federation of Amateur Baseball. Unfortunately, up to this time no resolution on this matter has been put forward. Funds are provided through the National Advisory Council to assist in a number of activities in Canada, among which is baseball.

There has been no affiliation of the Little League group with any of the established sports organizations that are receiving official or semi-official recognition through the Department of National Health and Welfare. I am not prepared to say that it is necessary that they should do so. I feel that the matter should be discussed and reviewed in an appropriate forum. In other words, if we have a national policy on sports, if we have established grants to encourage and develop various sports activities, the proper question to pose is: What is the relationship of the Little League to the bodies that have been given official or semi-official recognition?

I hope there will be further discussion of this matter. I am confident that there is nothing that cannot be resolved in a fair and amicable way, recognizing that everyone concerned is serving the younger generation, trying to develop activities that are healthy and in which we want our young people to engage.

Another comment that has been made—I simply wish to mention it without associating myself with it—relates to the question of the

degree of Canadian control of the program. I have referred to the discussions that took place regarding the lack of affiliation of Canadian-organized bodies. There is no question that the Little League is highly organized through the head office in Pennsylvania which continues to direct and control the program.

I listened to the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre and to the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell). I was pleased that neither of them raised the question of Canadian control. It has been raised in other quarters. The question of the development of institutions and organizations which are controlled within our own society is one which leads to a discussion which cannot always be productive.

I have listened to those who support the Watkins point of view in regard to industry. The last speaker is a member of that group. I am not one of those who share that point of view. I do not share the concern that is often expressed in this regard. I do not think we can make lacrosse our national sport in the sense in which some hon. members have proposed it at different times. It is probably the only truly distinctive Canadian game with a wide following and participation. We have long given up trying to make cricket the national sport of this country because it has not "taken" here and does not receive the response of other games.

There is no doubt in my mind that the influence of T.V. has resulted in the promotion of sports such as hockey, football and baseball. I believe our neighbours to the south will have to accept Canadian hockey players and we will have to accept U.S. football players. I suspect that there will be an expansion of baseball in our country. It is the kind of sport that is adapted to television and to the kind of spectacle that our people love to see.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I am one of those who enjoy these sports as much as any member of the House, and I am not at any point going to say we should look down on the sports that are gaining a broad North American audience, and in any way deplore them. We have a broad range of athletic, social and cultural activities which are common to the North American continent, and baseball is one. The associations and organizations which have devoted themselves to the sponsoring of this kind of sport commend themselves for favourable consideration. I believe the Little League should receive all the encouragement that can be given it, because of the program it has demonstrated it is capable of generating. It is a very well organized group. There is a wide degree of participation by younger people, and by parents in a voluntary capacity.

I am told that there is a series of interleagues between Canadian and American cities at border points. When Canadian teams are not sufficiently numerous, they fill in and play back and forth with teams from the United States. I think this is a very helpful, healthy sign and is the type of activity that builds international good will from a very early age.

In reviewing this bill, Mr. Speaker, I have called to the attention of hon. members that there is still an unresolved problem in relation to some of the other groups that are receiving official recognition and support. I believe that hon. members should also consider the basic question of what form of encouragement and recognition we should give. We must decide how many weeks we can give to baseball, football, hockey, the Babe Ruths, the Peewees, the Juniors, the Little League, and the various age groups that are organized in this way. I think before we make the decision that this week will be Little League Week, we should consider a policy and be prepared to say to other groups, "This is the kind of encouragement and recognition we are prepared to extend to you, and we wish you all the best in developing your program."

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, it is good that we have a private members' hour, because every once in a while we get a refreshing suggestion like this. I hasten to give my unqualified support to the idea that we give as much publicity, encouragement, financial and every other type of assistance as possible to the people who run Little League baseball.

As a member of the Mounted Police I was thrown into close contact with young people who got off on the wrong track, and from my experience and the experience of others with whom I have worked I find that when young people are involved in something like Little League baseball, the incidence of juvenile delinquency falls off dramatically.

I recall in a certain town the juvenile court had to hold special sessions every week. Then a young corporal in the Mounted Police set up a boxing class in the town. He had been running it only a few months when the juve-

nile court had to close entirely; there was no outward manifestation of juvenile delinquency. After having a record of being the worst community in Canada, in a few weeks, it became one of the best.

The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) is to be congratulated for taking up the ball from where it was dropped. Discussion on this bill opens up a whole field of interest. Some people, and perhaps they are dreamers, say there is no such thing as a bad boy, but there certainly is such a thing as a bad boy if you do not give him something to do. But given a proper outlet for their over-abundant energies, very few young people will go wrong. I think this is the point the hon. member is trying to make, and I support it.

In our day young people were called bad or difficult; they were not called juvenile delinquents. Society is vitally interested in helping these young people, but methods have changed over the years. The wood shed and the strap were used in my schooldays. Now we use a lot of fancy psychology. Perhaps we need a happy medium between the two. When you give a boy proper leadership and there is family teamwork, juvenile delinquency becomes a minimal problem.

The community of Sherwood Park, a satelite town near Edmonton, Alberta, is so well organized that I believe all girls and boys of school age have an opportunity to participate in Little League baseball. It also provides a wonderful opportunity for parents to get out, to get a little fresh air and keep in contact with their own and other children in the community, all of which makes the family work together and play together. I do not think it is necessary to add that Sherwood Park is not a nest of juvenile delinquents.

The service clubs of Canada have always been helpful with regard to the young. The Optimists' clubs across Canada have supported the Air Cadets, a natural place to which young people graduate from Little League baseball. At a later age our magnificent Air Force caters to these young people who, when mature, may have a role in defending Canadian skies.

This bill also brings to mind the need for a well-organized, national physical fitness program. I am not alarmed about setting aside a week for Little League baseball because I am quite sure in that week, basketball, hockey, skiing, and so forth, would also receive more attention and promotion. Perhaps a better name could be found for it. Youth Appreciation Week is recognized in many areas, and perhaps Little League Week is an offshoot of that. I give my support to this type of activity.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I feel that if the CYC had been involved in this type of thing, its reputation might have been saved and the thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money used to much greater advantage. I hope that even at this late stage the CYC might be revamped, with a little encouragement and the proper terms of reference. Most of its members, if not all, joined with the intention of carrying out projects like this. If we have a plan for them, a little supervision and well-defined terms of reference, the CYC may yet have a fully up-to-date physical fitness program for the country.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt other members wish to speak on this subject. I hope we will send the bill to committee.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my intervention in the debate on this very interesting bill will be brief indeed—and I am as gratified as hon. members opposite at that. However, I think the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan), coming from a somewhat deprived area of Canada where, unfortunately, the Canadian Radio-Television Commission is unable to intercept the signals from the five Detroit television stations across the river, may have a somewhat distorted view of what is good for Canada. I make this point before the bill goes to committee because I note the first two words of paragraph 2 of the bill are "throughout Canada". I am not sure it is a good thing for the fabric of Canadian culture that we observe and honour an institution that has been enshrined by legislative action of the United States Congress as the national sport of the United States of America.

Mr. Baldwin: Wait until they hear about this in Calgary.

Mr. Mahoney: I wonder if we would not be wiser, Mr. Speaker, to limit the geographic purview of this bill to a long baldhead, or perhaps a sinister-free, distance from the United States border. Seriously, I join other members in endorsing this bill. I hope it will present a more realistic approach to the fact of the continental entity which we enjoy, rather than some of the things which we observed and heard in areas of entertainment in the last few weeks.

Establishment of Little League Week

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to participate briefly in this debate. We have listened to a number of our colleagues who have a great love of baseball, and one or two of them are young enough to recall the days when they played it themselves.

Mr. Bell: We all are.

Mr. Blair: I am not claiming any great record as a baseball player but perhaps I have one distinction, that of having been an executive of one of the local Little Leagues in Ottawa, the McKellar Park Little League, located in the constituency of my good friend the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis).

We are all aware that governments are taking a greater interest in sports than in years gone by. Many of the facilities used by Little Leagues are provided by the communities, and principally by the municipalities. There is considerable support for sport from various agencies of the provincial governments. Lately, the National Advisory Council on Fitness and Amateur Sport has played what I consider to be a significant role in encouraging worth-while sport in Canada. I do not wish to recall recent history unduly, but I feel that as Canadians we can all take pride in the efforts which our government and its agencies recently made to reinforce Canada's position in international hockey.

It is against this background of wider government interest in sport that we should consider this bill. Emphasis must be laid on the degree of citizen participation in Little League baseball and similar leagues which support hockey, football and other sports available to boys and young men across Canada. Long hours of voluntary work are spent by those who undertake the responsible jobs of coaching and managing the teams. They virtually dedicate three or four months of the year to the activities of Little League and the children in the community. Anything that we in Parliament can do to encourage this very important degree of citizen participation in the community should be of first importance.

The hon. member for Ottawa West brought some problems to our attention. It is quite obvious that there are not enough weeks in a year to properly recognize or commemorate every sport in this country. After a further study it may well appear that the designation of weeks in support of different branches of sport is not the best way for Canada to show

[Mr. Mahoney.]

national support for sporting activities. When this matter is studied further, we will have to consider the degree of public support which should be given to branches of particular athletics rather than to the total sport itself. Perhaps there is a question whether there should be a week for the support of hockey, baseball, or whatever other athletic activity we think of, rather than for a particular branch or a particular league.

Having made these comments, I think the very fact that the time of the Parliament of Canada is taken up with the considertion of a measure of this type is indicative of the growing importance of organized sport in our community. In conclusion, I emphasize that the kind of baseball played by the youngsters who have the benefit of participating in Little League is far different and perhaps far better than the kind of ball we played as boys. These youngsters are well equipped with uniforms, bats, balls, clothes and all the other paraphernalia; they are properly coached and trained. The same goes for the youngsters in the hockey and football leagues. All this volunteer activity is a credit to our community. I hope the substance of this bill will be given serious considertion by an appropriate committee of the House.

Mr. Gerald Richard Cobbe (Portage): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) in this bill because I feel it is very important to a great many young people in our country that we designate a week in the second week of June as Little League Week.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) has done, and is doing, a tremendous job in promoting sports activities and providing physical fitness programs across Canada. Perhaps he cannot do that in the House of Commons, owing to the lack of facilities. In many areas of the country there is a tremendous increase in sports participation. Many people are involved in the activities of the Canadian Baseball Association. Those trying to establish a countrywide organization understand the problems confronting the Little League Organization in trying to establish rules, regulations and the type of equipment that is to be used across the country.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Attempts are being made to establish age groups, because in sports organizations across the country there is a tremendous overlapping in this respect and sometimes people

do not have the opportunity to participate in sports. We will be benefiting all Canadians by introducing Little League Week, and assisting those who have worked so hard to accomplish what has been done in this field. We have done a great deal under the Little League organization. It is true that we have worked with people and sports organizations of the United States, but we have found it more practical to establish our own organization and either consult or be affiliated with our friends across the border.

Other facts must be taken into consideration. The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) indicated that he did not have the opportunity of participating in Little League. I have found across Canada an increased interest in baseball perhaps because I come from an area which hosted the Pan-Am games. We had difficulty in creating a team to participate in the Pan-Am games because there was no organization in Canada which gave our young people an equal opportunity to participate. If they did nothing else, the Pan-Am games established a greater measure of unity across the country.

I think we all applaude the aims of the Little League and its attempts to set age limits. It is most important for us in the House of Commons to show interest in our young people. We hope that our young people will take an interest in what we are doing in Ottawa, and by passing this bill we shall show them we are interested in what they are doing.

It has been suggested over 7,000 adults work hard for many hours to give many of our people an opportunity of participating in Little League baseball. These people do a tremendous job. Sometimes our young people are disappointed and discouraged, especially when they see what some adults are doing behind the scenes. Perhaps we need a new program which will teach these people how to behave when our young people are participating in sports activities.

As it is established, the organization is not designed to produce athletes. Perhaps that is why we have separated from other athletic organizations. The organization is designed to build better citizens in our country. I say this because the organization's regulations state that the organization does not exist for the purpose of putting professionals into the field; it exists to give youngsters the opportunity to participate in sport, to compete and to understand what happens when you win or lose.

I hope that the National Advisory Council and the Committee on Fitness and Amateur Sport will give further consideration to the provision of facilities for organizations such as Little League. It is difficult for Little League to function effectively because when your young people wish to enter sporting events one finds there is difficulty in finding enough space and in obtaining the facilities to enable them and our older people to enjoy themselves. Also, the smaller diamond which Little League players use makes it necessary for the league to play on specified fields. This factor makes Little League operation more expensive.

I therefore hope that financial assistance will be given those who manage the Little League and who have worked long and hard to establish the existing facilities. I repeat, the League does not exist in order to create athletes. To reinforce this point may I read from the Little League pledge, printed on the back of the Little League leaflet. It says:

> I trust in God
> I love my country and will respect its laws
> I will play fair and strive to win
> But win or lose I will always do my best

Boys wishing to participate in Little League baseball take this pledge which indicates that the organization is not necessarily designed to produce athletes. I realize that there are only 52 weeks in a year and that almost every organization wants a week set aside for its own purposes. I would not mind combining Little League week with, say, national salad bowl week or pancake week. To some extent, the work carried on by various organizations overlaps in nature, and I should not mind if Little League Week were combined with another national week. I hope the committee will consider the second week in June. That was chosen in preference to one near the end of July; toward the end of July you would have difficulty bringing young people together to play Little League baseball because of the summer holidays.

The second week of June is usually the last week in which we can bring young people together to compete in Little League baseball before the play-offs and exam time. I also think the second week in June fits in best with the over-all program of the organization. I hope this bill will go to committee and that the committee will do a good job of studying and discussing the measure with the people involved in the organization.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Establishment of Little League Week

Mr. Bernard Pilon (Chambly): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That the said bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion (Mr. Pilon) agreed to.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Cinq heures.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that we call it five o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At five o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, January 19, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. DUMONT—INTERFERENCE OF MEMBER FOR DOLLARD IN THE PREPARATION OF CBC PROGRAM

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I want to remind the House that on Wednesday, January 14, at 2 p.m., I received a phone call at my office, asking me to prepare to appear on a CBC broadcast on Nigeria-Biafra which was to include participants from the four parties represented in the House. At 4 p.m. the same day, the broadcast was cancelled by another telephone call.

Well, on Friday, January 16, at 10.15 p.m. on *Format 60,* only a representative of the Liberal party appeared on the program. I therefore accuse the Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State for External Affairs and member for Dollard (Mr. Goyer) of having prevented the representatives of the CBC here in Ottawa from preparing a broadcast where the four parties would have been able to make their voices heard and of having requested the Montreal bureau of the CBC to prepare a broadcast where he alone would speak favourably on behalf of the government.

If the Nigeria-Biafra issue is to be presented favourably to Canadian citizens, the voice of the opposition should be heard. I therefore ask that an inquiry be initiated in order to find out who is to be blamed, because the population needs to know the whole truth about the Nigeria-Biafra dispute and must in no way be muzzled by this government, particularly in view of the fact that the Crown Corporation is financed by all Canadians, who have a right to unbiased and detailed information.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont) has given the Chair advance notice of the question of privilege he intended to bring to the attention of the House today.

I have had since then the opportunity of studying the matter raised by the hon. member. I wish to point out to him that, even though, under the circumstances he set forth, he had a substantiated claim against the parliamentary secretary to the minister or against the CBC, this would not be necessarily a prima facie case of privilege.

I do not see how the special rights or parliamentary privileges of the hon. member have been affected in any way whatsoever under the circumstances he described.

I must reach the conclusion that the matter cannot be considered any further, and I must add that, in view of the fact that the hon. member did not move any motion, his question of privilege cannot be studied any longer by the House.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order: Motions—Mr. Yewchuk:

That the first report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development presented on December 16, 1969, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Athabasca.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take exception to the propriety of putting on the order paper at this point the motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca to which you have just referred.

The basis of my argument will be that as a private member, lacking any authority whatsoever from this particular committee, the hon. member cannot, according to our rules, raise the question he proposes to raise, which amounts to a motion to concur in a substantive proposal, which can only be done by a private member by way of a private member's notice of motion.

Motion for Concurrence in Report

I intend to refer the Chair to a number of precedents which may be cited with respect to this particular course of action and to refer in a more general way to our Standing Orders as they bear on this question. Later I wish to make some reference to the relation which certain of our Standing Orders have to the general policy governing the course of action proposed by the hon. member.

First, with regard to the proposal that the House concur in this particular report, I am advised by members of the committee that though the hon. member for Athabasca may be the vice chairman of the committee, neither he, nor the chairman nor any other member of the committee had any instruction to make this motion to concur in the committee's report. In fact, I am advised that this matter was not discussed in the committee.

I think it must be perfectly clear, therefore, that the hon. member cannot lay any claim to be speaking with the authority of the committee when putting forward this motion. The committee arrived at no such conclusion itself. Further, I suggest it is inconsistent with the hon. member's position as vice chairman of the committee to take this particular action. As vice chairman of the committee he is under an obligation to act fairly with regard to all sides.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Hon. members opposite laugh at that, which must indicate a certain attitude on their part with regard to the chairmanship—

An hon. Member: Smile when you say that.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I notice the Leader of the Opposition laughed at that.

An hon. Member: We are laughing at you.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The Leader of the Opposition has suggested from time to time that members of his group might be given positions of responsibility at the committee table, but there is some evidence in his conduct right now to indicate why we should hesitate to accept any of his nominees.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It is perfectly clear that the hon. member for Athabasca had no right as vice chairman of the committee to take this course of action. He had no instruction from his fellow members on the committee to do so; he is putting forward this motion merely as a private member and not in any official capacity.

The hon. member for Peace River has raised objection from time to time, both here and in the press, to the absence of consultation concerning the way in which the business of the House is conducted. But there was no consultation on his part with me concerning the kind of action—

Mr. Baldwin: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker; on Thursday last I announced publicly in this House to all who were here that I intended to file a notice of motion which would come up in 48 hours.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Here again, we have an interesting illustration of the attitude of the official opposition with regard to consultation. If consultation on House business is to take place through public announcements or press releases we shall not get very far.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Who taught us that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder if the discussion on this matter might be limited to the procedural aspects of it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I apologize. I was interrupted by hon. gentlemen opposite who perhaps were worried about the merits of their case. I would refer them to the Standing Orders, and may I refer in particular first to the fact that the House, in establishing the Standing Orders, considered the problem of conducting the business of the House in the light of the desirability from time to time of permitting private members to divert the business of the House in order to debate questions of substance which may be of interest to them.

We have several Standing Orders which deal with this question. The first, and perhaps best known, is Standing Order 26, which was amended as recently as last year, and which permits any hon. member to make a motion to divert the planned business of the House for the purpose of discussing a particular public question. As I pointed out, the rights of hon. members in that situation are very carefully circumscribed by the Standing Order.

They were the subject of very extensive discussions, and finally agreed to by the House last year.

Secondly, in the last year or so, we have had a proliferation of motions under Standing Order 43, which is a change in the practice of the House. There have been applications under Standing Order 43, which makes it perfectly clear that, with the unanimous consent of the House, the course of the business may be diverted for the purpose of discussing another matter of substance which has not already been listed as an item of business for the House.

May I point out, Mr. Speaker, that there are obvious reasons of good sense and policy for not permitting individual members in all parts of the House to divert the business of the House which has been proclaimed, and which has been the subject matter of consultation. When I refer to consultation I mean discussion in private with hon. members opposite and not announcements to the press or in the House. Consultation of that kind is the only effective way of putting the business of the country before the House. I may add that it is the responsibility of the government to put it before the House.

I do not contest the hon. member's right to put this motion under Private Members' Notices of Motions, but might I point out that the consequence of accepting the motion put at this time by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) under the heading of "Motions" would be to make it virtually impossible to continue to plan the business of the House, to continue to plan the manner in which the House would deal with the business of the country, because one can foresee here, as has been the case under Standing Orders 26 and 43, that there would be a proliferation of motions by hon. gentlemen opposite to divert the House from the business already planned for that day.

The Standing Orders have provided for a number of situations in which hon. members may seek to divert the House from carrying out its announced business. Their rights in those situations are very carefully circumscribed by the Standing Orders, and I would argue that their rights having been so determined by the House in that way, then the rights of the House as a whole to deal with the business as put before it should not be derogated by this kind of motion. This particular precedent, therefore, should not be established.

I should like to deal with a number of instances in the past that have been drawn to my attention in which there have been motions by private members at the initiative of private members, as opposed to motions by, for example, the chairman of a committee. Here, I cite the example of the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) who has a motion on today's order paper standing in his name, and who did not move it because, I believe, the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) asked him not to do so today so that there could be further consultations in that regard. It has long been established that the chairmen of committees, who have instructions from their committees, may move concurrence in committee reports under the heading of "Motions". But I would suggest that we should not adopt, and there is no precedent for adopting, a practice whereby substantive questions would be raised for debate at this point rather than the other ways, under the rules.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I refer to two instances. The first was on May 23, 1932, a motion for concurrence by an hon. member in a report which stated that the price of gasoline was too high and recommended that the question be investigated by the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce. I suggest the effect of adopting that motion would not have been that of stating an opinion on a matter of government policy. In fact, the motion was not adopted on that particular occasion because it was moved that the orders of the day be read, so the question was never brought forth for decision.

I would emphasize that what was involved was a procedural action on the part of the hon. member in that case. He was not seeking to procure a statement of the House on a question of substantive policy; he was raising the question of which of the particular bodies within this chamber should consider a particular question. As such, that particular motion is distinguishable from the kind of motion we have before us today.

The other instance which has been brought to my attention was on May 19, 1947 when the redoubtable former member for Temiscouata, Mr. Jean François Pouliot, at that time moved concurrence in a report which would have had the effect of referring a petition to a special committee on redistribution for its information. There again, the effect of the motion, which was related to the inclusion or non-inclusion of a particular geographic

area in the member's riding, was not that of asking for a statement of opinion on a matter of government policy; it was again a procedural motion and, to give the committee an opportunity to discuss the matter, the motion was carried.

I argue that both these motions were of an entirely procedural nature. They did not involve the discussion of a substantive question, raising questions of underlying policy. On that basis, neither of the two precedents should be regarded as restricting you, Mr. Speaker, in your decision. I therefore argue that this being, if not the first time this question has been discussed certainly the first time in recent years, you should have an opportunity now to make a decision.

An hon. Member: Shoot down the committees.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I invite Your Honour to make a decision in favour of the House being able effectively to plan the way it will carry on business from day to day. I would therefore ask, Mr. Speaker, that the motion put by the hon. member, being a private members' notice of motion, not be dealt with at this point but be transferred to the appropriate place under the Orders of the Day so that it may be discussed in due course.

An hon. Member: There is not much support for that decision.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have a chance to speak to this point of order, which has been raised by the government House leader, because I think it involves a very important question for Your Honour's consideration.

I should like first of all to deal briefly with the whole question which has been adverted to by the minister from time to time. I think the point concerns the type of motion being made, and it relates to the type of report being considered. The hon. member for Athabasca, as a member of this committee, is entitled to base a motion on a statement contained in the report which reads:

> Your committee recommends that the government of Canada indicate to the world, without delay, that vessels, surface and submarine, passing through Canada's Arctic Archipelago are and shall be subject to the sovereign control and regulation of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: That statement does not ask the government to involve itself in the expenditure of money; it asks the government to get off its iceberg and make a statement on what should be done about Canada's Arctic North. If we are not to move farther in the direction of a presidential form of government, members of the House, and particularly government members as well as those in opposition, must have the right to seize the initiative when the government has failed to do so and put certain types of motions. Because a very important principle is involved I should like to quote from the Standing Orders of the House, beginning with Standing Order 57 which reads

> Whenever a resolution is reported from any Committee of the Whole, a motion to concur in the same shall be forthwith put and decided without debate or amendment.

I ask Your Honour to take note of the mandatory wording, "shall be forthwith put and decided". It may appear that if that rule were to be complied with there could be no debate. May I, therefore, also read standing Order 32(1)(b), which says:

> The following motions are debatable:
> Every motion:
> (b) for the concurrence in a report of a standing or special committee;

Finally, to complete an examination of pertinent Standing Orders, may I read standing order 65(10) which reads:

> In a standing or special committee, the standing orders of the House shall be observed so far as may be applicable, except the standing orders as to the seconding of motions, limiting the number of times of speaking and the length of speeches.

Clearly, the Standing Orders indicate that in committee proceedings you apply the same procedures as are applicable in the House, so far as they may be brought into effect. Consequently, when the committee of the whole House makes a report, according to the Standing Orders of the House that report shall—not may—be subject to a motion of concurrence. I submit Your Honour must consider the Standing Orders I have cited in deciding whether or not a motion to concur must be put. That begs the question, of course, as to who shall be entitled to put the motion.

May I also refer Your Honour to Bourinot's Parliamentary Procedure, Fourth Edition, which provides at page 477 as follows:

> It is the practice to move concurrence in the reports of committees in certain cases. For instance, the reports on printing are invariably agreed to, as they contain recommendations for the printing and distribution of documents, which must be duly authorized by the house—Also reports containing certain opinions or resolutions are frequently concurred in on motion—

Illustrations are given dating back to the time of confederation which show that in our parliamentary history motions of this kind were put to the House. Unquestionably, the House has the right to decide and when a committee has made a report of this kind I submit it would be wrong for Your Honour to deny the House the right of considering any recommendation contained in that report. One cannot compel the government to accept the report because, if it does not like the report, it need only call out its troops to defeat the motion for concurrence. But, I submit our parliamentary history clearly indicates that motions of this kind ought to be entertained by this House. They should be the subject of debate and decision.

May I re-inforce my argument with one more point. Until this particular committee report has been the subject of a motion to concur, it is in limbo. A motion to concur may be moved in this House. The House may also say that the report ought to be sent back to committee and changed, altered or amended. Until that is done there can be no conclusion to this most important report containing extremely important recommendations that are vital to our national security at this particular time.

• (2:30 p.m.)

I cite to Your Honour, from page 692 of Beauchesne's Third Edition, a decision of Mr. Speaker Lemieux:

> The report of a Standing Committee should be considered final only when it is adopted because the House can refer it back to the committee with instruction to amend it in any particular.

As I understand these three propositions, when read together, this report must be put to the House pursuant to the Standing Order. Until a report has been discussed and a decision made with respect to it, it is susceptible to change and referral back to the committee. No one knows where we stand on this matter. This is the situation which exists today. Practice and precedent of the past indicate that reports of this kind have, in fact, been put.

In so far as the right of the hon. member is concerned, I defy the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) or any hon. member in this House to indicate that it is the sole privilege of the chairman of a standing committee to put a motion to concur. As far as propriety is concerned, it would certainly be best if this were done as frequently as possible. But if there is a reluctance on the part of the committee chairman to put the motion because it may be embarrassing to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the government, I say that leaves a vacuum which can be entered by any member of the committee. I suggest to Your Honour there is no rule, practice or precedent which denies the right of a member of a committee to put a motion to concur when the chairman of the committee has failed to do so.

The President of the Privy Council said the committee decided it did not want to put the motion. Nothing to that effect appears within the four corners of the committee report. If that was the decision of the committee, it probably would have indicated they were not going to bring in a report and the committee would have acted accordingly. There has been too much of this business of hon. members opposite being strong and bold in words, but weak and snivelling when it comes to action in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: It is about time we struck out and reinforced the right of a member of this committee to put this kind of motion to the House for a decision.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the right of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) to make this motion at this time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I hear members across the way expressing surprise. I suppose it will also surprise them if I say that I rise to support the action of the Chair and the table in placing the motion on the order paper at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I listened with great interest to the non-political statement made by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald). When he began his statement, he said he was going to give us a number of precedents, Standing Orders and citations in support of his case. Being interested in this and being anxious to deal with any of these if I could, I took pen and paper in hand ready to take down all of these precedents, citations and Standing Orders. My sheet of paper is still almost blank.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Motion for Concurrence in Report

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have noted 1932 and 1947, two years in which he indicated attempts to move motions something like this were not allowed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): On a question of privilege, Your Honour. The hon. member may not have been listening too well. I said the exact opposite to what he just said.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I thank my hon. friend for correcting me. He gave these two as motions that were allowed, but he tried to make the point that something entirely different was involved in them than is involved in the motion now before us. In the matter of citations from the authorities and Standing Orders, my sheet of paper is still blank. The President of the Privy Council just does not have any that he can give to this House.

An hon. Member: It is another white paper.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In this area of the right of a private member to move a motion for concurrence in the report of a committee, our authorities say very little. At least there is nothing that I can find that denies the right of the hon. member for Athabasca or any private member of this House to place such a motion on the order paper and have it considered. As a matter of fact, I want by way of parenthesis to make that point, namely, that this right is open not only to the member for Athabasca, but that it is open to any member of this House.

Once a committee has made a report, that report has been given to the House. It is up to the House to decide whether it wants to adopt it or otherwise, not the chairman of the committee, not some individual member of the committee, not some government members of the committee, but it is up to the House to decide. The only way the House can decide is by having a motion placed before it.

I have attempted to chide the President of the Privy Council for not at least giving us one or two citations, so I better have some to offer on the other side. I draw Your Honour's attention to parts of citations 321 and 325 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition. I said parts, but before I am through I may read all of those citations. Citation 321 reads:

> If it be expedient the House appoint the consideration of the report of a Select Committee for a future day, by a motion made on the presentation of the report, or by a subsequent motion for that purpose.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

I submit that when the report was tabled on December 16, no motion was made then for its consideration. What we have now is a subsequent motion made by the hon. member for Athabasca. I continue with the citation:

> The House may appoint the consideration of the report of a Select Committee for a future day by giving forty-eight hours' notice. It will then be taken up when "motions" are called at the commencement of the sitting.

This is as plain as it can be, Mr. Speaker. The member for Athabasca gave 48 hours' notice. Having given 48 hours' notice, where do the Chair and the table place the motion on the order paper? They look at citation 321 and see that it should be placed under motions. That is where it is, and I submit that is where it has the right to be.

I now ask Your Honour and members who are interested to listen to citation 325:

> (1) When the report does not contain any resolutions, recommendations or other propositions for consideration of the House, it does not appear that any further proceedings in reference to it as a report are necessary. Every session, Select Committees make reports of this description, containing a statement of facts, or of the evidence on the subject of enquiry; but as they do not contain any proposition which can be agreed to by the House, they are simply printed for the information of the members.

There are many reports like that, but that hardly applies to the report on Arctic sovereignty. I continue:

> (2) Concurrence in reports from Select Committees is, in non-controversial cases, moved when motions are called by the Speaker during routine business.

That often happens where a motion for concurrence is agreed to on all sides of the House.

> If it be expedient, the House will appoint the consideration of a report for a future day. By a motion made for that purpose in the British House, the report of a committee presented during a previous session has been taken into consideration.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Paragraph (3) refers to Standing Order 41 which is now Standing Order 42 of our revised rules and it states:

> —notice must be given for the motion for concurrence in reports of committees, said concurrence being a resolution of the House. If such a motion is brought up without notice, it can only be allowed to pass by unanimous consent.

There again is a clear instruction not only to the hon. member for Athabasca but to the Chair and the table. Here is a motion for concurrence in a report. Since it will not be

allowed to pass by unanimous consent it has to be given under Standing Order 42 and that is what was done.

Then paragraph (4) of Citation 325 reads:

When a motion is made for concurrence in a Select Committee Report, it is competent for the House to adopt it, reject it, refer it back to the committee or decide that consideration of the report will take place "this day six months".

I thought since I referred to Citation 325 I should read the whole of it, but surely the crucial part of it is in paragraph (3) which gives the right, under what is now Standing Order 42, for a motion to be made and dealt with under motions for concurrence in the report of a committee. I emphasize that there is nothing in either of those citations, and I cannot find anything anywhere else, which says this right is limited to the chairman of the standing committee or says it is even limited to a member of a standing committee. It says the House shall make this decision, and every time there is any reference as to when the House shall make such a decision it says it shall be done under Routine Proceedings. It shall be done under motions, which is precisely where it is on today's Order Paper.

I submit, therefore, that in the absence of any prohibition against the hon. member for Athabasca making this motion at this point, and in the light of statements that this is the place to deal with motions for concurrence in a report of a committee, that the hon. member had every right to ask that his motion be placed where it is and that Your Honour had every right to see that it was put on the Order Paper in this place and that it be called at this time.

The other comment I wish to make is perhaps in the vein in which the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) was speaking. At least, in a sense, it is in the same vein. He talked about the implications of this course of action in relation to the planning of the business of Parliament. I should like to talk about the implications of what he wants to deny to this House in relation to the professed aim to strengthen the work of our committees.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What on earth is the value of strengthening our committees, so they can make these strong reports and say the excellent things that are said in this report, if those statements are to die once the reports are tabled in the House of Commons? I do not have them in front of me, and perhaps it is a good thing I do not or I would be reading at length from the reports of one of our procedural committees back in November and December of 1968 when we went into this whole business of the work of committees and our desire to strengthen them. This is like motherhood around this place. We all support this. Committees are wonderful. They must be given more to do and more support. Private members on the government side welcome them because in committees they can speak their minds; they can pass resolutions and bring in reports and say something. To what effect is the result of all that if, when the report is presented in the House, it is printed not even in *Hansard* but in *Votes and Proceedings*, which not very many people see, and that is the end of it? If we are going to talk about implications let us talk about the implications of what we are trying to do for our committee structure and accept the fact that when a committee goes to the trouble of making the kind of report this committee did we should have the right to deal with it here in the House of Commons.

I recognize that there are not very many precedents for this being done. It is the usual and traditional thing for the chairman of a committee or for someone designated by the committee to make the report, but there is no rule under which such a person does it. There is no rule which says no one else can do it. In fact, as I have already said, I go so far as to say that any private member of the House should be able to make the motion. Supposing for example the hon. member for Athabasca had been removed from the committee after it had made its report, would he not still have the right to move the motion? And what about some of the rest of us?

In any case, because there are no rules against it, because this is in line with what we are trying to do to strengthen the work of committees, and because Your Honour and the table saw fit to put the motion where it is, I suggest it should be called and proceeded with at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, Standing Order 51 of the House of Commons reads as follows:

51. Whenever Mr. Speaker is of the opinion that a motion offered to the House is contrary to the rules and privileges of Parliament, he shall apprise the House thereof immediately, before putting the question thereon, and quote the standing order or authority applicable to the case.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) is asking that you

consider the motion of the member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) as affecting the privileges and rules of Parliament and, therefore, that you reject it.

In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I rather agree with the two previous speakers. While I agree with their comments, I would like to put forward the arguments which, perhaps, they have not stressed enough.

Mr. Speaker, I think the problem is of paramount importance. In fact, the question is whether a member can influence in any way the proceedings of the House or its committees without violating the Standing Orders.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the motion or the point of order of the President of the Privy Council were accepted, the Chair would seem to favour force, instead of democracy. It seems to me that for some years, the successive majority governments have been tempted, because of their numerical strength, to impose their views on the House and the committees.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to recall that members of the Opposition have always been anxious to co-operate with the government with a view to speeding up the proceedings by agreement, as the President of the Privy Council said, among the various party representatives. But this has nothing to do whatsoever with the power or basic rights of a House member.

Mr. Speaker, an attempt was made to improve committee work. I would point out two precedents of the last session to show the government's negative attitude. It will certainly be remembered that the government disagreed on the contents of a committee report and that on another occasion, it was defeated through its failure to maintain a majority in this House. The Chair was made aware of the situation. Now, on those two occasions, the President of the Privy Council stepped in and succeeded so well in imposing his views on the dispute that the matter was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Speaker, I would humbly submit that instead of accepting the proposal of the President of the Privy Council, the Chair recommend that the subject-matter of the dispute be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, since the rights of the members are involved.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, this aspect is more important than is generally believed. It is agreed that

[Mr. Fortin.]

hon. members, the government, the opposition parties have rights.

But when we ask the ministers for information during the oral question period, we know what happens. Either we receive a haughty answer, or none at all. Hon. members cannot demand a reply, as at that moment Your Honour steps in to say that the minister can rightfully act that way. Even at the information level, the part of the private member is practically nil. It is the same within the committees. When a private member wants to say something, to put forward a motion, right away the majority principle is invoked and put in operation and he is defeated.

When a private member tries to bring in a motion giving rise to an expenditure of public funds, the Speaker says: "A private member cannot do this."

Mr. Speaker, since the adoption of Standing Orders 75A, 75B and 75C, the length of the debate is restricted and is determined by the majority in order to further reduce the part played by private members.

I suggest that this is a basic question of very great importance, and that the decision that the Chair may give shortly will protect the rights of the minority, those of private members, and not necessarily those of the strong.

In my view, some government members are really doing a good job in using their strength to crush the private members.

Now, if the part played by a private member is reduced to nothing, I wonder what we are doing here?

Mr. Speaker, you agree, I feel, that hon. members should fully and consciously do their duty, that they should take part in the discussions and bring in motions, in accordance with the Standing Orders and the practices of the house.

Hon. members are waiting for your decision, in order that their right to intervene, not to foist their views on the House concerning the order of proceedings, be protected. Hon. members honestly wish to carry out the business of the house.

[*English*]

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. As a result of certain remarks made by the hon. member for Peace River, I feel I should clarify one or two points. Just before the Christmas recess the hon. member for Athabasca prematurely attempted to move a motion for concurrence

in this report. Because he had failed to give 48 hours' notice, I understand his motion was not accepted at that time. Immediately after that attempt to move the motion a meeting of the steering committee of the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development was held. At this meeting, which was held either in the afternoon or the day after the attempt to move the motion, the consensus was it was neither wise nor desirable for the committee to ask for concurrence in its recommendations. The reason for this consensus was that the committee did not want unanimity in respect of its recommendations contained in the report to be in any way diluted by any artificial divisiveness which might be the result of a motion for concurrence in the House.

In respect of the comment made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, surely the committee is the master of its own tactics. If it decides by making a very strong report that it can push the government in the right direction, then it should have the right to decide on the tactics to be employed. If it should be the committee's decision, as it certainly was in this instance, to deliberately not ask for concurrence, then surely it is in its power to take this position. I submit it should be obvious to everyone in this House that any kind of division in respect of this extremely urgent and important question could be misinterpreted outside the House and would not be in Canada's interest.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I appreciate the point being made by the hon. member for Laprairie, but it would seem that if we are to continue the discussion at this time it should be limited to the procedural aspect of the matter. It would seem that we are getting more and more into the substance of the report. When there is a discussion today or later on in respect of the report itself, it would seem to me that might be the proper time to bring up the kind of argument being made now by the hon. member for Laprairie and perhaps by other hon. members taking part in the debate.

I realize how important this point is and I have no intention of limiting the discussion. However, I invite hon. members who take part in the debate in respect of the procedural aspect to limit their contribution to this aspect of the matter which is the procedural point raised by the hon. President of the Privy Council.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of referring to authorities. However, I wish to make two very brief arguments. First of all, in complete answer to the hon. member for Laprairie, I would say that the report, having been presented to the House by the committee, belongs to the House and not to the committee. That is the short answer. The committee has reported to the House. It has presented the report. The report then belongs to the House and not to the committee. Therefore, whether the committee decides yea or nay with regard to continuance is immaterial. This is a decision for the House. This was amply pointed out by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and in the citations to which he referred.

The second point is that the situation in respect of the rephasing of the recommendations so-called, and participation of hon. members in the business of the House, is completely contrary to the situation in this regard as argued by the President of the Privy Council. When he suggests that this House must be subservient at all times for all things to the dictates of the cabinet, he misstates the situation. The situation is that the cabinet is responsible to this House. Let us underline that fact.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Somehow or other, it seems that hon. gentlemen across the way who occupy the treasury benches now have the idea that this House at all times will do everything they think fit. That is not so, Mr. Speaker. They are part of this House and are responsible to this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): There is no question about that. If there is to be any validity to the importance of committees, surely it is quite wrong for the government House leader to argue that it is the chairman, who is there at the behest of the government, who should move concurrence in the report. We have often seen examples where a chairman who was too independent was changed. Something was done or something happened. Perhaps he was just not reappointed. Pressures are brought to bear. Now, if a committee is to do its job it may bring in recommendations which are adverse to what the government is thinking. Well, the government does not have a monopoly on, shall we say, having the right conclusions. Goodness knows, this government makes more mistakes than any other group of mortal men. But here we have a House committee, composed of

members from all sides, which makes a recommendation which may prove to be embarrassing and which may be critical. If the House and Your Honour should accept the argument of the government House leader, then any criticism can be stultified at the whim of the cabinet.

The report does not belong to the cabinet or to the committee. It belongs to this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): True enough, it is customary or at least it is a matter of courtesy that the chairman shall present the report and then ask for concurrence in it. But in his absence, it may be presented by the vice-chairman or by any other committee member on behalf of the chairman. It is not the chairman's motion—not at all. It is the motion of the member who proposes the adoption of the report. In this case, I would say everything has been done properly. I would say also that the strictures advanced by the government House leader are a reflection on the Chair and the officers who decided that the motion should be put where it now stands on the Order Paper.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Since it has been placed there, the hon. member for Athabasca has a perfect right to put his motion for the consideration of the House. I ask hon. members to accept this view, and trust I have persuaded Your Honour that it is the right course.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): I assure Your Honour that I shall heed your warning to speak directly to the subject and that I shall try to be extremely brief.

I make no apology for entering this debate. I raised this question in the House when the so-called watchdogs in the opposition had not uttered a single yelp. They are interested in this subject very late. I am one of those who feel that the government of Canada has been dilatory in this matter; I believe it should have moved long before now. I am also one of the committee members involved in this report. To speak directly to the question at issue, I believe there is a difference between a recommendation from a committee as to a policy line, and detailed, close recommendations involving the expenditure of public money, acceptance of which by the government would not be merely the acceptance of a principle.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

The hon. member for Peace River gave the impression—I do not suggest he was trying to mislead the House—that by accepting these recommendations the government would merely be accepting a certain principle voiced by myself and by a large number of other members of this House that Arctic sovereignty must be proclaimed and proclaimed soon. But a reading of the report does not bear this out. There is one paragraph on Arctic sovereignty, an extremely important one with which I fully agree, but there are others which involve the expenditure of money. On page 210 of *Votes and Proceedings* dated December 16, 1969, we read, for instance:

> Your committee recommends that appropriate agencies of the government move immediately to conduct a search in the Arctic to gather information on the following—

Then a number of subjects for research are listed.

A little later we read a recommendation that further research studies be undertaken into the effects of pollution and so on. These are recommendations intended to influence the government, and I certainly hope they do, but I believe there is a fundamental difference between the expression of a point of view by a committee with the intention of putting pressure on a government, and the setting out of detailed policy which amounts, in effect, to a committee taking on the job of the cabinet by spelling out policy in detail—policy which the government would then be obliged to follow to the smallest particular.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): I hope I may have your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, while I draw to your attention a matter which cannot be allowed to pass without comment, and one which is disturbing me immensely. I refer to the fact that during the discussion this afternoon, for the first time to my knowledge in the 17 years in which I have had the privilege of being a member of this House, an hon. member—a member on the government side, it so happens—has seen fit while talking about a matter before the House, to disclose the discussions, consideration and decision of a steering committee of a committee of this House. This is a matter of the utmost importance.

A steering committee is appointed by a committee, and it reports only to the standing committee which appointed it. The disclosure to this House of the discussion, consideration and decision of a steering committee establishes such an extraordinary precedent that I feel obliged to draw it to Your Honour's

attention. If this practice is to be allowed in the future, Your Honour should make it known.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I thank hon. members for their learned and useful contributions to the debate during the last hour or so. All hon. members who have spoken have pointed out that this is a very important matter. The decision which the Chair is called upon to take is, of course, an important one.

As hon. members may have guessed, this matter has been under consideration for some days and it is as a result of this consideration that the Chair has come to at least the temporary conclusion that the motion of the hon. member for Athabasca should be placed where it has been placed on the order paper, that is, under Motions.

I doubt whether I can agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Edmonton West that the raising of this matter as a point of order at this time is in any way a reflection on the Chair. I must say I cannot agree. If the proposed motion had been placed under private members' notices of motions, I assume the honourable and learned member for Peace River would have raised a point of order seeking to have it upgraded to where it is placed at the present time. I would think the intervention of the President of the Privy Council is quite in order in the sense that I fully expected that the points he has made would be made, and that the Chair would then be placed in the position of having to review the matter further.

The only two precedents which have been quoted in the course of the debate are those which go back to 1932 and 1947. It is of interest to note that in both instances a member of the House who was not the chairman of the committee concerned was allowed to make a motion of the type now standing in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca. In the absence of any precedent contrary to this situation in previous years it was felt by the Chair that the motion should be given the precedence which it has been granted on the order paper. I realized that it would be in order for the Chair to give the matter very serious consideration within the next 24 hours or so in order that a lucid, logical and understandable ruling might be made, because in a way this is a precedent setting situation—the two precedents which were referred to by the President of the Privy Council did not include a procedural discussion, so they are not finally binding on the Chair.

The direction which the Chair tends to take at the present time is obvious. It was as a result of lengthy consideration that the motion of the hon. member for Athabasca was placed where it is, and I would think this is the decision which should be reached. I shall not prejudice the matter, however. If hon. members will allow me to do so I will reflect further on the matter and give a ruling within the next 24 hours which I hope will be acceptable to the House.

There is a difficulty in the sense that if a decision were made tomorrow and if, perchance, the decision were favourable to the hon. member for Athabasca, he would be called upon to make his contribution—and perhaps subsequent contributions would be made to the debate—in conflict with the arrangement which has now been concluded to the effect that tomorrow would be an opposition day. I would not consider the hon. member's motion as an opposition day subject, but I would consider it to be a committee day, in a sense. It might be that discussions should be held between representatives of the parties to decide if, theoretically a decision were reached in the hon. member's favour, a debate on the motion might be postponed to a subsequent day in order to allow the House to devote itself entirely to the motion which stands on the order paper at the present time in the name of the hon. member for Mackenzie. This having been said, I will postpone a decision until tomorrow, if hon. members will allow me to do so.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be the usual willingness to co-operate, in consultation with the President of the Privy Council, as to an appropriate time when Your Honour's decision might be made.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I see you are learning.

Mr. Baldwin: What was that?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I said, I see you are learning.

INVESTMENT COMPANIES

MEASURE RESPECTING FURNISHING OF INFORMATION, LOANS AND INVESTMENTS, TRANSFERS OF SHARES, ETC.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (for the Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-179, respecting investment companies.

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

Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CBC COVERAGE, 1968 LIBERAL CONVENTION

Question No. 443—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the Liberal Convention held in Ottawa in April 1968, what was the total coverage given to the convention by CBC (a) English radio and television (b) French radio and television?

2. What sessions of the Liberal Convention were broadcast "live" by the CBC radio and television and what was the total time of such coverage?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: Since this convention was a leadership contest, extensive coverage was given on CBC English and French radio and television networks. Combined total radio and TV coverage which included live coverage of speeches, voting for leadership candidates etc., amounted to approximately 43 hours on the English networks and 24 hours on the French networks. Of these amounts approximately 31 hours on the English networks and 19 hours on the French networks were devoted to live coverage from the floor of the convention.

[*English*]

CBC COVERAGE, 1969 NDP CONVENTION

Question No. 444—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the New Democratic Convention held in Winnipeg in October, 1969, what was the total coverage given to the convention by CBC (a) English radio and television (b) French radio and television?

2. What sessions of the New Democratic Party Convention were broadcast "live" by the CBC radio and television and what was the total time of such coverage?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC as follows: The combined total radio and TV coverage of this biennial convention amounted to approximately three hours on the English networks and 1⅓ hours on the French networks. While there were numerous actuality clips used during the period of the convention, the only live coverage in full from the floor was the hour-long closing address of T. C. Douglas on the English networks.

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

[*English*]

CBC COVERAGE, 1967 CONSERVATIVE CONVENTION

Question No. 445—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. For the Conservative Convention held in Toronto in September 1967, what was the total coverage given to the convention by CBC (a) English radio and television (b) French radio and television?

2. What sessions of the Conservative Convention were broadcast "live" by the CBC radio and television and what was the total time of such coverage.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: Since this convention was a leadership contest, extensive coverage was given on CBC English and French radio and television networks. Combined total radio and TV coverage which included live coverage of speeches, voting for leadership candidates, etc., amounted to approximately 48 hours on the English networks and 20 hours on the French networks. Of these amounts approximately 40 hours on the English networks and 17 hours on the French networks were devoted to live coverage from the floor of the convention.

[*English*]

NORTHUMBERLAND STRAIT CROSSING

Question No. 452—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Are any officers of any department of the Government of Canada studying the feasibility of the building, or in any way giving attention to a permanent crossing between New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island across the Northumberland Strait?

2. What was the estimate of Colonel Edward Churchill as to the total cost of such a crossing?

3. On what date was such estimate presented to the government?

4. Have the 4.98 miles of railway on the New Brunswick side of the proposed crossing been declared surplus material and, if not, what plans are being made for disposal of this railway spur line?

5. In each of the years since 1962, what was the total amount expended on research and construction for the Northumberland crossing?

6. Has the Government of Canada received any offers from private firms to construct such a crossing and, if so, from whom and what was the response of the government in each case?

7. Has the Government of Canada any indication that any provincial government is giving consideration to proposals from private interests concerning the building of such a crossing?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned: 1. No.

2. $176 million including prior expenditures as listed in Part 5.

3. January 24, 1969.

4. Yes. The rails and ties have been declared surplus and have been disposed of through Crown Assets Disposal Corporation to the Canadian National Railway.

5. Expenditure by fiscal years:

Fiscal Year	Amount
1961-62	$ 9,141
1962-63	49,296
1963-64	499,796
1964-65	1,239,077
1965-66	1,650,101
1966-67	4,317,352
1967-68	4,764,733
1968-69	3,905,052
1969-70 (to November 1969)	299,801
Total	$16,734,349

Note: The above figures include all payments relating to consultants, land acquisition and construction.

6. A consortium of contractors represented by Northumberland Consultants Limited last summer presented to government officials an outline of the elements of a proposal to construct the crossing on the basis of private financing. Northumberland Consultants Limited was advised that a firm proposal, based on the outline discussed and supported by adequate assurances with regard to private financing, would be considered for presentation to the government. No such firm proposal has resulted.

7. No.

RAILWAY TRACK RELOCATION GRANTS

Question No. 459—**Mr. Thomas (Moncton):**

In the last three years, have any grants been made from the Railway Grade Crossing Fund to cities, towns or municipalities for the specific purpose of railway track relocation and, if so, to which cities, towns or municipalities and in what amounts?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: Grants from the Railway Grade Crossing Fund are made to railway applicants for track relocation only when the purpose of the relocation is the elimination of existing level railway-highway crossings. Two such grants were authorized by the Canadian Transport Commission as follows: (1) $500,000 to the Canadian National Railways, in October, 1967, for relocation of the Sorel Subdivision in the Towns of St. Bruno-de-Montarville, St. Hubert and Boucherville and the City of Jacques Cartier in the Province of Quebec; (2) to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in January, 1969, for relocation of the Halifax Subdivision in the Town of Windsor, Province of Nova Scotia.

CAROLINE POST OFFICE TENDERERS

Question No. 544—**Mr. Thompson (Red Deer):**

1. How many firms tendered on the construction of the Caroline Post Office?

2. What are the amounts of the tenders and the names of the contractors?

3. What sub-contractors were not paid by the general contractor and what are the amounts?

4. Other than a percentage deposit, what standards had to be met in order to tender on this contract?

5. Does the previous record of a firm have any bearing on acceptance of a tender?

6. If a firm fails to pay its sub-contractors, is its name removed from future lists to tender on contracts?

7. What protection does a sub-contractor receive when the contractor does not pay for the work he completed?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Five.

2. Contractors are: Dynacon Construction, Calgary, Alberta, $24,014; Bond & Leitch (Calgary) Ltd., Calgary, Alberta, $24,780; Jason Construction, Calgary, Alberta, $24,950; F. Avery Construction (Division of A.N. Holdings Ltd.), Stettler, Alberta, $26,488; W. R. Sandquiet Construction Ltd., Red Deer, Alberta, $32,368.

After tenders were called, it was decided to make certain changes in the work. In accordance with departmental policy, the three lowest bidders on the original tender were asked to submit new quotations.

Two of the three low bidders submitted the following tenders: Dynacon Construction, $22,151; Bond & Leitch (Calgary) Ltd., $22,450.

3. Sub-contractors claiming unpaid accounts are: Menzies & Herbert Ltd., Red Deer, Alberta, $968.00; Westview Plumbing & Heating, Rocky Mountain House, Alberta, $1,880.00; Dunrite Plasterers, Red Deer, Alberta, $450.00; Spruce View Co-op, Spruce View, Alberta, $14.40; Heathfield & Hilderman, Spruce View, Alberta, $493.50; V. R. Nielson, Spruce View, Alberta, $12.00; Bob Jorgenson, Spruce View, Alberta, $152.60; Revelstoke Building Materials Limited, Calgary, Alberta, $1,072.29; H. Kenda Agencies, Red Deer, Alberta, $209.50;

Harold Ogilvy, Red Deer, Alberta, $180.00; The Red Deer House of Decorating, Red Deer, Alberta, $463.60.

4. Government Contract Regulations do not require deposits on tenders under $25,000. Tenders must be submitted on forms supplied by the Department.

5. Yes.

6. Since tenders are mainly obtained by public advertisement, past performance on payment of accounts is a factor in determining acceptability of tender or alternately requiring the posting of a labour and materials payment bond.

7. Clause 21 of the general conditions of the contract permits Her Majesty to discharge lawful obligations of, and satisfy lawful claims against the contractor or a sub-contractor arising out of the execution of the work to the extent that moneys are available to do so under the contract.

CBC "WEEKEND" PROGRAM—APPEARANCE OF JAMES HARDING

Question No. 638—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Was James Harding on the CBC Weekend Program on Sunday, November 30, 1969?

2. How much exposure in time was he given on national television?

3. What are Mr. Harding's credentials and, on whose behalf was he speaking?

4. What was the purpose of Mr. Harding's television appearance?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. Yes.

2. 10 minutes, 45 seconds.

3. Mr. Harding is considered to be one of the more prominent spokesmen in Canada for the "new left". He is a former teaching assistant at Simon Fraser University and was a guest speaker at the recent Liberal party conference at Harrison Hot Springs. He spoke for himself on the CBC program.

4. The purpose of Mr. Harding's appearance was to provide a significant viewpoint about the Canadian political scene.

[*English*]

COST OF UNUSED DESIGN FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE BUILDING

Question No. 646—**Mr. MacLean:**

1. What was the total cost of the unused design for the Department of National Defence building which was to have been built in the LeBreton Flats area in Ottawa?

[Mr. Laing.]

2. What was the cost to (a) the Department of Public Works (b) the Department of National Defence (c) any other government departments or agencies?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. $1,355,-885.95.

2. (a) Cost to Department of Public Works, $1,355,885.95; Salary of D.N.D. personnel seconded to D.P.W. $10,458.00; Total cost to Department of Public Works, $1,366,343.95. (b) $372,576 for salaries and travel for a planning group which varied in strength from three to seven personnel over a five year period. $33,047 for consultant services. (c) Not applicable.

*NATIONAL FILM BOARD RENTAL FEE

Question No. 668—**Mr. Fairweather:**

1. Is the National Film Board proposing to charge a film rental fee effective January 1, 1970 and, if so, will schools and other educational institutions be exempt from paying the rental fee?

2. Were the budgetary implications of the new policy discussed with provincial departments of education before the announcement about change in policy?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the National Film Board as follows:

1. The National Film Board proposes to institute a service charge for the use of its films, effective January 1, 1970. Schools and other educational institutions will not be exempt from paying this service charge if they wish to use NFB material.

2. The budgetary implications of this new policy were discussed with provincial departments of education in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, before the change in policy was made known; elsewhere, provincial departments of education were consulted shortly after they received, in the third week in November, a letter intimating the change in policy.

[*English*]

"THE FORSYTE SAGA"—PURCHASE OF SERIES BY CBC

Question No. 669—**Mr. Broadbent:**

Did the CBC consider purchasing the BBC production series, The Forsyte Saga, for the 1969-70 viewing season and (a) if not, for what reason (b) if so, what are the specific reasons for not purchasing the above BBC program?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC that it has purchased the series and plans to schedule it this spring.

[*English*]

SMALL BUSINESSES LOANS ACT VIOLATIONS

Question No. 693—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. Did the Minister of Finance receive complaints from ACEF of Montreal concerning violations by finance companies of the Small Businesses Loans Act and what is the date of each complaint?

2. What companies were mentioned in these complaints?

3. Did the Minister of Finance order an enquiry into the cases of violation submitted by ACEF?

4. Have any sanctions been applied and, if so, what were they?

5. Has the Minister granted the request of ACEF to exercise a closer control in the administration of the Small Businesses Loans Act?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): It is assumed that the question intended to refer to the Small Loans Act rather than to the Small Businesses Loans Act. 1. Letters of complaint were received in 1969 by the Superintendent of Insurance from the Association Coopérative d'Économie Familiale. Copies of these letters were sent by ACEF to the Minister of Finance. The letters that contained direct reference to companies licensed under the Small Loans Act were dated April 11, 1969, April 22, 1969 and July 3, 1969.

2. Beneficial Finance Co. of Canada, Household Finance Corporation of Canada and Niagara Finance Company Limited.

3. The basis for the complaints was investigated by the office of the Superintendent of Insurance.

4. It was considered that no violation of the Small Loans Act had occurred; consequently no sanctions were necessary.

5. No such action was considered necessary since the administration of the Small Loans Act is, and has been, carried out in a satisfactory manner.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—USE OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 718—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Does the Department of National Revenue use computer-operated machines to send out assessment notices to taxpayers and, if so, how much did the computer cost?

2. How many assessment notices does it deal with daily?

3. How many different types of letters is the computer programmed to send?

4. Were any parts of the information supplied in answer to this question given by the computer itself and, if so, which?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Yes. The Department of National Revenue, Taxation, has two large and one small computer systems which are used for centralized processing of individual taxpayer returns, accounting functions in respect of individual taxpayers and payroll deductions as well as research projects and statistical programs. The processing of individual returns is done on these computers and notices of assessments are printed by printers which are part of these systems. The purchase price of these systems is $5,073,000.

2. The 1969 assessing program has one or two "outputs" per week depending on workloads. At peak filing time in the 1969 program the output of assessments was over 600,000 per week—321,831 on the highest day.

3. The computer is not programmed to send actual letters as such. In respect of assessments of returns, the computer is programmed to print up to four of 99 different messages in either English or French on notices of assessment. Where such messages do not fit typewritten explanations are sent. In the areas of other functions, forms in respect of individual accounts including instalment payments and payroll deduction accounting forms to employers are used on which various messages are computer generated. There are ten such forms.

4. The information supplied re question 2 was obtained from computer generated statistics.

REPLACEMENT OF STORM WINDOWS, CENTRE BLOCK

Question No. 747—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. What was the total cost of the replacement in 1969 of the storm windows on the Centre Block of the Parliament Buildings?

2. In what year were the previous storm windows installed?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. In 1969, four storm windows were replaced in Rooms 103A and 105A at a total cost of $280.

2. Various storm windows were installed during the past ten years as per individual Member's request and approval by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

Questions

PETITION RESPECTING CJCL-TV PROGRAMMING

Question No. 755—**Mr. Peddle:**

1. Has the Northern Service of CBC received a petition from Labrador City, requesting a change in programming on station CJCL-TV, to allow the showing of movies on Saturday night, and hockey rebroadcasts on Saturday afternoon?

2. Will CBC accede to that request and, if so, when will the change in programming commence?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the CBC that the Corporation has received a brief from Labrador City and that the broadcasting service provided to the area is presently being reviewed.

[*English*]

REMISSION OF CERTAIN TAXES FOR AIRLINE COMPANIES

Question No. 769—**Mr. Crouse:**

1. Under what Order in Council are Canadian airline companies eligible for remission of customs duties, sales and excise taxes on the purchase of aircraft and parts to be used in international service?

2. Were companies with extensive international operations permitted to defer payment of taxes on the domestic portion of their operations until the year end and, if so, who made the ruling to permit such deferments and under what authority?

3. Was permission for such deferments rescinded recently and, if so, by whom and under what authority?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): 1. Order in Council P.C. 1966-18/1495, dated August 10, 1966.

2. Companies with extensive international operations were permitted to defer payment of taxes on certain aircraft used in a combination of domestic and international service until the year end. This deferment of taxes on the domes ic portion of the aircraft was necessary as the extent to which the aircraft was used domestically was not known until year end and an accurate calculation of the amount of sales tax to be remi.ted was not possible until that time.

3. The application of the Order was suspended temporarily but was reinstated pending a new submission to Council to replace the present Order.

FARM IMPLEMENT PRICES COMMISSION

Question No. 784—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. What was the date the Commission on Farm Implement Prices was set up?

2. When is a final report by the Commission to be expected?

[Mr. Laing.]

3. How many members are on the Commission?

4. What is the total expenditure by the Commission to date?

5. What is the anticipated total expenditure that will be made by or for the Commission by the time the final report is received by the government?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): 1. The Royal Commission on Farm Machinery was appointed by Order-in-Council 1966-978 on May 26, 1966.

2. By mid-1970.

3. One.

4. $1,288,635 to December 31, 1969.

5. $1,581,409.

COST OF BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM COMMISSION

Question No. 809—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, has been the cost to date of the Bilingual and Bicultural Commission?

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Total cost of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism to December 31, 1969, is $8,433,162.

UNION OF PRAIRIE PROVINCES AND NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Question No. 834—**Mr. Robinson:**

To the knowledge of the federal government, have the Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta discussed unity with the Northwest Territories and, if so, is the government prepared to consider this proposal?

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

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

GOVERNMENT PUBLIC RELATIONS SERVICES

Question No. 217—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Which government departments have made arrangements either by contract or any other method with private public relations firms to publicize the work, the programs, the activities of each department or its personnel?

2. How much did each department agree to pay to the public relations firms involved?

3. Were the arrangements made following competitive bidding and, if not, what criteria were used in choosing the firms concerned?

Return tabled.

EXPO '70—COST TO GOVERNMENT

Question No. 362—**Mr. Howe:**

1. What is the total sum set aside by the federal Treasury to pay the cost of Canada's participation in EXPO '70, Osaka, Japan?

2. What is the cost of the building programme, the musical and entertainment programme and the social programme?

3. Have grants been made to individuals or organizations who have been invited to participate in this Exposition and, if so, what are the names of the individuals or organizations and the amount of the grant provided?

Return tabled.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

FEBRUARY CONFERENCE—DISCLOSURE OF PROPOSALS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in light of the statements yesterday by the Minister of Finance I would like to ask the Prime Minister when is it the intention of the government to disclose the proposals it intends to make to the premiers of the provinces in relation to the forthcoming federal-provincial conference?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): To disclose to the House?

Mr. Stanfield: No, to the provincial governments.

Mr. Trudeau: I am not quite sure if I understand the question correctly, Mr. Speaker, but I have been in correspondence with the premiers of the provinces in relation to this conference and we are in the process of agreeing on an agenda and on a format for the conference.

Mr. Stanfield: But is it the intention of the Prime Minister to lay before the provinces, prior to the conference, the proposals that the federal government intends to make in connection with the agenda?

Mr. Trudeau: For some of the items, yes, Mr. Speaker, the proposals will be put to them. One is in the form of a white paper by the Minister of Finance, and another is by way of a report of the Tax Structure Committee. There will be certain documents given to the participants in the meeting.

Mr. Stanfield: Is it the intention that the agenda and these documents will be made public prior to the conference?

Mr. Trudeau: We will follow the usual practice, Mr. Speaker. As regards the agenda, if the premiers want to make the agenda public we will do so. It will depend on whether the meetings are private or public, or partly private and in part public. I repeat that I am in correspondence with the premiers. Until there is final agreement on this I do not want to commit myself because, as the hon. member no doubt realizes, there is a great deal of consultation involved.

Mr. Stanfield: One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government of Canada willing to make public its proposals to the provinces prior to the conference if the provinces have no objection to this?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, when the conference is a public conference and when the documents are meant to be public, what we have done in the past has been to get agreement by all parties that any province, or the federal government, wanting to make its proposals public could do so on a date agreed upon by all parties, generally a week in advance. In this particular case the question is a bit hypothetical because, as I say, there is no final agreement yet, and I have not heard from all the provinces on the final wording of the agenda or on the format of the conference.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, with reference to the remarks of the Minister of Finance dealing in particular with anti-inflationary proposals that the government may wish to make. Is it the government's intention to disclose these to the provinces in ample time for the provinces to study them and engage in a meaningful dialogue in order to deal with the problem effectively at an early date?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, even there we cannot make any commitment because the course of the conference will in large degree depend on the results obtained by the Prices and Incomes Commission. As the hon. member knows—it has been said in the House previously—the Prices and Incomes Commission is aiming toward a date in late January or early February. Therefore I am not sure what time we will have between the two events to engage in what the hon. member

calls meaningful consultation. The purpose of the federal-provincial conference is to have meaningful consultation.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): A further supplementary question. Could it be that the Minister of Finance was misdirecting himself when he indicated during his remarks that the Prime Minister would be disclosing the proposals dealing with anti-inflationary measures to the provincial premiers prior to the conference?

Mr. Trudeau: I would have to refer to the statement of the minister on that point. I am not aware of this particular statement, Mr. Speaker.

AGRICULTURE

ACTION TO LOWER TRACTOR AND COMBINE PRICES

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the recently tabled report of the Barber Commission, which states that Canadian farmers are being charged excessive prices for farm machinery by multinational firms, can the minister indicate to the House what immediate action is being taken to make farm machinery available at lower cost to Canadian farmers?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, up until the present, action has not been directed along that line. What I said on Friday was that an interdepartmental committee had already been established because there are some implications contained in Dr. Barber's findings and recommendations that deal with such things as anti-combines law, anti-trust law, and so on. He also recommends that discussion be held with counterpart officials in the United States and in the United Kingdom. This has already been initiated. I think it would be wise, and indeed fair, for the people who are affected by the findings and recommendations of the royal commission to have at least a day or two to look at the report, which has been in the public domain only since eleven o'clock or 11.30 last Friday morning.

Mr. Gleave: I appreciate the minister's statement that the report has been in the hands of the government for only a short while. However, in light of the fact that for some time it has been public knowledge that tractors were being sold more cheaply to people overseas than to Canadian farmers, would the minister act with all expedition to see that this situation is corrected as rapidly as possible?

Mr. Olson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. As has already been pointed out, a number of actions have already been taken because as you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member will recall, there was a preliminary report or position paper written by Dr. Barber for the agricultural congress held last March. This indicated in a preliminary way what he has now substantiated by evidence. During the intervening period a number of actions have been taken and, indeed, last September I visited the tractor factory in Czechoslovakia that he referred to to ascertain whether or not they would be interested in expanding in a substantial way exports of this type of equipment to North America, particularly Canada.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture and I hope he will bring it to the attention of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that the report describes tractor prices in Canada as being maintained at discriminatory, artificial levels, now maintained arbitrarily by a few large multinational corporations dominating the Canadian market, will the government use the same procedure as it has with the drug manufacturers and suggest that if prices are not reduced the government will seriously consider a definite program of its own?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, this is part of the recommendations in the report. I think we should have a discussion with several ministers, such as the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs who is responsible for anti-combines legislation, and then have a discussion with the farm machinery and equipment companies named in the report.

Mr. Howe: A further supplementary for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Would he consider referring to the Minister of Finance the possibility of a reverse dumping factor in order that there might be equalization of prices, as between the farmers of Canada and the farmers of England?

Mr. Olson: The Minister of Finance is already aware of that recommendation in the report.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): A supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In view of this evi-

dence of price exploitation, would the minister consult with his colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with a view to a rollback in the price increase announced by the major farm implement companies last fall?

Mr. Olson: The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is very well aware of the recommendations in the report, Mr. Speaker, and I have already had a number of discussions with him related to this matter.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Will the minister give consideration to the establishment of a buying agency to carry on the purchasing of tractors and farm equipment from other countries? Also, is the government planning to conduct any further studies, possibly through the royal commission, with a view to the reduction of manufacturing costs in Canada on the basis of the experience of firms now producing tractors in this country?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, that is not one of the recommendations in the report, although perhaps it will be included in discussions of matters to be considered in order to remedy this unsatisfactory situation.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Is it the minister's intention to refer the Special Report on Prices of Tractors and Combines in Canada and Other Countries to the Standing Committee on Agriculture at an early date?

Mr. Olson: We could do that, Mr. Speaker. However, I believe that the Standing Committee on Agriculture has one matter referred by this House before it which will take up most of the time available between now and February 17. There is also a further question of grain marketing on the Order Paper which will have to be taken into consideration as well.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Agriculture. In the minister's discussions in Czechoslovakia with manufacturers of farm machinery did he take the opportunity to point out to them the very evident savings they could make by shipping tractors to western Canada through the port of Churchill?

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Has he set a schedule for this interdepartmental study to be completed within the next two months, say, or does he intend to let it drag on as long as necessary?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, this study is not going to start in the next two months or so; it started several days ago.

Mr. Korchinski: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the minister understood my question. I want to know when it will be completed rather than when it commenced.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is either possible or proper to attempt to predict with confidence, when commencing a task, when it will be completed.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the removal by persons or persons unknown, of plates over serial numbers of tractors imported from England, would the minister say whether he would request his colleague the Solicitor General to have the RCMP investigate this cloak and dagger operation in order to determine the person or persons responsible?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I think the police were informed of that some time ago.

Mr. Speaker: May I bring to the attention of hon. members that we have had quite a few supplementary questions on this subject and it might be in order to move on to another subject and return to hon. members before the end of the question period if there is time.

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUGGESTED MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER WITH NEW QUEBEC LIBERAL PARTY LEADER

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that during the weekend the great economist Robert Bourassa was chosen as leader of the Quebec Liberal party, could the Prime Minister tell us whether he plans to meet this talented man to discuss with him the steps required to check inflation?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Edmonton Centre.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Godin: Should I infer that the Prime Minister would rather fight it alone?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The inference should rather be that the question is not a serious one, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the right hon. gentleman granted a one-hour private audience to Mr. and Mrs. John Lennon during his busy schedule before Christmas, would he inform the House whether he was one of the 20-odd people who paid $1,350 for John and Yoko prints?

HEALTH AND WELFARE

LEGISLATION RESPECTING CIGARETTE ADVERTISING

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Would the minister indicate whether he will be able to make a statement soon in regard to his legislative intentions in line with the report of the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs on the phasing-out of cigarette advertising?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that we are now giving consideration to the committee's report in the department. Our deliberations will then go to the cabinet and government for final determination. Subsequent to that time a policy will be announced.

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS IN TWELFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Justice. In keeping with the undertaking he gave at the close of the last session, is the minister now in a position to report on the examination of evidence by law officers of the Crown in accordance with the recommendations contained in the twelfth report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker. We would not comment on the evidence except that, if charges were warranted, we would put it in the hands of the proper authorities. It is not the practice to comment on evidence one way or another.

IMMIGRATION

ADMISSION OF POLISH JEWS

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Is the government considering any special arrangements to admit to Canada, under the classification of refugees, people who have been forced to leave Poland because they happen to be Jews?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, applicants coming forward from this group to our offices have been very sympathetically received and will continue to be received in this way.

Mr. Fairweather: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How many people in this refugee category have been admitted or given permission to come to Canada as a result of our sympathetic plans?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether the question as asked is in order.

ENTRY OF DANIEL COHN-BENDIT

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the apparent entry into Canada of Danny the Red, can the minister state how this situation has come about when Cohn-Bendit, alias Danny the Red, is restricted by order from coming into this country?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Paproski: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Manpower and Immigration wanted to answer my question about Cohn-Bendit. After all, the man has come into this country illegally. I understand that his entry is restricted and I merely wanted to know why he had been allowed into the country.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It was my impression that the hon. member's question was asked in an argumentative way or implied argument. Unfortunately, I am not

familiar with the details of the situation the hon. member referred to. If it is a matter of immediate interest and does not relate to past circumstances, perhaps the minister will want to reply.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, Cohn-Bendit has been admitted to Canada for a period of six or seven days. He is not a prohibited person so far as Canadian immigration laws are concerned and has therefore been admitted to Canada.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—INQUIRY AS TO MEETING WITH FATHERS KEVIN AND MICHAEL DOHENY

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I gave him notice of it. Is the minister or the Prime Minister going to accept the invitation to meet with Fathers Kevin and Michael Doheny in order to discuss the most recent developments in the former Biafran region?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have had no representations from Fathers Kevin and Michael Doheny, but I would be very happy to see them if they should ask to see me. I have had a telegram from Donald MacPherson, Director of News and Features for the CTV network in Toronto, but I have not had any contact with these gentlemen.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ROSTER SYSTEM—ABSENCE OF CERTAIN MINISTERS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the Prime Minister prompted by the absence today of six ministers who, according to the roster system, are supposed to be present. The system, incidentally, is illegal and contravenes the provisions of Standing Order 5 of this House. Will the Prime Minister revise the present roster system or take disciplinary action against the ministers who are not present and thereby are depriving hon. members of the opportunity to discharge their duties responsibly?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are thinking of taking disciplinary action against the flu virus.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—ACCESSIBILITY OF WAR ZONE TO OBSERVERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On Friday last I asked the Prime Minister a question and he said he would ask the minister to consider it. My question is: Will the government request the Nigerian government to enable observers to visit immediately the areas formerly occupied by Biafran forces in order that they might be in a position to observe and report from the areas in which the main threat of massive starvation is believed to exist?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I missed the key words in the question. What were the hon. member's opening remarks?

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I said by way of preamble that I asked this question of the Prime Minister on Friday, but perhaps that is beside the point now. Will the government request the Nigerian government to enable observers to move immediately into those areas previously occupied by the Biafran forces where the greatest threat of starvation apparently exists?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, we depend to a very large degree upon the observers themselves, and this applies not only to ourselves but also to the Secretary General of the United Nations and the governments of Sweden, Poland and the United Kingdom. So far there has been no indication that the observers have been denied access to any parts. Indeed, the observers have been in some of the most troublesome spots quite recently. In addition, many other observers are now appearing in the area—for example, newspapermen, representatives of the United Kingdom government and General Wrinch of the Red Cross. Therefore we ought to be most careful in making representations which would throw doubt on the good intentions of the Nigerian government.

NIGERIA—COST OF MILITARY OBSERVERS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. On two occasions last week I asked the minister to inform the House who is paying for the cost of the military observers

operating in Nigeria. He said on Thursday that he would answer the question when next he was in the House. Can he reply now?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The answer is that Canada pays the salary and the normal allowances drawn by Department of National Defence officers assigned to overseas duty. We also, of course, cover the transportation costs of the Canadian observers to and from Nigeria. While in Nigeria the Nigerian authorities meet the local accommodation and food expenses of the team and provide transportation, although we are ready to provide transportation if the observers should request it. I understand that this arrangement applies both to Canadian observers and to the nationals of other countries comprising the observer team. The value of rations and quarters is placed at $36 per month and is deducted from the allowances paid to the officers.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the statement that has been made to the effect that international observers admitted into Nigeria have not had access to the area surrounding Uli airstrip, the area in which there is possibly the greatest concentration of refugees, is the minister prepared to say that the observers have been given access to all of former Biafra or is he simply basing his position on the fact that no complaints have come forward from the observers?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I make the assumption, which I hope the Leader of the Opposition makes, that as good Canadians our observers are just as interested in observing conditions and reporting to the Canadian people and the world as either one of us would be.

Mr. Brewin: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister's attention been drawn to the statement of the United Nations observer on the team to the effect that they have not been able to go into any area except that close to advancing troops and that their reports to date were pointless?

Mr. Sharp: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not seen this report.

CITIZENSHIP

REDUCTION OF FIVE-YEAR RESIDENCE PERIOD

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State. It is prompted by the widespread interest of many established residents of Canada in the attainment of the right to vote and the right of citizenship. Is the minister giving consideration to bringing in an amendment to the Citizenship Act which would reduce the mandatory five-year residence period where that is now applicable?

[Mr. Nystrom.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, this matter is included in the interim study pending publication of a White Paper on citizenship.

[*English*]

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

LAY-OFFS OF EMPLOYEES—CHARGES FOR USE OF FILMS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State. Can he report now on the matter of the rentals being charged by the National Film Board, which libraries and other educational institutions have asked be withdrawn?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give a final reply yet in this matter, in spite of the fact that the answer to the starred question gave the particulars as I had heard of them from the National Film Board. But as I said to the House before, this matter was studied by an impartial party appointed by me for the purpose at the request of the Commissioner of the National Film Board. The report was submitted to the Commissioner who then sent it to me. It is now being translated into English and I understand, from talks with the Commissioner, that he has certain remarks and comments that he would like to publicize concurrently with the report, which should be soon.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): A supplementary question to the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the charge for films by the National Film Board is causing serious hardship in the province of Newfoundland where people cannot afford it and as it results in denying many thousands of students the right to this educational facility, will the minister investigate this situation and eliminate the charge in those areas where people cannot afford it?

[*Later:*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Secretary of State. He informed us that the report of the person he appointed to look into the program of possible dismissals by the Film Board and the charges to be made for use of films is in the hands of the commissioner of the Board. Has the report also been made available to the employees' association at the Film Board?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the report is also in the hands of the department but it is being translated. As I said a moment ago, the Commissioner, to whom the report was given, wishes to add certain comments. Naturally, union leaders who feel involved will have the same opportunity. The report was given to all negotiating units of the Board.

[*English*]

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): A supplementary question to the Secretary of State. In the meantime is the National Film Board proceeding with any further lay-offs or have the proposed lay-offs been suspended? I would also like to inquire about the status of the user charges which were announced prior to the Christmas recess.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have dealt with the matter of expenses incurred by those who will be using the National Film Board's films from now on and I have nothing to add in reply to this further question, which is the same as the one directed to me a few minutes ago. In so far as the report is concerned, it contains considerations on this matter.

Finally, I did not quite understand the other part of the hon. member's question. Oh yes, he asked whether there had been any lay-offs. No, there have been no further lay-offs, and there will be none before the report is issued.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR POLITICAL ASYLUM BY POLISH SEAMEN

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): My question is to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Can the minister indicate when his department will make a final disposition of the cases of the nine Polish seamen still in detention at immigration facilities in Halifax?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Very soon, Mr. Speaker. The case is before me at the present time and I hope to deal with it very soon.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

LAC LA BICHE NEWSTART PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): My question is directed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion but in his absence I will direct it to the Prime Minister. Because of the government's insufficient supply of operating capital to the Alberta Newstart training centre in Lac La Biche, Alberta, the school was closed about a month ago. The native people have become very incensed and have occupied the school for some three days. They plan to stay there until the school is re-opened. I ask the Prime Minister to ensure that the small sum required to re-open the school will be available very soon.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member is making a representation he has to assume the suggestion he is making to the government will be considered.

COMMUNICATIONS

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—REVOKING OF RIGHTS OF CANADIAN NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): My question is directed to the Postmaster General. In view of the fact that a December survey of calls from Ottawa to the Northwest Territories showed that only one in ten could be completed due to the busy lines, can the minister indicate to the House whether consideration is being given to the suggestion that the area rights of Canadian National Telecommunications be revoked?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a suggestion. In any event I think this subject, to the extent that it is put in the form of a question, ought to be placed on the Order Paper.

WOMEN

INQUIRY AS TO ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): My question is directed to the Prime

Minister. Can the right hon. gentleman say when we may expect the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have no idea, Mr. Speaker. I will inquire. The commission, of course, decides its own timing and procedures. They may wish to tell me when they expect to report.

TAXATION

MODIFICATION OF WHITE PAPER

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to ask the Prime Minister what is to be the scope of the supplementary white paper on taxation that the Minister of Finance has referred to? Is this supplementary white paper to be confined to certain aspects of capital gains taxation or is it to include other aspects of taxation as well?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have not heard of the supplementary white paper, Mr. Speaker. I will confer with the minister.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I seriously direct this question to the Prime Minister, the head of the government, in the assumption that the Minister of Finance alone does not decide the taxation policy of the government. Has the government itself decided upon modification of the position set forth in the white paper?

Mr. Trudeau: Not yet, Mr. Speaker. We have published the white paper and we have told the Canadian public that we are going to wait for representations from them. Until we have heard from all interested parties, those who want to make presentations, we are not going to revise the white paper.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are we entitled to assume, therefore, from what the Prime Minister has said that the indication by the Minister of Finance is correct and that a supplementary white paper will be presented or a supplementary paper will be presented with modifications? I ask the Prime Minister whether this is necessarily so, and has any such decision yet been made by the government of this country?

Mr. Trudeau: Quite to the contrary. When we published the white paper it was the government's position that we were doing it in order to hear representations and, if necessary, to modify our views on certain points. This is the purpose of a white paper, so that it can be discussed before being put into legislative form. We intend to do this.

Mr. Stanfield: May I suggest that the Prime Minister had better consult with the Minister of Finance—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: —in view of the fact he also indicated—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

BANNING OF SALE OF CERTAIN TOYS CONTAMINATED BY DDT

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): My question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of a television program last night concerning various types of children's toys being contaminated by DDT, will the minister indicate to the House what action he has taken to assure the buyers of all toys made in other countries as well as Canada that toys found to be contaminated with DDT will be banned from sale?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to look into this matter. I believe this would be an area of responsibility of my colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, on the advice of the Food and Drug Directorate.

ELECTIONS

POLICY RESPECTING PROCESSES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Was the President of the Treasury Board enunciating government policy when in a speech the other evening to the National Conference on Science and Engineering he looked forward to the day when politicians will not have to go through the "rather tiresome charade" of present-day electoral processes?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Vancouver East.

Mr. Dinsdale: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member rises on a question of privilege.

Mr. Dinsdale: I regard this question to be of some considerable urgency because it appears

to be the beginning of the government's process of bypassing the electorate in the same way it now bypasses Parliament.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

STUDY OF MEMBERS' INDEMNITIES, ETC.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? Two hundred and sixty-four members of the House are interested in the matter but nobody seems to have the guts to ask the question so I will do so. Does the Prime Minister have under consideration the appointment of a commissioner or commissioners to study all aspects of salaries, expenses, research facilities, offices, indemnities and everything else with regard to members of the House of Commons and perhaps the Senate? If so, when does he expect to name the commissioner or commissioners?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the government has this matter under consideration and we hope to make an announcement in due course.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I trust that "in due course" will be as long as it usually is.

Mr. Trudeau: I am glad we have the support of the hon. member on this very important question.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The Prime Minister knows he is misunderstanding me. He does not have my support.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I was merely going to say that, before the Prime Minister appoints a commissioner or commissioners, in the interest of all hon. members perhaps he should consult with the hon. member for York West.

MANPOWER

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—INQUIRY AS TO PROGRAMS TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have an urgent question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration arising out of the statement yesterday by the Minister of Finance that the government has some special programs to offset the forced unemployment in the Atlantic and other areas of Canada. Will the minister say what the nature of these special programs is and, if he is not in a position to give a detailed statement now, will he take the first possible opportunity to make such a statement on motions?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is in order to the extent that the hon. member invites the minister to make a statement on motions.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to make a statement when the circumstances justify it.

Mr. Lundrigan: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Approximately two months ago I posed this question and the minister gave me the same supercilious and senseless answer. Approximately 20 per cent of the people of Newfoundland are unemployed and about 16 per cent are unemployed in Atlantic Canada. Surely to God there has been time for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to prepare a statement indicating what plans, if any, the government has to offset unemployment. This is a useless situation.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question related to the request just put to the minister by the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate. Will the minister also deal with the situation that is developing as a result of the situation at Fairey Aviation of Canada and indicate what is to be done to offset this unemployment? We have heard absolutely nothing or very little in this regard. What are the department's plans for rehiring and relocating these several hundred employees?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will put a question onto the Order Paper I will be happy to give him all the details about departmental activities in this situation.

Mr. Forrestall: Is that going to put food in their stomachs or money in their pockets?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ACTION TO MAINTAIN GOOD RELATIONS WITH WEST INDIES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs who has left the House, but it is of such importance that the Prime Minister might deal with it. In view of the fact certain persons studying here

in Canada are returning to various parts of the West Indies and indicating that this country is racist, would the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and other ministers give the required publicity and meet with the several high commissioners in order to impress upon them that this country does not follow racist policies and that it never will, so that the relationships we enjoy with these countries in the Caribbean will not be affected to such an extent that the faith they have in us now will be less?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will very gladly take up this important suggestion with the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

WATER RESOURCES

PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed from Friday, January 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, 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, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Last Friday, while the House was studying a motion for second reading of Bill C-144, the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) rose on a point of order to call the attention of the House to a difference that existed at least on the surface between the French and English texts in the preamble of the said bill.

What the hon. member said is reported on page 2497 of the official report of House of Commons' Debates of Friday last. Several members took part in the ensuing debate on the point of order and it was agreed that a ruling would be handed down later on, so that the Chair could have a chance to study the contested point.

The French text of the preamble has this sentence:

Et considérant que le Parlement du Canada souhaite, en outre, que des programmes d'ensemble soient entrepris par le gouvernement du Canada agissant seul ou en collaboration avec les gouvernements provinciaux...

[Mr. Alexander.]

[*English*]

On the other hand, the English text reads:

And whereas the Parliament of Canada is desirous that, in addition, comprehensive programs be undertaken by the government of Canada, and by the government of Canada in co-operation with provincial governments—

It would appear that there is a difference between the two texts in that the French version uses the disjunctive form while the English text uses the conjunctive "and". It should be pointed out that the English text would not make sense unless the conjunction "and" were interpreted as being both conjunctive and disjunctive, so that in substance there may not be any real difference between the two texts. It seems to me that the difference is more one of form than one of substance.

At the same time, while the Speaker might be expected to know something about procedure interpretation he is probably not expected to be at the same time a grammatical expert. I suggest, indeed, that it is not the duty of the Chair to interpret the language of a measure when one text appears to be at variance with or different from the text of the other official language. The difficulty is compounded in this sense that if it were found that there was a real difference between the two texts it would be difficult for the Chair to rule on which of the two reflects the intention of those who have drafted the bill.

[*Translation*]

During the debate last Friday, it was suggested that the problem could be more usefully considered at the committee stage, when the question could be submitted to the minister's advisers. That suggestion seems to me both practical and reasonable. In fact, any amendment to the preamble or any clause of the bill at the second reading stage would be contrary to the rules.

Is it necessary to add that, according to many precedents, a private member cannot move an amendment to the preamble of a bill. In this connection, I quote May's Parliamentary Practice, 17th edition, in particular the following paragraph to be found on page 548:

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Amendments may be made in every part of the bill, whether in the clauses or the schedules. Clauses may be left out and new clauses and schedules added. Amendments to the preamble and title are also admissible where amendments have been made to the bill which render them necessary.

It would seem that while a substantive amendment to the preamble cannot be proposed even in committee, a modification proposed for purposes of clarification or uniformity would not come under the prescription stated by May.

I would therefore suggest that the amendment, if any is required, should be proposed at the committee stage.

[*Translation*]

I hope that the hon. member for Lotbinière will accept what I am suggesting to him, namely that the very valid question which he raised last Friday could be considered in a more logical, more practical and more efficient way when the bill is studied by the committee.

[*English*]

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, in order to place in some context the remarks I want to make this afternoon I should like with your permission to remind hon. members briefly of the inseparability of water as a resource not only for this generation of Canadians but for many future generations.

The measure now before us has been dealt with fully and the lack of what we would expect as being a meaningful suggestion regarding methods of controlling the pollution of waters in Canada has been pointed out. Most glaring of all is the fact that there has been no comment by a spokesman from the government side or from anybody else in the House during this debate or on previous occasions when water has been discussed, regarding the thousands and thousands of miles of contiguous and still fresh, pure water on both coasts and off the Arctic shelf. I have not been able to find any such reference. It is the lack of any such reference in the Bill before us that prompts me at this time to take part in the debate which will result in deciding whether or not the bill should be referred to the committee.

It seems to me, as I am sure it must seem to thousands of Canadians, that water whether it be salt or fresh is a priceless human resource. Four of the many things that live in water can be found in the waters contiguous to our country. This fact alone brings me to my feet in dismay over the failure of the government and the minister, even in terms of fresh water pollution, to establish guidelines and to bring forward a policy for a country which has one of the largest coastal lines in the world. Senator Claiborne Pell, reporting in *Saturday Review* of October 11, 1969 under the title of "The Oceans, Man's Last Great Resource" had this to say:

> After millenniums of exploiting and often destroying the riches of the land, man is now hovering acquisitively over the wealth of the oceans that cover three-quarters of the earth. In the no man's land of the seabed, a scramble for minerals and oil, for new underwater empires secured by advancing armies of technology—

He points out that people are concerned with and are desirous of tapping this wealth and establishing what he goes on to describe as moral commitments.

I suggest that the failure of the minister and his departmental officials in drafting this bill to establish the first national guidelines in recent times on the question of pollution of our waters is not acceptable to myself and certainly is not acceptable to thousands upon thousands of fishermen upon both our coasts. It cannot be acceptable to the thousands of people who during the summer must look out daily, for example, on the waters off Vancouver and off the beautiful city of Victoria and physically smell and see the pollution which is there. I cannot understand, in these first guidelines, why there was no reference to the contiguous salt waters of Canada, let alone waters such as the Gulf of St. Lawrence, our great national harbours, the Arctic, Hudson Bay and many others. I cannot understand this and I am sure the constituents in our maritime provinces, as well as the citizens of Canada, cannot understand it either.

In his remarks in this debate the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) lamented the failure of the government to move effectively in respect of a national standard concerning water pollution and water control. I believe he was correct in making that observation. I think the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), when he replied to the minister, was right when he commented on the failure of the proposals in this bill to meaningfully attack or even approach the great problem involved in this question of pollution. One of the problems which perhaps the minister faced, and one that I can understand although I do not accept it and do not believe anyone accepts it, was the failure of the government and the draftsmen to make provision for minimum standards of water quality.

The hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter) spoke of the pollution of one of the great fishing areas of his native province of Newfoundland. He spoke about the failure of

the government to act under the authority contained in the regulations under the Fisheries Act. In connection with this point, I wish to suggest that I do not believe Canadians are afraid to spend the required dollars and cents in respect of water purity and water control, if those expenditures will mean that incidents such as occurred in Newfoundland will not take place in the future. Indeed, on the contrary, I think any national sampling of opinion would indicate approval for the immediate and urgent expenditure of money. I am concerned about the salt water immediately off both our coasts. I am concerned about the failure of the minister and the government to include any meaningful thoughts in their present bill.

It is rather interesting to note that the bill simply refers to water and does not define salt water or fresh water. I have not heard anyone imply that the bill is to cover salt water, so I am making the assumption that it does not and that the bill was designed to cover only inland fresh water systems. I am disturbed about this because even a casual study of the efforts of other maritime nations around the world with regard to the water over the continental shelves lying off their immediate coasts suggests they have a real concern and one which Canada has not begun to approach. We have a continental shelf covered with water to the extent of some 1½ million square miles. That is almost half of Canada's total land area. The failure of the government to deal, in this bill, even in passing, with the danger to Canadians and to the world through pollution of these waters is inexcusable. It is very difficult to understand. Indeed, I suppose in many respects it displays a weakness of thought and unconcern with the question.

I sometimes wonder, because the pressure to do something about pollution has grown so rapidly in the last two or three years, whether there was a politically motivated fear that if the government did not do something that failure might be misconstrued. I suggest that if the government had any strong or moral convictions, it would have done something meaningful and useful for Canadians.

It is interesting to note that there has been no comment on this bill from large Canadian industries. I sometimes wonder whether they are just sitting back, keeping their fingers crossed, in the hope that nobody will find what they consider to be the glaring omissions from this bill.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

• (4:10 p.m.)

It is not my desire to deal today with the inland or fresh waters; I wish to stay, if I can, with the subject of the off-shore waters, the salt waters. In recent years we have witnessed the failure of the federal government to resolve satisfactorily the question of off-shore mineral rights. In this field alone there has been considerable delay in the application of applied research to methods of reaching the resources of the sea. This is simply a consequence of the government's failure or inability to resolve the more fundamental question. Today we are talking about water rather than minerals, but the connection is an obvious one. If we have failed to resolve so straightforward a matter as the ownership or right of interest in the mineral contents of the continental shelf, how in the name of the Lord shall we ever resolve the question raised by effective control over the quality of our coastal waters?

In the years ahead, life on earth may well depend on the quality of our water. In an age in which we talk about famine and starvation and when doubts are expressed as to the ability of the planet to feed mankind in the not too distant future, it seems extremely short-sighted to me that we have not turned much sooner in our development to the resource that is the sea. Some day we shall, and I hope that when this day comes our people will be able to look back to the closing years of the 20th century and say: Some Canadians were concerned; some people, at least, were beginning to protect the quality and the purity of our salt waters. Failure to do so now would represent an abdication of our responsibility and duty to future generations. If we fail to act now, what is there to show that the next generation will take the step we should have taken? If we intend to do something, let us do it today, let us do it this year—let us establish guidelines and enforce meaningful ways to control the pollution of our salt waters.

I am not one of those who believe we shall never clean up our fresh waters. I believe we shall. Significant work is going on now at Burlington, the inland centre for fresh water studies. But it is a damned shame nothing is going on at the Bedford Institute of Oceanology with regard to this question—as a matter of fact, it is inexcusable. If we do not find a way to approach our neighbours in the maritime communities around the world, if we have not by the turn of this century effectively established minimum standards for the protection of the quality of these salt waters,

I am afraid the task of cleaning up our oceans will make the task of cleaning up our fresh waters seem like the rinsing out of a wash basin or bath after a shower.

We can clean up our fresh water, and we shall do so. This bill, meagre and fainthearted as it is in its approach, is at least one step. I commend my hon. friend from Parry Sound-Muskoka and my hon. friend from South Western Nova for their restraint in dealing with it—they recognized, as I do, that this measure is at least a step—but I shall never understand the government's cowardice in not going all the way; I shall never understand the failure of the government to come to grips with the problem of pollution by big industry. By foisting this off on to the provinces it is saying there is no way by which federal standards can be brought to bear. This avoidance of responsibility is cowardly. This is not what Canadians want, at least not the ones I talk to. Constitutional issues be damned! The preservation of our fresh water is important. The cleanliness of our salt water is also important. If we are to wait until we see what the provinces do in terms of establishing quality control areas in order that the federal act can be applied, I am afraid we are only delaying the solution to these questions, nothing more.

The cleaning up of our rivers, lakes and streams will be a costly process but if we fail to do something of consequence soon, either unilaterally or on a multi-national basis to protect our salt waters, it will take hundreds of years and untold expenditure to remedy the damage.

There are dangers, and they are becoming increasingly evident. Three major explosions have occurred aboard oil tankers off the coast of Africa—inexplicable explosions which have crippled and sunk three 200,000 ton oil tankers. They were empty, thank God, but what would have happened if they had been full—if 200,000 tons of crude oil, or however many tons or barrels of oil their cargo represents, had been spilled into the ocean? I do not say that something is not being done. The oil companies concerned have moved swiftly; they have accepted their responsibility for trying to determine the cause of these accidents. They realize the long lasting effect of the breaking up of large supertankers on the high seas. All the world realizes the danger. We have all seen what happened in California. We have all seen what happened when the *Torrey Canyon* broke up in the Bristol Channel. Well, we in Canada, with one of the longest coast lines in the world, have failed to include any reference whatsoever in this bill to what may be the greatest resource we possess—the waters contiguous to our three coasts.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I hope that when this bill goes to committee, the committee members will call before them people who will tell them about the danger of pollution to our salt waters, people who can speak with some exactness and on the basis of knowledge about the cost of cleaning up polluted salt water as compared with that of cleaning up inland water. For example, I would hope they would take a look at Bedford Basin, which is already dangerously close to being in a very serious situation. I have been told that a body of fresh water similar in size to Bedford Basin could be cleaned up in a matter of a few short years, but that Bedford Basin would require many years' work because it is salt water.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I lament the failure of the government to recognize the oneness of the resource that is water. I lament its failure to mention the oceans that surround us. I regret the failure of Canada to bring the matter of pollution before international bodies. This has lessened our international reputation. Certainly, we are concerned with and join international debates on the peaceful uses of the sea bed. We have great concern over the location of detection devices on our continental shelf, and over the strategic value of undersea weaponry.

Earlier today we heard one hon. member express concern about the report of a standing committee on which he serves. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned, but I suggest it is only in a casual, superficial way. When it comes to translating our thoughts into action, we pussyfoot. We use every device known to us to avoid facing fundamental truths and facts.

I am pleased to belong to a party which would never bring a bill of this nature before the House of Commons, a bill which goes only part way down what is a very long road. That road is a two-way street. I hope members of the committee which will examine this bill will accept the responsibility of tidying it up, of making it worthy of our intentions to combat pollution not only of our fresh waters but of the oceans surrounding us, waters that are our greatest human resource.

Mr. John Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, on rising to take part in the discussion on

Bill C-144 I wish first to deal briefly with the situation in my province of Saskatchewan. Numerous comments have been made about the Saskatchewan River, which also flows into Manitoba, and all of the reports and observations we have read are far from what we consider adequate explanations of what could be done to stop its pollution.

We have been informed that the North Saskatchewan River is polluted by the pulp mill that exists at Prince Albert. Spent acid and caustics are being dumped into the river. The water below the mill is black, and the foam markings on the river banks are an indication of the lack of pollution control. I have been told that enough caustics have been dumped into the river by that pulp mill to make any form of fish life impossible for many miles downstream.

Some provinces have regulations requiring that effluent discharges be treated by aeration, but there are no such regulations with respect to this location at Prince Albert. Instead, all that is done is to provide settling ponds, and all hon. members know, particularly the minister in charge of this bill, that no effective type of pollution control can be achieved with only the use of settling ponds.

I am positive that if federal legislation were introduced that had teeth, the people of the nation would support it wholeheartedly because they are awake to the dangers of water pollution. No doubt certain power groups would lobby against the enforcement of such legislation, the adoption of which might cut into their profits, but the people generally, including those who work in factories, pulp mills and mining enterprises would appreciate the government taking positive action.

At present we have a hodgepodge of provincial regulations and authorities. A waiting game is being played. The status quo is being maintained. I believe the time has come for the federal government to implement positive legislation that will enforce pollution control.

A release by *Canadian Press,* which appeared a short time ago with reference to the Prince Albert pulp mill, stated in part:

> The Prince Albert Pulp Mill is not contributing to mercury poisoning in fish in the North Saskatchewan River, Paul Naftel of Regina, said during the weekend.
>
> Mr. Naftel, of the Natural Resources Department's Fisheries Branch, said although mercury was found in fish at the ferry below the pulp mill, it also was found in fish up river from the plant.

The Toronto *Globe and Mail* of January 19, today's date, contains an article headed, "Lack of Information and Equipment Hampers Study of Mercury Pollution." It reads in part:

> Investigators of mercury pollution in the Saskatchewan River, uncertain about the source of the problem, are hampered by a lack of information and research equipment.

Further on, it reads:

> It isn't that the problem didn't exist until six weeks ago. Nobody had ever checked Saskatchewan River water for mercury pollution before.

This indicates to me that the federal government does not provide the necessary resources to the provinces to enable them to do the proper research into water quality. Unless sufficient funds are provided to the provinces to enable them to investigate the quality of their waters, nothing will be done to combat pollution until it is too late, and until fish have died by the millions.

I quote another press article as follows:

> Grant C. Mitchell, Executive Director of the Saskatchewan Water Resources Commission, said Friday his department will deal next week with a plant at Saskatoon accused of polluting the North and South with mercury.

This investigation results from complaints from Manitoba. We should not have to wait for complaints from another province before launching such an investigation.

It has been said many times that there is no excuse for giving a licence to any company or individual to pollute our waters. This must be repeated time after time if we are really concerned about the over-all situation. I am sure that some members have referred to the *Canadian Churchman,* January issue, where certain comments appeared that I think should be put on the record. One article is written by Maurice Western, entitled "Ottawa Comment", and it reads:

• (4:30 p.m.)

> In the session of 1960, pollution rated a few scattered questions, speeches by a pair of backbenchers and a private member's bill in the name of Bert Herridge. The bill received first reading and then consigned, as usual but unfortunately, to parliamentary oblivion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this pollution question has not just come upon us today. Here is a report, which indicates that as far back as 1960 the member had a private bill on the order paper but he accomplished nothing that would help mankind or animal life to survive. The article continues:

> The complaining backbenchers are now gone from the Commons. What they said about dead birds, oil spills and ruined fishing grounds has since been abundantly substantiated. But nothing much happened to disturb Marx and Technology or to check the pace of pollution.

Now suddenly a floodtide of public concern is out-dating the plans of all governments before they have even taken effect.

It appears that the only time any government will act is when the public demands that something be done, regardless of which government is in power. In the following paragraph, Mr. Western states:

In addition, the government, following the Swedish lead, has clamped down on the use of ddt. It is under pressure to take similar action against other polluting products.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when I asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) about pollution and DDT on children's toys, I got the stock answer, "we do not know but we will look into it." Mr. Speaker, that is not good enough. This government must take positive action today, not tomorrow, about pollutants which the scientists tell us exist, the facts about which are well documented beyond any reasonable doubt. The government could pass legislation or enforce the present legislation to ensure that the people of this country are not subjected to complete contamination by all pollutants. In another paragraph, the article reads:

Unhappily, we are constitutionally handicapped as compared with other countries in committing ourselves to international co-operation. We have not ratified the 1962 Convention on the High Seas, which dealt with ocean pollution, and we have been unable to take advantage of the opportunities for co-operation in interstate and international waters created by the U.S. federal water pollution control act of 1956.

The reason is the inability of the federal government to enter into treaties which impose obligations on lower levels of government in Canada.

While we talk about being constitutionally handicapped, I again emphasize the fact that this government has the backing of the people of this nation. If the government of any province suggested that it would not agree to strong antipollution measures, it would never be re-elected.

As one citizen of Davidson, Saskatchewan, Mr. E. Laird, said:

My first concern is to have enough money to eat and my second concern is to be able to stay alive or survive in this pollution-riddled world.

Most people in this nation today, Mr. Speaker, are positive they will no longer be able to survive in this polluted atmosphere. The provincial governments of this country are still prepared to use petty arguments on a political basis in order to try to substantiate their condemnation of federal legislation. I think it is very very important that we find out at an early date what these provinces will do, and if any of them object to strong federal legislation this House and the Country should be well aware of it.

I cannot understand why, as far back as 1962, the Convention on the High Seas was not ratified. As we look at the provinces standing in the way, it makes us wonder where we are going and how we are going to get there.

In the October, 1969 issue of *Reclamation*, there are comments on the new Canada water act as follows:

Toronto: Ontario's Energy and Resources Minister J. H. Kerr yesterday welcomed the proposed Canada Water Act and said Premier John Robarts is even more determined than I that we are going to co-operate with Ottawa in this. He hoped there would be no jurisdictional problems.

I will add "Amen" to that, Mr. Speaker.

Victoria, B.C.: Ray Willison, British Columbia's Minister of Resources, said the province would co-operate with Ottawa but, in the manner one would "when someone points a revolver at your head."

That is a disgraceful statement by the minister in British Columbia and one typical of a defendant of the status quo. Any minister who stands up in the provincial legislative assembly and says, "We will co-operate when someone puts a revolver at our head" is not too concerned about pollution control.

Winnipeg: Natural Resources Minister Sid Green called the federal government "a move to dramatize the seriousness of the pollution problem." However, he expressed concern that the administrative body set up to govern pollution would be unwilling to enforce strictures against pollution.

At the same time, Health Minister Leonard Evans commented, "The federal government's intention is good, there is no doubt." Of course, intentions are not good enough, Mr. Speaker; it is action that the people of Canada are concerned about. Then, we move to Edmonton where Health Minister James Henderson said:

Ottawa's proposed Canada Water Act will not solve the problems of water pollution.

Here again, we can ask who is the Edmonton Health Minister concerned about? Is it the people of Canada and their health or is he concerned about sticking up for the status quo and making sure that the industries polluting the water in Alberta are not affected by antipollution measures?

Medicine Hat *News*: Alberta's Health Minister threw some cold water on Ottawa's proposed Canada Water Act. His grounds were poorly chosen. The minister, James Henderson, said the act will not solve the problems of water pollution because the major generators of pollution are population cen-

tres. His point about sources of pollution may be correct but this does not mean that industrial pollution can be ignored, it must be curbed.

I can add my thanks to the editorial writer in the Medicine Hat *News* for stating a situation as it actually exists.

Quebec: Paul Allard, Quebec Natural Resources Minister, was critical yesterday of the federal government's announcement of a federal-provincial water clean-up campaign. Mr. Allard chided the government for what he said was its failure to consult with the provinces before announcing a proposed Canada Water Act.

Once again, we are back to the constitutional question. Here are some examples, Mr. Speaker, of provinces that are not concerned about pollution but only about political gain by opposing federal legislation, even though that federal legislation in my opinion is very weak and was only brought forth so that the feelings of the provinces would not be hurt. Surely, these provinces could look intelligently at the over-all situation and not try to put roadblocks in the way of pollution control measures brought in by the federal government. Hopefully, then, in committee we will be able to make amendments to this legislation, Bill C-144, so that it will really mean something and help the people of this nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure it is a straight case of the government of this day looking at the over-all situation as elimination or survival. If any so-called constitutional legal experts attempt to use pollution to feather their nests then there can be only one answer, the tar and feather philosophy. Then, we will see how long they can survive when resembling a bird. We all know birds of a feather stick together. But the only place for opponents of the national pollution policy is at the end of a pipeline which is discharging untreated, contaminated effluent into our streams, rivers and lakes and they should be kept there long enough to know what pollution is all about. Unless we make these people realize what pollution means, then there is nothing we can possibly do about it.

We see that various governmental bodies are to be used to deal with pollution control. It is said that there will be a federal program co-ordinated by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources through an interdepartmental committee. It seems that the Department of Agriculture will not be involved in this matter and I hope that when the bill goes to committee, the views of the Department of Agriculture will be sought, because it can be most useful in over-all programs relating to pollution control. Also, I think the Minister of Finance, (Mr. Benson) Treasury Board and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) himself ought to be drawn into these discussions. Unless those who hold the purse strings can be interested in a proposition for pollution control, no money for pollution control measures will be forthcoming. Although the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) appears sincere in his desire to curb pollution, little has come from the Prime Minister's office on the subject, except pollution in the form of verbiage.

• (4:40 p.m.)

As I see it, the bill before us expounds a philosophy but will do little to correct the present situation. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) representing Saskatoon-Humboldt and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, have asked members of the public to make representations to those repsonsible for pollution control. The public has been asked to participate in the discussions pertaining to this bill. There are many instances of people having tried to approach provincial or municipal governments on the subject of controlling pollution, but without success. In Moose Jaw, Mr. Gerry Hudson, first vice-president of the Moose Jaw and District Labour Council, made a survey of the incidents of pollution in the Moose Jaw area and presented his findings to council. Nothing was done about his report. Mr. Hudson and his assistants took photographs of surrounding waters and documented their findings. On November 18, 1969, they presented the findings to council in the hope that the matter would go to the provincial or federal governments. The newspaper report in my hand regarding this incident reads as follows:

Gerry Hudson, first vice president of the Moose Jaw and District Labor Council, attacked city council Monday for not acting on a labor council pollution brief.

The article continues. Answering an alderman who asked if someone could be accused of polluting something already polluted, Mr. Hudson expressed surprise and said:

'Surely, this could be characterized as the idiocy of the year' . . . 'The logic of the observation escapes us . . . an analogy to this might be—if a woman is raped once would it be pointless to accuse someone if she was raped a second time?'

In essence, this bill says that because our rivers and streams have been raped, they will therefore continue to be raped again, again and again. They will continue being polluted.

I hope no one will say that just because rivers and lakes are evil smelling, our conclu-

sions that they are polluted are unscientific. In 1954, Moose Jaw city council had on its books a bylaw prohibiting the pollution of streams or rivers of the area. Unfortunately, no one enforced the bylaw. It is pointless having bylaws that are not enforced. I was as guilty as anyone for not making sure that our anti-pollution bylaws were enforced because at one time I was a member of city council. Unfortunately, I was as ignorant as the next man about the extent of our pollution. This shows how necessary it is for us to have strong federal laws if we are to control pollution. At the same time, I hope we shall not be accused of being unscientific if we say that evil smelling waters are polluted. Municipal authorities and those involved with pollution matters must make their views known, and we must therefore make certain that the members making up the committee to study this bill will not adopt an arrogant attitude and say that allegations of pollution are not being substantiated with scientific evidence.

According to the bill, it seems that the Governor in Council alone will decide whether the minister has made all responsible efforts to reach agreement with the provinces in this area. I do not think the Governor in Council alone should have the right to make this decision. I ask, after it has established a treatment plant in a designated water quality management area, how will the federal government collect revenues with repsect to that?

For the last couple of years, the federal government has only talked about pollution but done nothing concrete. Its approach to the problem is typified by saying it wants to help but that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has no money available for pollution control purposes. We need water quality standards in Canada to apply especially to interprovincial waters. The federal government measures quantities of water throughout Canada; why could it not, by using the same staff and facilities, measure the quality of those same waters? Prairie Farm Rehabilitation engineers, who are the people on the spot in many instances, could do useful work in measuring water quality.

Replying to motion for papers No. 51, which I believe was in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), the Minister of National Health and Welfare indicated that there are a certain number of municipalities which have done absolutely nothing to control the pollution of their waters. On the one hand, the government cut the allotment in its 1969 budget for pollution control and, on the other, the minister has been going around the country expounding the philosophy that we must control pollution. Some municipalities do not even have adequate sewer or lagoon facilities. A few have lagoon treatment systems. Municipalities in need have asked the federal government for assistance, but they have been told there is no money. Question No. 107 on the Order Paper is in the name of the hon. member for Kootenay West. It asks whether the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has announced that incentives for the construction of municipal sewage plants exist under the National Housing Act. Part 7 of the question asks, "If so, which cities and municipalities have been informed of this decision?" As I look at the list before me, I see listed municipalities in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, Saskatchewan, etc.

• (4:50 p.m.)

As I go down the list, there are many, many areas, including British Columbia, which intended doing something but which have been told by this government, sorry, there just is no money. The government makes the pretence of telling the people of these provinces that really they are prepared to help with pollution control, but there is no money. The provinces and municipalities cannot do this alone. They alone were not responsible for this pollution. There is no other way of looking at it than from the standpoint that they must receive assistance from the federal government if we expect to accomplish anything.

I noticed that the comments I received in one of the questionnaires I sent out could apply to the entire nation. A letter from Davidson, Saskatchewan, refers to the DDT in the tissues of all Canadians. In fact, there is more DDT here than is permitted in animals slaughtered for human consumption. DDT comes into the over-all picture of pollution, but not necessarily too strongly in the Canada water act.

Another comment I wish to put on record is from a gentleman in Moose Jaw. He says:

—inflation and pollution are closely related. They have their roots in the profit system.

I think everyone in this House realizes that these people who are making the profits must also be obligated to erase completely the pollution we have in our environment. I now wish to put on the record a few comments with regard to pollution generally. The questions asked these people were, what action

they considered should be taken with regard to pollution and were they in favour of strong federal pollution controls? These are some of the replies I received:

By all means, any city or town should be compelled to control pollution at their own expense.

The sooner the better.

We need to keep a healthy and sanitary Canada.

No sewage should be allowed to run into any river or lake.

The problem can't be ignored.

As I look at this list, I see there are many other comments from various other parts of the area.

Definitely. Crack down on all offenders, big and small.

Should be federal laws on pollution so individual provinces could not sacrifice to get industry.

I believe this is one of the main points this government should realize. There must be strong federal measures or individual provinces may have to sacrifice pollution control because industries will not locate where they have to worry about pollution control. Some more of the answers are as follows:

It is long past time of being needed. It is most important now.

Emphatically and now.

It is becoming a serious problem and is vital to our survival.

T.N.T. today—not tomorrow.

Yes, and make the polluters pay for it.

More money is spent on less important items.

It has got to be done or we will all be poisoned eventually.

Hopefully it isn't too late.

Definitely. I am a strong conservationist and think Rachel Carson's book is not exaggerated.

It should be done now before it's too late.

National policy in this regard to date is a disgrace. Much more must be done and soon.

The people most responsible are often not too concerned—only for profits.

Strict control must be put into force immediately.

If they don't take firmer measures, the whole country will suffer and it would cost a great deal more and perhaps it would be too late.

Long past due.

It is long overdue.

Yes, especially raw sewage from cities and industrial waste from industry going into rivers, lakes, etc.

We wish to have clean air and water for us and our future generations.

The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) addressed a meeting in Vancouver on January 15, 1970. I wish to quote one short paragraph from his statement:

A national water quality code is essential.

We need to know what the performance standards for each industry are. We also must get each industrial association into the mood where their membership is prepared to carry out joint research and to recognize the public relations advantages of voluntary measures control.

Regional guidelines must also be drawn because each area of the country has its own requirements and may want to set higher standards still.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

In my opinion Bill C-144 does none of the things the Minister of Fisheries mentioned. Later on, he states:

In industry we must keep the worst pollutants to ourselves.

I suggest that keeping the worst pollutants to ourselves refers to the industry or municipality that is polluting. It is not good enough to suggest that we will put in primary pollution control measures which in effect would only take the lumps out and that is all. As we look at the speech the minister delivered in Vancover, it makes us wonder. He talks about industry-hungry New Brunswick being able to see the river dying, and mining seriously affecting the Atlantic salmon industry:

The mining industry currently employs 200 men the year round; the fishery 600 New Brunswickers on a part-time basis. One, the mines, has a limited 15 year life. The other, hopefully, has an unlimited life.

I hope the minister will have some influence on his cabinet colleagues with regard to pollution control measures. I feel that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, as well as the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, is concerned about pollution controls. Their concern is to no avail, unless the resources are at their disposal to do something about this problem.

According to the statistics we have, it is absolutely impossible for this country to survive much longer unless money is made available to these various departments which are concerned. When this bill goes to committee, I am certain we will ensure that there are strong federal measures put into the bill so that the pollution control measures envisaged by the average individual in this country will be implemented by federal legislation. Provincial legislation will never be able to handle it. When this bill is considered, I ask that the cabinet reintroduce those loans under Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which are directed towards pollution control so there will be some funds available to do something about this problem.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the

House that the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment tonight are as follows: the hon. member for Broadview (Mr. Gilbert)—Housing—inquiry as to allowances; the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Consumer Affairs—alleged misleading advertising by Imperial Tobacco Company; the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Dumont)—External Affairs—Nigeria-Canadian action following ceasefire.

Order, please. 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, notices of motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

THE SENATE

MOTION TO ESTABLISH COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE ROLE IN PARLIAMENTARY SYSTEM

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the appointment of a Special Committee of this House which shall have the power to hold hearings in various parts of Canada, take testimony and hire experts, with the following terms of reference: That it shall examine the role of the Senate within Parliament and in its general constitutional functions and report with recommendations on whether the Senate should continue as it has been and is, or whether it should be abolished (and if so, by what means) or whether some form of reformed Senate is worth while (and if so, what reforms).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Having read the motion to the House, I feel it is incumbent upon the Chair to draw the attention of the House to the fact that a decision has been taken with respect to one of the provisions in this proposed motion.

• (5:00 p.m.)

On December 16 last, the House negatived a motion for second reading of Bill C-18, which bill proposed the abolition of the Senate. Having made that statement, I refer hon. members to citation 194 of Beauchesne's fourth edition. I will read it in part:

A motion or amendment cannot be brought forward which is the same in substance as a question which has already been decided, because a proposition being once submitted and carried in the affirmative or negative cannot be questioned again but must stand as the judgment of the House.

In view of the provisions of that citation I will allow the debate to proceed, but it could be difficult for the House to reach a point where a decision might be taken. However, I think in all fairness to the hon. member and in view of the fact that in part his motion goes beyond the specific point, dealt with in Bill C-18, I will allow the debate at this time.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the decision which was made last month, I want to make it clear that as I move this resolution I am, have been, and will continue to be a believer in the abolition of the Senate. The reason I moved the resolution in the form in which I did was that I realized it was unlikely the House would approve a resolution calling for the outright abolition of the Senate. That being the case, it seemed to me possible that the House might be willing to approve a resolution which gave consideration to the appointment of a committee to study, not just the question of whether or not the Senate should be abolished, but how the Senate could be reconstituted to make a better contribution to the democratic life of this country.

Anybody who studies the evolution of the democratic system in society, whether it be in Canada, Great Britain, France or any other country, will quickly realize that second chambers such as the Senate or the House of Lords are actually the survivors of a predemocratic age. They are survivors of feudal institutions and constitutions which were in effect in medieval Europe before democratic systems such as we know them came into existence. The upper houses in most countries in early generations represented not faith in democracy but a hedge against democracy. The House of Lords in Great Britain was the bulwark of privilege and property, while the House of Commons was the protagonist of the rights of the people. I suggest that anyone who looks at the books which have been written about the Canadian Senate will come to the conclusion that the same is true of our upper house.

Robert MacKay in his book "The Unreformed Senate of Canada" said that of 308 Senators who served in the Senate of Canada from 1925 to 1963, 71 per cent were recruited from the realm of law, business and agriculture. Professional fields such as medicine, engineering, education and journalism, not to mention the very substantial percentage of Canadian people one can classify as workers or labour, have been grossly underrepresented in the membership of the Senate.

If one looks at the Parliamentary Guide and considers individual Senators, one can

quickly see to what I have reference. I made no exhaustive study, but if my figures are wrong at all they are not wrong to any great extent. Let me give a couple of examples of what I have in mind.

Senator Hayden is a director of 10 companies in Canada. Senator Aird is the director of eight or nine companies Senator Molson is the director of eight companies. Senator Gelinas is director of 15 companies and Senator Thorvaldson is a director of nine companies. There is nothing illegal about this and I do not suggest that for a minute, but I do want to say that in a chamber which has the tremendous legal power which the Canadian Senate has, this could be and is a very dangerous situation.

Robert McKeown, who writes in *Weekend* magazine had a column on September 12, 1969 headed "Senators should be above suspicion—but they're not". He quoted from Section 53 of the rules of the Senate as follows:

> No senator is entitled to vote upon any question in which he has any pecuniary interest whatsoever, not held in common with the rest of the Canadian subjects of the Crown; and the vote of any such senator so interested will be disallowed.

Robert McKeown goes on to detail how three bills dealing with bank charters were tied up for several weeks in the Senate Banking and Commerce Committee, the memberships of which included four directors of chartered banks and whose chairman, Senator Salter Hayden, was a director of the Bank of Nova Scotia. Senator Hayden did not consider that being a director of a bank meant he had a pecuniary interest in the matter before the Senate. Robert McKeown said, and I agree, that Senator Hayden's definition may satisfy Senator Hayden and some other senators but it should not satisfy Prime Minister Trudeau or the Canadian public. I do not believe it does.

The situation in the Senate is not new. Goldwin Smith said this about appointments to the Senate:

> The Senate is a bribery fund in the hands of the Government . . . nor on its present footing will it ever be anything else—

Stephen Leacock, and certainly he was no flaming radical, said:

> Liberals and Conservatives combined, we made our Senate not a superior council of the nation, but a refuge of place-hunting politicians and reward for partisan adherence.

I could not agree often with what Stephen Leacock said or wrote about public affairs, but I can agree with every word he said in that passage more than a quarter of a century ago because it is still true.

If we consider the appointments former Prime Minister Pearson made to the Senate in his five years in office, we find that he made 31 appointments to that chamber. George Bain has analyzed them and points out that five were appointed because of their devotion to duty in the backrooms of the Liberal party, five because of their uniformly distinguished service in the House of Commons, four for their tenacity in hunting down campaign contributions in the role of party bagmen, three were recognized because of valour in the face of unequal odds, their inability to get elected in the Liberal cause, and five more because of miscellaneous contributions of time and effort to the Liberal party in the provinces.

In my own province of Manitoba, I can think of one senator appointed by the former Prime Minister. His main claim to fame is that he was the campaign director for the Liberal party during two elections in Manitoba. In one they elected two members out of 14 and in the second they elected one out of 14. That may be too many, but it does not speak well for his organizational ability.

Mr. Osler: You took over his policies.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Orlikow: We took over his policy—ha ha. I wouldn't mind taking over his financial status. However, this is the situation. Mr. Pearson will be remembered, and given credit, for a great number of things. He gave this country many years of distinguished service. One thing for which he will not be remembered and given credit is the calibre of the appointments he made to the Senate. Let me say, somewhat in defence of Mr. Pearson, I do not suppose his appointments were any worse than those of Mr. Diefenbaker, Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. King or Mr. Bennett before him. That is the way the system works. I submit that it is a bad system. Frequently, the Canadian Senate has been compared by those who would defend it to the British House of Lords. We must keep in mind, however, that the Senate, unlike the House of Lords, has a fixed number of members.

The British prime minister, if his legislation is threatened by the House of Lords, has a certain right. When Lloyd George, the Liberal prime minister of Great Britain in I believe 1908 or 1910, proposed to introduce legislation which was very progressive for that time he found that the House of Lords

threatened to block it and made clear that if the legislation were blocked by the House of Lords he would appoint sufficient new members to the House in order to get the legislation passed. No Canadian prime minister can do that because the number of seats in the Senate is fixed by our constitution. The House of Lords and the Canadian Senate are entirely different in respect of the powers they have to amend or reject legislation. I do not intend to outline the powers of the British House of Lords but I suggest that the committee might take a look at them. The power of the House of Lords to reject or even hold up for more than one session legislation proposed by any British government is very limited.

Our Senate has virtually unlimited powers which can be exercised. I suggest this is not consistent with a democratic way of life. In Great Britain, the House of Lords has no power at all over money bills. That again is different from the situation in respect of the Canadian Senate. A number of proposals have been made for the abolition of the Senate. I do not wish to speak about this in view of the vote taken last month. A number of proposals have been made in respect of reforming the Senate. There was the suggestion, for example, that Senators be appointed for a limited term of office. There has been the suggestion that the power of the Senate be limited much in the same way the British system has led to the diminution of the power of the House of Lords in that country. Both these suggestions have some merit. They could both be dealt with by the committee which I am suggesting.

Now, I should like to deal with one other suggestion which has been made. I refer to the suggestion made by this government in the document entitled "The Constitution and the People of Canada" which was presented to the constitutional conference called by the federal government which was attended by the representatives of all the provinces. This constitutional conference was held on February 10, 11 and 12, 1969. At page 30 of the English section, we find the following:

> The Government of Canada feels that the Senate should be reorganized to provide for the expression in it, in a more direct and formal manner than at present, of the interests of the provinces. At the same time, the interests of the country as a whole should continue to find expression in the Senate to maintain there an influence for the unity of Canada.
>
> The Government of Canada would therefore propose a new approach to the organization of the Senate to achieve this end. The Senate could be partly selected by the federal government and partly selected by provincial governments.

Later on, at page 32 of the same document, we see this:

> —the provincial governments themselves—

would get—

> —a means of naming people who could give direct and clear expressions to the views and interests of the provinces—

Then, it reads:

> We feel however, that a reconstituted Senate should have certain special powers flowing from its role as an important institution of federalism. It should have a new jurisdiction to approve nominations by the federal government of judges of the Supreme Court of Canada, ambassadors and heads of cultural agencies.

I completely reject that proposal, because it would lead to more power for the Senate. What is even worse, I believe it would lead to more power for the provinces to do indirectly what they cannot do directly, namely block programs evolved by governments elected by the people of Canada as a whole. I believe this would be a very bad decision for the people of Canada to make. As I understand it, this proposal made by the federal government would require a change in the constitution and would therefore require the unanimous consent of the provinces. I wish to make clear that I have not discussed this matter directly with the present premier of Manitoba, my former colleague, at that time the hon. member for Selkirk, and I am not saying for a moment that I am speaking officially for him. However, I have known the present premier of Manitoba for a long time and I believe I know how he thinks. I am certain he would not agree to those proposals made by the federal government. That being the case, those proposals can be put into mothballs right now.

I shall close by suggesting to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) that if he is not prepared to abolish the Senate, he might as well make the 12 or 14 appointments to fill the vacancies. I suggest that he make them in the usual way they have been made by former governments; that is, that he appoint well deserving political hacks from the Liberal Party. My colleague, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles,) is not happy with my suggestion. I am not happy with it either, but we will be able to deal with the provinces.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I just wish *Hansard* would show the smile on your face.

Mr. Orlikow: I would hope that members who are not prepared to vote for abolition of

the Senate, and who may not be in agreement with all the criticisms I make of present or past Senators, will realize the important function, the important rights and the important veto powers the Senate of Canada has, and will therefore be willing to support this resolution which calls on the government to appoint a committee which would study the whole question of what role, if any, the Canadian Senate should fill.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to express my views on this question.

I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), who has just resumed his seat.

I have noticed that the hon. member has talked mostly in favour of abolishing the Senate, instead of insisting on the chief merit of the motion he was proposing to us, namely, the desirability of recommending to the government that a special committee be established to study the reorganization of the Senate and, perhaps, its abolition.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The abolition of the Senate is only one important point among several raised in his motion.

The hon. member begins by saying that he will always be in favour of abolishing the Senate. It is obviously his right to hold this opinion but what astonishes me is that, as far as I know, those who advocate most strongly the abolition of the Senate, of that institution which seems useless, backward, obsolete, a relic of the past, as he said, are precisely his own colleagues.

I am not sure of it but, a few years ago, was not one of his colleagues appointed to the Senate?

I am wondering whether the reason which leads the hon. member to fight with such frenzy for the disintegration of this venerable institution would not be that he feels disappointed and desperate about the improbability of his appointment to the Senate.

All of us speak more and more about evolution, but it seems to me that we could go too far when speaking of the evolution of our democratic society. It may be that the hon. member has exaggerated in saying that the Senate is a frivolous, pre-democratic and medieval institution.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

There are still many institutions which we all find valuable and which date from the Middle Ages or from a still more remote period.

However, I commend the hon. member for having brought in that motion, because I personally feel that it would be desirable to reform the Senate. The term "unreformed Senate" struck me, because it is surely partly accurate.

When considering the reform of the Senate, we could envisage the possibility of a fairer representation of the various ethnic groups of the Canadian population. Bilingualism and biculturalism, for example, are realities in our country. Right-minded citizens from all groups are proud to say that Canada is a bicultural and bilingual country.

It was even proposed that senators be elected, a system which could well be applied in the future and which has its merits since some countries, the United States included, elect their senators.

That senators should be company directors or that they should have some money interests, as the hon. member said, there is nothing illegal in that. Besides, is it as dangerous as he claims? When a senator is appointed while he is well on in years, it is obvious that he has not been waiting all his life for this post and that he certainly had other activities in the past. That he should already hold important offices in business or industry seems normal to me.

If we want our senators to be practical occasionally and to know how to join theory to practice, it is necessary that we should give them a chance to be realistic.

Having practical duties to perform in society could help them prove more useful to their country, I believe.

As concerns financial questions, they must be discussed, since we are all interested in them, including the hon. member.

When income tax or other tax matters are debated, we are all concerned, for we all have to pay taxes.

One of our past prime ministers, and others before him, came under fire for having made some political appointments. The hon. member said a while ago that the former prime minister had named 5 of the 31 present senators; it was their reward as party supporters, for having rendered great services to the party now in office. It seems to me that the proportion is not that great and, furthermore, who would blame those men for having

worked for their party? Would that prevent them from having the qualifications required to do their task properly as senators? Let us not forget that a member for Parliament belongs to a party and that as long as the present system of political parties last we will not be able to work without taking that into account. Is it not also a most honest game? And if it is played according to the rules, I do not see any thing wrong with it.

However, I do congratulate the hon. member for his motion, a very substantial one, in my view. Every one of its points is of great importance. Once again, I am surprised that the hon. member has dealt with only one aspect of it, the last but one, that is the abolition of the Senate.

I am convinced that the other aspects of his motion were well-founded and very objective, showing the way for concrete and effective ways to improve the organization of the Senate.

From another standpoint, I wonder, in spite of the soberness of the wording of his motion, if the hon. member has not submitted something that should be considered in reverse order, that is from the end to the beginning, if we are to deal with the matter in an intelligent, sensible and serious manner.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I wonder if we should not rather endeavour to tackle the matter of the abolition of the Senate, as well as other very serious related problems, in a more comprehensive and logical way, going right to the heart of the matter. I also wonder why we should not follow a practice that has been followed for several years within the Canadian government. That method has passed the test in spite of the criticisms of some people and it has been recognized by most Canadian thinkers and serious businessmen.

A few years ago, after 1960, task forces and Royal Commissions have been set up. I think they have shown their worth. To the best of my recollection, the Glassco Royal Commission on Government Organization finalized its work.

The members of this Commission studied the whole public administration system. The study was comprehensive and dealt with essentials. Later on other commissions examined administration in detail. Their approach was more concrete and more analytical than synthetical, which in my opinion should come first. These commissions studied secondary and less important aspects of the problem that the Royal Commission on Government Organization had failed to analyse. I refer particularly to the Royal Commission on Taxation, to the Montpetit Commission which studied postal administration, to the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission which made the extensive and very important survey on bilingualism and biculturalism.

I wonder if this process could not instead be the basis of a recommendation to the government to study our parliamentary institutions as a whole, including the Senate and the House of Commons, so that they be more efficient, more practical and more interesting for all Canadians.

For several years now we have come to believe again in the relative importance of the Senate. The Senate has some importance, but it might be a good idea to evaluate it once and for all. In many quarters, and this is the hon. member's opinion, people are under the impression that it is useless.

It is currently said that the Senate seems to rubber stamp all the decisions taken by the House. It is accused of inefficiency. However, for me, the Senate—as the House—is a body which confirms the freedom of speech of the Canadian citizens. That is therefore to the advantage of the Senate or the House.

Without being a traditionalist, because I am a Liberal, I would rather favour changes but provided safety is not jopardized as some people have been saying for some time in some quarters.

However, one can say, given the past, that since the world began, wise men of any nation have always been of great importance and usefulness.

Let us also refer to the old popular saying, which still is valid and practical, yet reflecting a spirit of youth and renewal: "If the young knew, if the old could".

Although the future is said to belong to the young, and although the trend is that even the present is theirs more and more, we must not lose all sense of proportion. The young have some value, but the old too. We must not forgot that. We must be able to draw a distinction between them and let them play their own role.

If I speak of elders, everybody will recognize that any Canadian citizen over 30 may be appointed to the Senate. Generally speaking, senators are old men, citizens who have already proven themselves often enough in the course of a fairly long career; in short, those we can classify in general among the

wise men of the nation are the ones who are appointed to the Senate.

When it comes to drawing a parallel between young and old people, some verses from a great French poet may serve as a rather good illustration of the problem raised by the different set of values cherished by young and old.

I remember some verses from the poem: "Booz endormi" by Victor Hugo. Booz was sleeping near sheaves of wheat. Here is what Victor Hugo wrote:

Les femmes regardaient Booz plus qu'un jeune homme. Car le jeune homme est beau, mais le vieillard est grand.

If the young have qualities, but their elders have theirs also. And Victor Hugo said:

Et l'on voit de la flamme aux yeux des jeunes gens—

It is true that as a rule young people are full of spirit and life, and that is as it should be.

But he added:

Mais dans l'œil du vieillard, on voit de la lumière.

If we need the eager strength and enthusiasm of youth, we also need the controlled strength and enthusiasm, if cool at times, of those nearing the end of a life filled with many past achievements and efforts, which have after all borne fruit.

But in this matter—

[*English*]

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

Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat, I would like to congratulate the mover of the motion. Looking at its wording, one can see it has much to commend its being passed by the House. However, I cannot congratulate him on the speech he made, which was completely political. He was crying because there are not many members of the NDP in the Senate. The reason is that appointments are made according to the population of the country, and we have in Canada many more Liberals of ability than we have among the supporters of the NDP. However, we did have an NDP member in the Senate, and no doubt there will be other members of that party in it in the future.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I congratulate the member on what he said. As I understood it, he suggested that a committee be set up to investigate all aspects of the Senate. I agree with this, Mr. Speaker, because there is no doubt that we are the most over-governed country in the world. According to the last census figures there are less than 21 million people in this country; yet we have 102 members of the Senate, 264 Members of the House of Commons and 634 members of provincial legislatures. We have municipalities with councillors and aldermen, boards of education, public utilities and, in some areas, county councils. In rural Ontario it is a most unfortunate citizen indeed who has not six or seven bodies for whom to vote. In addition to these elected bodies we have the Lieutenant Governors of the provinces and the Governor General of Canada. Overriding the whole legislative system is the Queen.

I think I am correct in saying that as far as Canada is concerned, with all due respect to the Indians, we have far too many chiefs and not enough Indians. Let us consider some examples. The province of Saskatchewan has 962,000 people, about half the population of the cities of Toronto and Montreal, but it is allowed 13 members of the House of Commons, six Senators and 59 members of the provincial legislature. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to that great grain-growing province, that is simply too much government. There are in addition the municipalities, county councils, public utilities, etc.

My own province of Ontario is the most densely populated in the country, with about 7½ million people. We have 88 members of the House of Commons, 24 Senators and 117 members of the legislature. There are also the Toronto city council, the metro council, the hydro commission and the public and separate school boards. One does not have to delve too deeply to appreciate that we are over-governed.

If the motion of my hon. friend would bring this state of affairs to the attention of the general public so that the Senate—and I give this only as a hypothetical situation—might be abolished or changed, or that the other governing bodies might be restricted, I would support it.

I had the privilege last summer of flying over the great and beautiful province of Prince Edward Island. It has a population of only 110,000 people, but it has four Senators compared with 24 for Ontario which has 7½ million people, or Quebec with 6 million. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there is room for change here. It is time the government set up a com-

mittee to study the Senate and all other governing bodies in Canada. Prince Edward Island has four members in the House of Commons and 32 members in its provincial legislature.

I agree with the last speaker that the Senate has done much to help this great country of ours and has brought us through many rough times and situations. But perhaps it should be changed or reconstructed. Perhaps the whole system of governing Canada should be changed or reconstructed in some way.

The province of Manitoba has less than one million people but it has 57 members in the legislature, six in the Senate and 13 in the House of Commons. It is a great province and will be celebrating its centennial this year, but I wonder if it has not too much government.

Mr. Orlikow: Let's start by removing the Senators.

Mr. Whicher: My hon. friend says we should start by removing the Senators, but he does not say that in his resolution. As I read it, he suggests there should be a committee to examine the role of the Senate within Parliament. Perhaps the Senate should be eliminated. Perhaps my hon. friend's seat should be eliminated. I do not know about that; but there is too much government here, it should be investigated by a committee and something should be done about it.

It is not my intention to take up further time, Mr. Speaker. As I have said, for a country of 21 million people to have 634 members of the various legislatures, 102 members of the Senate and 264 members of the House of Commons apart from all the municipalities, etc., is simply too much government. I would, therefore, support my hon. friend's motion that a committee be set up to investigate the role of the Senate. At the same time, I suggest that the committee's terms of reference be enlarged to investigate the role of other governing bodies in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I listened with much interest to the mover of this motion and I was surprised at the comments of the hon. member for Rimouski (Mr. LeBlanc). In fact, perhaps I paid more attention to him than to the mover because, first of all, he spoke in French and he brought up something new.

As for the mover, since we already knew his position concerning the Senate, there was nothing unexpected in his remarks.

The hon. member for Rimouski surprised us a bit and much as I esteem him, I do not agree with some of the views he expressed. I would like to see opposition members show to an increasing degree the same open-mindedness as the hon. member for Rimouski.

I feel I should stress the fact that the mover of this motion has shown that he sincerely wished to improve the role of the Senate, and it is his privilege.

The motion itself is divided in three parts. First, it should be recognized that the Senate raises a problem which requires consideration. In the second place, if it must be established whether the Senate should be abolished, improved or modernized, the members should be informed through the findings of a committee.

In my opinion, the mover does not impose his views on the house, but rather expresses a worthwhile opinion, because it is obvious that the Canadian people are not satisfied with the Senate, and they would like that body to be more efficient, whatever its future might be.

I agree with the hon. member for Rimouski that the older people deserve our respect and I felt involved when he mentioned the old and the young. We, younger people, may be full of enthusiasm, but we must recognize that those who are no longer young have experience.

Although I am in agreement with the principle set forth by the hon. member for Rimouski, I must point out that appointments to the Senate are the result of political favours. Under any government, when an individual has served the party well, or when it is deemed advisable to get rid of a member who creates problems for the party, he is appointed to the Senate.

We are expecting appointments to the Senate in the near future, as there are several vacancies there. And once again it will be seen that appointments to the Senate are used as a reward for services rendered more to a political party than to Canada.

What is wrong with the Senate is that Canadians have no say in the matter of appointments. Secondly, Canadians have no say insofar as the fixing of their emoluments is concerned.

Thirdly, Canadians get no report regarding the business of the Senate.

Fourthly, it is rather unusual to see the Senate oppose the decisions of the House of Commons. I could go on and on.

Our parliamentary system is surely out of tune, because in spite of all possible good intentions, talents and goodwill, the Senate has become a club where are found people most of whom would be better off to get their old age pension and to remain at home, not because they can no longer serve Canada, but simply because their duties have been cut down to nothing, and under our parliamentary system, this is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member for Rimouski is made a senator and then, he will have to realize as we do—he who shows such devotion—that he will be allowed to do very little when it comes to formulating legislation. All he will have to do is get up and sit down, that is do as his leader does, and cash his cheque.

He will not really be able to give the Canadian people leadership. Nor will he give advice to the House of Commons.

I have been in the House long enough to know this for a fact. No senator has ever met with us to give us advice about formulating legislation or to go over certain matters they know better than we do.

I see the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Pilon). I hope he is appointed to the Senate that he might also realize that when one is made a senator one can only bless the Prime Minister for the appointment, because it is a reward. I do not wish him the appointment to get rid of him, but rather to reward him because he serves well the interests of the Liberal party.

It is rather ridiculous to deal with such an important motion on that level, but I do because to me that is obvious. As a good Liberal, one should welcome such a motion which, in fact, does not impose views on anyone and does not ridicule anyone. On the contrary, I feel it reflects to some extent the views of Canadians generally who would like a review to be made of the role of the Senate within Canadian parliamentarism, that there might be complementary ties between the House of Commons and its counterpart the Senate.

If the Senate were to disappear overnight, it would be a good thing for all Canadians. There would be less patronage, fewer political appointments. Indeed, what do the senators contribute as legislators? They make inquiries which in the final analysis solve very little, and whose recommendations are never implemented.

I could give several examples of inquiries conducted by the Senate. The reports usually gather dust somewhere, and are never studied. It seems to me that problem should be studied in depth.

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the speeches made in this debate and, in particular, to the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). The motion before this House would set up a special committee. The proposer of the motion went into some detail regarding his complaints about the Senate: he alleged that it does not represent the populace, that conflict of interest situations arise in it, and so on.

However, the proposer of the motion did not deal with the central issue of the procedure by which the Senate is to be amended or reformed. He read into *Hansard* proposals brought forward by the government of Canada at the constitutional conference. They included one that the manner of choosing members of the upper chamber should be discussed and reviewed with the provinces, and that the provinces should have the opportunity of naming some of the members of the Senate.

At least the motion before us is a little more sophisticated than the one brought forward recently by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). His proposal would have amended the British North America Act by a resolution of this House, and was a little more difficult for some of us to follow. The notice of motion before us is more sophisticated because it suggests another line of action or investigation parallel to that which has already resulted from discussions that have taken place in federal-provincial conferences.

Those of us who have watched the Senate have, I think, mixed feelings about it. We know the problems. Thirty-five years ago as an undergraduate—and I am dating myself with this remark—I studied Professor Mackay's book, "The Unreformed Senate of Canada". Nevertheless, those of us who have come here and watched the other place must concede that useful work has taken place in it. I am thinking of the studies of science policy under Senator Maurice Lamontagne as chairman of the committee, the special committee on poverty under Senator Croll and

the studies currently in progress under Senator Davies.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. the hour appointed for 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

WATER RESOURCES

PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, 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, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Mr. Speaker, on the news tonight a United States Senator made the statement that we are polluting ourselves into disaster. The Canadian Labour Union indicated that lack of pollution control could be an item for decision on strike action some time this year. For years we have talked about the necessity of carrying out proper conservation procedures and methods. To my way of thinking, conservation is the practice of one generation looking after the heritage with which it has been endowed, passing on to future generations a heritage unsullied and in the same shape and form in which it was handed down. I am afraid that every one of us in Canada is guilty of breaking conservation practices. Every one of us at some time has thrown away a piece of Kleenex, a chocolate-wrapper, a gum wrapper or an empty cigarette package. By the same token, pollution is being effected by our big industries in the tailings of mines and the pollutants from vats which are being poured into our lakes and rivers.

Now we are advised that the chemicals that we thought were doing so much good for mankind contain elements which can have dire effects upon ourselves and future generations. So that in fact, Mr. Speaker, we have not practised good conservation methods. In spite of all the programs of research, studies by commissions, discussion and debate in this House, we in Canada today are guilty of not doing as we should and we shall not be able to pass on to future generations—to our sons, daughters, grandsons and granddaughters—the heritage that was handed down to us.

Thus have fallen civilizations of the past, Mr. Speaker. Unless serious, thoughtful and considerate steps are taken, having in mind all the phases of this tremendously important question, we may soon—as some people have said—be wallowing around in our own garbage. We see this demonstrated on every hand these days, particularly in our rivers and lakes. We see the fish floating belly up; they are being washed ashore by the thousand due to the fact that life-giving ingredients have been destroyed by the chemicals we have poured into the lakes and rivers which were handed down to us in a pure state.

As I have said, there has been a tremendous amount of research carried out and a great number of articles written about the necessity of cleaning up our rivers and lakes; in fact, considering the whole question of pollution. I have been interested in this question for a great many years, Mr. Speaker, because in my own area in 1905 an engineer by the name of William H. Breithaupt walked from the source of the Grand River to its end. At that time he advocated some conservation measures, but it was not until many years later—1942, in fact—that the first conservation dam was built on the Grand River. This was the first effect of his advice given many years previously. Because of the water conservation bill that has been in force since 1952-53, two subsequent dams were built on that river. These were for flood control and to provide proper conservation methods. That conservation program has been of tremendous benefit to the whole area, and around each one of these lakes there has been a tremendous growth of summer colonies which have attracted tourists to the area. This program has been well worth the money spent on it.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Let me say something about the conservation measure that we are removing from our statute books by this bill. It was a good measure whereby municipalities, the provinces and the federal government took part. As a result of the union of these three forces, a great many conservation programs were started in

the province of Ontario. I do not know about the other provinces, but I know the areas along the Grand River and the Saugeen River have been improved tremendously as a result of efforts by the municipality. The people interested in their areas were able to get into the act and do a tremendous job of providing conservation programs.

That was not enough. We knew there was need for more teeth in a bill to make it possible for law enforcement officers to bring to task those who unwittingly or knowingly pollute our rivers and are responsible for their condition today. The bill now before us was introduced with great fanfare. After talking about this situation for many years, we now have Bill C-144 which, as it says, is an act to provide for the management of the water resources of Canada including research, planning and implementation of programs relating to conservation, development and utilization of water resources. When we consider the various parts of the bill that begin with the word "whereas", it would seem that this might be the perfect bill. Considering the high-sounding phrases and window-dressing by the minister in introducing the bill, the people of Canada should expect great things from this measure.

It is rather difficult to understand why some of the agencies we have had in this country have not done a great deal to correct the situation. Rather than a bill with all this window-dressing, we should have a bill that would co-ordinate all the government agencies involved in this question. Had that been the case, we might have found some substance in this bill. Let me mention some of the government agencies that are involved. There is nothing in this bill about correlating all the services we have, and there are a great many.

In the federal government alone we have the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources; the Department of Agriculture, which takes in the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act and its administration; the Department of Forestry and Rural Development, which takes in the Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act and its administration and the Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act. We also have the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Department of Public Works, the Department of Transport, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Department of Evternal Affairs and the International Joint Commission.

[Mr. Howe.]

Let us consider the federal government agencies. We have Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which makes loans for sewage-treatment plants, the Municipal Development and Loans Board which makes loans for water treatment, the Atlantic Development Board and the National Research Council with its committee on water pollution research.

We must also remember the international bodies. There are the International Joint Commission, boards of control, engineering boards, advisory boards on pollution, the Council for the International Hydrologic Decade, the International Committee on Irrigation and Drainage and the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission.

We should also keep in mind provincial agencies. In every province we have agencies set up to deal with conservation and the pollution of our rivers and lakes. If this bill is to be of any advantage to areas which require assistance, we should establish an organization with this end in mind, rather than all these local agencies. Perhaps we could correlate all the provincial, municipal and federal bodies into one tremendous organization that could attack this problem and find the solution so urgently required in our nation.

It is interesting to note that the bill points out that for a fee one can pollute the waters of this nation. This measure is not aimed at stopping pollution; it is aimed at licensing pollution. This situation should be rectified. We have been discussing Canada's water resources for years. We must continue to discuss it. We must make sure that this is the best possible bill and that it comes to grips with this great national problem.

I have in my hand the report of the Special Committee on Land Use in Canada which was handed down in 1963. One recommendation of that committee was the following:

> That the work of various agencies in the study and management of our water resources be expanded—specifically that work relating to drainage and erosion problems, irrigation, levels of water tables and present and likely future water requirements.

That report was published in 1963, yet in 1970 we are discussing a Canada Water Act. I also have the report of a study made by the University of Toronto, Great Lakes Institute, entitled "The Great Lakes and their problems". This study was conducted in 1965. In its introductory remarks, with reference to our Great Lakes it is stated:

> The Great Lakes constitute the largest single reserve of fresh water in the world and although

we can say this very proudly it soon becomes apparent that the very size of the lakes can work to their disadvantage as well as being their strength. Because of their size it has been assumed that they will always be here with the same quality and quantity of water and there is nothing that man might do in the way of use or abuse that could change the natural regime.

We have seen what has happened to Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair because their lakes were not big enough. The report states further:

This was the thinking that motivated our forebears when they carried out their onslaught on the seemingly unlimited resources of this continent. It is not necessary to remind ourselves of the results of the wanton destruction that took place, but we should keep this image before us and realize that we are at present committing a similar monstrous destruction of the last large resource left to us in this area. We must also constantly remind ourselves that the Great Lakes are a natural resource which is far more vital to us than any of those which were destroyed in the past.

We have a great fund of knowledge and material in connection with problems confronting us in the field of conservation and the necessity of taking care of the great Canadian water resource. Anyone who wants to make a study of pollution should read this document which I have in my hand. It was published by the Department of Biology, McMaster University. It is entitled, "Up the Pyramid" and contains a passage headed, "Pollution as a road to nowhere". It states that the important question is not can man progress, but can we survive at all.

We have been warned about what we are doing. We have set up commissions, government agencies and bodies to study the situation; yet we go on and on polluting. This could be disastrous, as was said by a United States Senator. At times it seems that we are getting very close to disaster.

I suggest to the minister that before Bill C-144 is completely studied and reported back by the committee, he should call in all the expert opinion he can find. He should ask for interpretations and suggestions by the organizations which have made a study of this matter, including experts from the University of Toronto and almost every other university in Canada. Before the bill is brought back into this House, I sincerely hope a great many changes will be made to it. In this way, those who pollute the waters of Canada can be brought to task. I hope every step that can be taken will be taken to ensure that the waters of Canada remain pure and unpolluted.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, having read and listened to the contributions to the debate on the Canada water bill from various parts of this House, I think all of us recognize that the problem of the control, management and proper use of our water resource in Canada is not only of concern but is of urgent importance to all Canadians.

Members from each corner of this House have expressed in their own way, sometimes effectively and at other times not too effectively, how they feel about the use and management of our water. Hopefully, as the bill moves into the committee stage all those who have spoken out so strongly and effectively will make their views known before the committee, which body will have the responsibility of coming back to this House at the report stage with the best possible Canada water bill that can be devised.

After listening to the various members who have spoken, it would seem that there are two or three areas in respect of which I might devote a little time this evening in an effort to clear up some of the misunderstandings which may exist at the moment. I believe I can leave to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) some of the specific answers to questions which have been raised by members. However, there are two areas with which I intend to deal at the moment.

The first is the question of national standards. There is a feeling among members in the House that there should be a national standard for water and in respect of water pollution. I think we might say briefly that this bill is intended to be designed for the management and use of our great national and natural resource—water. Although it is not so intended, it will no doubt be used as an anti-pollution measure.

I must emphasize strongly that it simply is not an anti-pollution bill. A bill framed to combat pollution alone would miss the point that we must seek a balance among all uses and all benefits. If one were to write a bill that would simply combat pollution, it would not be any more effective than one to control flood alone. Therefore, we have spoken of water resource management, comprehensive planning and water control management to indicate the breadth of this approach.

One of the facets of this broad management approach is, indeed, the setting of water qual-

ity standards. These standards must be the best possible for the river or river basin in question. They must be compatible with the nature of the river, the resource base of the region, the growth rate of population and industry and the variety and concentration of uses of that river. I think we seek to analyse and plan each river in detail and set the best standard.

The standards will be for full protection of human health and aquatic life and for the preservation of recreational values and scenic beauties as well as all other benefits. But to set a common denominator that suits both Lake Louise and Hamilton harbour is entirely inappropriate. Since all waters can never be entirely pure, we would have to set a standard for the nation that would be less than pristine purity. That being the case, anyone without stricture could pollute our finest waters down to the national standard.

I would ask members of this House whether that is the proper way to treat our purest water resources. My opinion, which I am sure is shared by most, is that it would be a licence, and a free one at that, to pollute. Yet that is precisely what a national standard would do. We want to improve the quality of polluted streams and keep those that are now beautiful and clean in that ideal state. This is why we say there should not be uniform standards but optimal standards. These optimal standards will not be set by local agencies. These agencies are only empowered to analyse, plan and recommend. The two senior levels of government are jointly responsible for the final decision, and hopefully, in the unlikely event that there is not co-operation at the provincial level of government, this bill will provide the federal government with the tools to move ahead on its own.

One of the great attributes of the Canada water bill is that it represents a positive approach toward the management of this nation's vital water resources. By embodying all the forces at the command of governments, and by providing for the effective utilization of these forces, it avoids the chaos of constitutional issues which in the past have inhibited or prevented a sound approach to water resource management and development. In the conservation of our natural resources, particularly in husbanding our scarce and critical ones such as water, we must use all the tools at our disposal. Through education and information we can bring moral suasion to bear; through prohibition and penalties we can bring punitive measures to bear, and through effluent discharge fees we can bring economic forces to bear. The bill before us incorporates all three.

I should like to devote some time to the discussion of the economic forces and the concept of effluent discharge fees which critics of this bill in their frequent reference to financing have somehow or other failed to comprehend or even note. One of the first principles of economics is that items of value have costs. These costs may be expressed in terms of money as determined by the market process. We are all familiar with the concept of the balance sheet whereby all the costs of doing business are totalled and compared with the revenue received from sales, which results in either a profit or a deficit. These are internal costs. But where costs are incurred, say, by another firm outside the framework of the balance-sheet, they are external to it and hence not considered in the accounts or in determining the value of production, the processes used or the combinations of labour and capital. The social costs of pollution are analogous to these external accounting costs and, indeed, include the costs of treating polluted water for downstream use.

By far the larger costs of pollution are borne by downstream users in the form of health defects, depressed land prices, closed recreation areas and destruction of our fish, wildlife and aesthetic resources, all of which have been brought forcefully to the nation's attention, through the public information media, by conservation groups and by this debate. Yet up to the time of this bill there existed no mechanism whereby these social costs could be integrated into industrial and municipal decisions; one had to rely upon moral suasion and the corporate image concept. While there have been some outstanding examples of social responsibility, these have been isolated and weak and have varied from industry to industry and from company to company.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Alternatively, one could choose to rely solely upon standards and penalties, but these punitive measures come into effect only after a plant has been built, after it has operated, and after the damage has been done. The cost and time required to determine the source of pollution, and carry through court action, mitigate against the use of these instruments for the day-to-day control of millions of tons of wastes.

Punitive measures do, however, have a place where flagrant and persistent violations are committed, or where tangible damage has resulted. National standards induce people to deposit harmful wastes to degrade water down to that standard and, as has been mentioned several times during this debate, general or national standards cannot possibly take into account the many special factors which apply to individual river basins or regions. I do not wish to be interpreted as saying that these punitive instruments have no place in pollution control. Clearly they have, but taken alone they have proved historically ineffective in maintaining and improving water quality.

The concept of effluent discharge fees embodied in the bill, to my mind, is one of its boldest and most imaginative features. It takes into account:

1. That there are social costs in the form of pollution resulting from many productive processes

2. That these social costs vary, depending upon the nature of the pollution, its aggregate volume, the characteristics of the receiving waters and man's use and enjoyment of these waters

3. That the contribution to pollution which industry makes is specific to the industry or plant; and

4. That there are a number of alternatives open to the firm or industry such as a change in production processes, recirculation, reclamation of waste and advanced forms of waste treatment.

The operation of the effluent discharge fee system would be straightforward. With the designation of water quality management areas and the constitution of the water quality agencies as provided for by the bill, a schedule of fees would be devised based on waste loadings, the characteristics of the water quality management area and the use of the water resource. These fees, when approved by government, would be levied on the firms and industries within the area for specific discharges and volumes.

The effluent dischargers would thereby be given a discreet and tangible incentive to undertake alternative courses of action such as recycling, advanced waste treatment, recovery of byproduct or a change in the production process. Fees could be used by the agency to undertake construction of treatment facilities for the effluent if it deemed this course of action advisable. Periodic review of the fee structure would ensure that water quality was maintained and, over the longer term, substantially improved.

I hope that without going into economists' jargon about "internalizing external economies and diseconomies," and so on, I have succeeded in drawing the attention of hon. members to at least one important aspect of the bill. Land, forests and minerals in this country were once in the category of free, or almost free goods which were open to exploitation or misuse. Over the decades this situation has changed, until today they are conserved and husbanded; it is recognized they have a value and a cost.

I believe this principle should be no less applicable in the case of water quality. Those who claim the fees which put a price on quality constitute a licence to pollute, miss the point. These fees are a penalty. They constitute an incentive not to pollute. They are a preventative force. On the other hand, standards and fines alone do give a free licence, with full legal and moral support, to pollute down to that standard. The record, expert opinion and commonsense all say they are not enough.

As to the bill now before us, the House has an assurance from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources that when it is in committee amendments will be considered, and if they are in the national interest and compatible with the principles of the measures, they will be accepted. I hope that as we continue the discussion this evening those who wish to express their opinions on the bill will not hesitate to do so, and that the legislation will then be sent to the committee as quickly as possible.

Contrary to the opinion which has been expressed on more than one occasion in this House, I believe there are many in this country who will wish to acquaint the committee with their views on water management in Canada. I hope that people across Canada who are concerned with the maintenance of this resource and its preservation in the best possible state for Canadians of this and future generations will come forward.

I have sought to deal with two or three of the objections which have been raised by members of the opposition in respect of this bill. I hope that when the committee meets, those who have expressed their concern along these lines will make their views known once again to the committee. I can give the House an assurance such as which the minister himself will give later—that the matter is still

open. We are prepared to discuss these things and do our best to come up with the best possible water management bill for the people of Canada.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, while the problem of pollution is not a critical one in the area from which I come, it is a current crisis in many regions of Canada. I feel this measure is of great importance to us all because it is becoming increasingly evident, at least to all who keep themselves up-to-date on world affairs, that if we do not get worldwide pollution and rising birth rates under control in this decade, our civilization may well not last beyond the year 2000.

We human beings, with all our great intelligence and initiative, are much like common rats in this regard; if left to our own devices we shall pollute and breed ourselves out of existence. I do not think it would be fair to point the finger of blame for pollution in any one direction. Government and industry are both blamed from time to time. But I do not think it is as simple as that. Every human being contributes to pollution to some extent. Every member of this House has, over the years, made his or her contribution to pollution.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Another trait which is common to man is the compulsion to bite the hand that feeds him; to share responsibility for pollution and then to blame government or industry for the results. We all appreciate the standard of living that a profitable industrial complex affords us, while criticizing it as though it were completely responsible for all the pollution that has occurred. If there were ever a matter upon which we need complete cooperation among all parties in this House, among governments, industry and business at all levels, it is the whole area of pollution.

We cannot segregate and classify one type of pollution that might come under the Water Act because all pollution is tied together—air pollution, land pollution, soil pollution. One progresses to the other. They form a pollution chain and eventually will have to be dealt with under one agency. Industry must realize the futility of growth and profits if within a matter of two or three decades our once great civilization lies as quiet as a lunar landscape because of pollution. Governments, not just ours but all governments in the world, have their heads in the sand if in their governing they believe that matters like ideology, language and culture are of any real significance. These are matters that should be used only as talking points for people who are otherwise unoccupied, because the real battle—the battle that, if lost, will effect the eventual demise of many of the younger members of this chamber—is the battle to keep man from polluting his environment to an uninhabitable level.

Citizens, men, women and children should all be made to realize the futility of material success, the futility of almost everything upon which we put value today, if there will be no tomorrow. I reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that worldwide pollution is one of the greatest problems facing mankind. I will not mention the individual instances and problem areas in the country that are concerned with pollution. Members who have preceded me have done a more than adequate job in citing examples. Likewise, the shortcomings of the bill have been stressed many times.

In summary one might say that the bill will make no effective change in our pollution control. As several hon. members have pointed out, we have the power under several other acts, the Navigable Waters Act and the Fisheries Act, to enforce many of the pollution measures, if not all, that are proposed in this bill. But what worries me is that we might tie ourselves to so many regulations and red tape, and establish so many agencies, boards and petty empires that we will be in the same position as we are now with our grain marketing system. There we are so sorely overloaded with red tape, regulations, commissions, agencies and boards that we can do nothing but present claims and counterclaims, and in the final analysis we are storing half of the world's wheat, with the storage and handling charges eating away at the total value of the product.

In conclusion, I say to the minister who will be in charge of anti-pollution measures, "Yours, sir, is by far and away the most important portfolio in the government, for it is in this area that the continuation of civilization will depend." It would be the tragedy of this Parliament, even the tragedy of the century or of time, if any politician for the sake of expediency were to court the popular vote or the industrial establishments at the expense of pollution control.

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate many of the speakers who preceded me in this debate because the concerns which they expressed about the water resources of the country are concerns

that I share. As I look at the title of Bill C-144, the aspect of the bill which I would like to stress in my contribution is that which has to do with the management of water resources.

When the topic of water resources comes up, the people of northwestern Ontario become both interested and concerned, for this region of Canada has an abundance of the freshest water that is to be found anywhere in the world. I have had the personal pleasure of travelling in small craft along such rivers as the Winisk, the Severn, and the Attawapiskat, which flow northwards into James Bay. It is possible for one to dip a cup into these rivers and enjoy the sweetest, purest water imaginable; in fact, water that is safer to consume than that which you get from a tap in your own home. This is certainly not the place to tell fish stories, but there are in those rivers some of the largest and most enjoyable fresh water fish to eat that you can find anywhere in the nation.

We in northwestern Ontario want very much to preserve this precious resource of fresh water, along with as much as possible of the wilderness area that surrounds it. This is not for selfish reasons, not just for our own benefit and enjoyment, but rather for the enjoyment of those who live in what we sometimes refer to as the Great Lakes basin, an area that within the next 100 years will have a population of 200 million people. These 200 million people, living mainly in large, concentrated urban areas, will be looking northward for their recreation and for an escape from the rigours and tensions of urban living. We can offer them this in the region which I represent. It is therefore essential that industries, groups of people or individuals should not be permitted to pollute these valuable fresh waters or to destroy the recreational resources that we have in such great abundance.

It is always heartening to see industry respond in a positive way to the problems of pollution. Recently in the Thunder Bay area a major program was announced by the Domtar Company at Red Rock. The headline to the story indicated that Domtar was about to spend $18,300,000 on an expansion program, and that $7 million of that sum is to be used for pollution abatement. This company has been charged by the Ontario Water Resources Commission with polluting freshwater streams. I think the lesson is obvious—that corporations, like individuals, respond to good laws, and if these laws are acted upon, corporations as individual citizens will respond in a favourable way. My constituents and myself therefore applaud the federal government for introducing the Canada Water Act, which apparently is designed to permit the federal government to mount a systematic attack on water pollution problems jointly with the provinces, but unilaterally if necessary.

• (8:50 p.m.)

There have been those who have described the Canada Water Act as mere window-dressing, or as a ploy to convince the Canadian people that something is being done about pollution when in fact very little action will transpire. Just from looking at Bill C-144 it is difficult for me to judge whether this is the case or not. The effectiveness of this act, I suppose, depends upon the determination with which it is implemented by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and also the degree of co-operation which may be forthcoming from the provincial governments. The other question is how much the government is prepared to spend in the implementation of this act.

It has been said that the management of Canada's water resources is a regional problem, requiring a regional approach. Under the new act, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) may enter into arrangements with the provinces and form joint committees for the purpose of consultation and development of programs and to coordinate their implementation. This could be established along national, provincial, regional or even lake or river basin lines.

It is said by the minister and his officials that where necessary regional-federal-provincial boards will be set up to take inventory of water resources, collect data on their quality, distribution and use, conduct research and direct a variety of programs designed to conserve and develop regional water resources to the full. Such a concept pleases us in northwestern Ontario, because we feel very strongly about regional development. We want a say in these plans and we want a say in government programs designed specifically for our region.

I think it is well known in this House that northwestern Ontario, a vast wilderness region in that rich province, has always been a little suspicious of governments, whether in Queen's Park or Ottawa. There is a strong feeling among the people I represent that they want to be involved and informed whenever important and far-reaching decisions are being made about our region and its

resources, whether we are talking about mining, the forest industry or our water resources.

This is not always the case, however. Frequently we are not consulted and are left in the dark, presented with a *fait accompli* when it is too late for us to offer any suggestions or have any input regarding these decisions. For example, from the year 1966 to 1970 the amount of money spent by the federal government on studies of northern Ontario water resources will amount to $2,203,000. This is the federal government's contribution to the Co-ordinating Committee on Northern Ontario Water Resource Studies which was established in accordance with announcements made by the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of Ontario in the early part of 1965.

I do not know what the provincial contribution to these studies is, but I assume that it will be on a shared-cost basis, 50-50. This means that about $5 million has been spent in the last few years to study water resources in northern Ontario. This information interested us greatly, Mr. Speaker, but to the best of my knowledge no one in the region has been involved or even kept informed of the purposes or results of these studies.

This situation has of course led to a great deal of fear and suspicion. There are rumours about ambitious plans to divert northward-flowing rivers southward into Lake Superior. Those who live on Indian reservations and settlements, people who operate as tourist camp outfitters, and many other citizens, have approached me for information. They do so in a spirit of anxiety. Some ask whether our governments are making plans for the massive exportation of water to the United States. My reply is that I do not know but I will endeavour to find out; I will make inquiries so that we know the purpose of the extensive water resources studies that are going on in our region. Some people claim that the American Corps of Engineers is involved in taking stream-flow measurements. They want to know what these people are doing there. The minister has assured us that to the best knowledge of the Canadian government such people are not involved.

Recently I attended a meeting at which a number of concerned citizens discussed questions of the diversion and exportation of fresh water. I think the announcement which went out indicates how citizens feel when they are not informed or involved when something that affects them directly is going on under their very noses. This is what the letter said in part, Mr. Speaker:

> We in the area have been made aware of a gigantic plan by our federal government and that of the United States, to divert huge flows of water now flowing north to flow south to the U.S. Many of us have viewed a detailed mapped plan of the project and are very much concerned over the scheme. The secrecy of the whole plan so far is certainly undemocratic and, according to the mapped plan, could be most devastating to our north country. This is all contrary to what we as Canadians fought for in two world wars. Surely we have a right to know what is going on and how it will affect the future destiny of our children and the country as a whole.
>
> This meeting has been called to discuss this enormous plan and its effect on wildlife and many other aspects. We trust we may have the pleasure of your presence and your views on the project.

I went to that meeting, Mr. Speaker, and met citizens who were deeply concerned and quite disturbed. They had fears and anxieties that the balance of nature, the ecology of northern Ontario would be upset by the diversion of the swift, northward-flowing rivers. This turned out to be an organization meeting. What came out of it was an organization with the interesting name of KNOW, Keep Northern Ontario Water.

They wanted to know what I could tell them about this project. All I could say was that up to the present, eight progress reports had been submitted to the government of Canada and the government of Ontario and, more specifically, to the Co-ordinating Committee on Northern Ontario Water Resource Studies. I was able to acquire progress reports Nos. 6 and 7 through the courtesy of a member of the Ontario legislature. Looking through these, I found a statement of objectives prepared by the Co-ordinating Committee for Studies to be carried out separately by agencies of the two governments. This statement of objectives reads as follows:

> With respect to waters draining into James Bay and Hudson Bay in Ontario, to assess the quantity and quality of water resources for all purposes; to determine present and future requirements for such waters; and to assess alternative possibilities for the utilization of such waters locally or elsewhere through diversions.

The latter phrase is the one that catches the eye immediately—"utilization of such waters locally or elsewhere through diversion." Responsibility for hydrologic and engineering studies required to attain these objectives has been divided between the Division of Water Resources of the Ontario Water Resources Commission and the Inland Waters Branch of the federal Department of Energy,

Mines and Resources. Economic Studies are the responsibility of the Economic Planning Branch of the Ontario Department of the Treasury and Economics and the Policy and Planning Branch of the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. Other federal and provincial agencies are actively participating in this work.

This leads us, Mr. Speaker, to ask the question whether there really are plans in the wind to divert and export fresh water to the United States. Of course, I do not know whether there are such plans buried somewhere deep within the minister's department. I do know, however, that in the United States there are people who are talking very clearly about the need for water to be imported into the arid zones of their country. Before the turn of the century the western United States may be using Canadian water to augment its meagre supplies. This is the opinion of Dr. Donald W. Calvin, vice-president of the Federation of Western States.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Denver water engineer Lewis Smith is also quoted as telling the July meeting of the Western States Water Council that the key to obtaining Canadian water was the understanding that the Canadian economy would benefit from any diversion program. Western gubernatorial eyes were also cast on Canadian waters during the recent meeting of the Western Governors Conference in Seattle, Washington. The Los Angeles *Times* quoted Wyoming Governor Stan Hathaways' apparent majority view as follows:

—many of us feel the real answer is to import water from Canada.

California Governor Ronald Reagan added the note, "We'll trade a university for some water." A question regarding diverting and exporting water to the United States was asked of the minister in the House on November 19. He replied that no such discussions are presently going on between Canada and the United States. Nevertheless, this entire question remains a pressing matter in the minds of many Canadians. I should like to read some of the views expressed at the Interprovincial Conference held in Quebec City last August. The views expressed are interesting and are worth relating to the House. I read from a report contained in the *Globe and Mail* of August 6, 1969. It says:

Premier John Robarts of Ontario put great stress on the need for information on water needs and resources. 'I would insist on a very, very, very serious study before we sold a drop of fresh water and I don't believe that these studies have taken place.

'I am not in favour of flushing away somebody else's pollution with fresh water, Mr. Robarts said. I believe that pollution has to be cleaned up at the source.

'But, if water were needed, the question would be where it would come from?'

The last question I believe can be answered. The water would obviously come from those areas that can supply fresh water. Manitoba Premier Ed Schreyer is reported as having said that who controls water will become a serious issue when proposals are made for the sale of water to others, especially to the United States. He added that he does not think water should be exported for industrial use; if it is to be exported it should be sold first as a developed commodity such as electricity. That is an interesting point.

One of my constituents said, perhaps in jest, "If we are going to sell water, we can do it one way only: bottle it, then sell it." Premier Schreyer advocates converting it in to electricity and then selling it. He added, however, that if there are large bodies of water in the northern parts of provinces, that cannot be used for any other purpose, it would be foolish to refuse to consider future sales of water beyond the needs of the Canadian people.

I would quote information as to how much water actually is available. There is some information about that, and I shall refer to it in a moment. I quote from a paper entitled, "The Rationale of Water Export and its Implications for Water Resources Research in the North," presented in 1968 by a professor of geography at the University of Alberta. The paper says in part:

The total water supply in Canada available for use in the future will probably not be much over 1 billion acre feet. At present we withdraw about 2 percent of this amount for use, consume 0.3 to 0.47 and temporarily damage through pollution dilution about 10 percent . . . By the year 2000 it is unlikely that we will withdraw more than 10 percent, or consume more than 2 percent of the available supply. With the help of our neighbours, in particular the Great Lakes region, we may pollute between 20 and 30 percent of the supply. The greater part of the supply will flow into the sea virtually unused.

One of the Premiers has suggested that any excess water flowing into the sea might be exported in some form or other to the United States. According to the *Globe and Mail* report, another Premier at the conference, Premier Thatcher of Saskatchewan, said:

We most definitely oppose the sale outside of Canada until the needs of our province, such as in

the Palliser area, are met. In principle we are against the exporting of water and in particular we are against it from our part of the country.

The report also says that Premier W. A. C. Bennett of British Columbia was almost equally adamant, saying:

Under no circumstances would we sell fresh water to the United States. Where water flows naturally, we will do nothing to interfere. But water is a basic element of life— It is Our No. 1 resource.

When one talks about diversion schemes on the North American continent, Canada seems to figure prominently in the discussions. About eight large-scale, long distance water diversion schemes have been proposed on paper, but these are engineering schemes and are privately sponsored, having been promoted at water resource conferences where such schemes are discussed. One such scheme for diverting Canada's waters to the United States was discussed at a conference held at Sherbrooke, Quebec, in 1966. A very important man was present at the conference, General McNaughton, Chairman of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission from 1950 to 1962. General McNaughton called the scheme for diverting our waters for export a monstrous proposal, saying:

The promoters would displace Canadian sovereignty over the national waters of Canada and substitute, therefore, a diabolic thesis that all waters of North America become a shared resource of which most will be drawn off for the benefit of the United States midwest and southwest regions where existing desert areas would be made to bloom at the expense of development in Canada.

These schemes for diverting our waters for export are really no more than academic exercises on paper, because apparently not all the water authorities in the United States have been convinced of the need of an international diversion of waters. One of the more thoughtful views on United States water management problems was given in 1966 by the Committee on Water, of the National Academy of Sciences. The report begins with these words:

This report is not prompted by a national shortage of water, for there is no nationwide shortage, and no imminent danger of one—

This view is contrary to that expressed often in magazines and newspapers but must be accepted with some degree of confidence because of the body that expounds it. Some have suggested that the United States government is more concerned with increasing its efficiency in water use and in alleviating pollution levels. When asked whether he had any designs on Canada's water, former Secretary of the Interior Udall made this decisive statement:

We've suddenly begun to realize in the United States that if we do the right job in pollution control, we are going to increase our water resources enormously . . . we are not looking hungrily at Canada's water resources, we are looking at our own.

I think what interests those I represent and what ought to be of concern to Members of Parliament is the government's present position on this matter and what has been the position of preceding Canadian governments. If one looks through the records and summarizes statements made by responsible ministers and officials at both federal and provincial levels of government during the past several years, a number of points emerge which seem at this moment to represent Canada's policy with respect to its water resources. Six of these points are as follows:

• (9:10 p.m.)

(1) Canadian waters are not a continental resource; they are as Canadian as any other resource found within the national boundaries.

(2) There is no identifiable market as yet for Canadian water in the United States.

(3) Canada would be unwilling to negotiate any sale of water at present even if there were a market, because Canadian water supplies have not yet been adequately inventoried and Canadian water requirements into the future have not been assessed. Canada must satisfy its own requirements first.

(4) An accelerated effort is underway in Canada to this end, but it will take at least several years to complete.

I assume the studies going on in northwestern Ontario are a part of this accelerated effort to assess our own resources.

(5) Federal and provincial governments in Canada must both agree before international negotiations can begin.

(6) Canadian waters will never be sold under conditions which would jeopardize their permanent ownership and their repatriation if and when needed in Canada.

If that summary of statements is the position of the present government, it is one that can be supported. It is said that the Canada Water Act, now being debated, will provide a multi-dimensional, co-operative approach for a dynamic, new attack on our water problems appropriate to today's concerns and according to today's concept of federalism. I would appreciate receiving assurance from the minister that local and regional interests will be consulted in all policies concerned with water resources, both their protection and utilization, and also that the regional water management agencies which will be established

under this act will enlist and use people who possess both knowledge and concern for the region that is involved.

If something so drastic as the diversion of rivers is actually to be carried out, we in northwestern Ontario are not concerned merely with the engineering feasibility and accomplishment of something that is as expensive and vast as this; we are also concerned with other important factors such as the ecological effects, the effect on the balance of nature. What would be the effects of major diversion and storage upon river scour and deposition patterns? Would micro and macro climatic patterns be changed? Would vegetative cover and wildlife patterns be affected, and would these effects be positive, negative or both? Would patterns of water development and land use in Canada be affected, and in what ways? Can the negative effects be reduced or modified, possibly to our advantage?

One of the disturbing things about the studies going on in northwestern Ontario is that apparently engineers are almost exclusively involved. Where are the ecologists and the social scientists? Should they not also be having an important input regarding a decision to radically alter the environment of a large and important part of this nation?

I understand that this is not the only country studying the question of diverting rivers. Apparently it is also being done by the Soviet Union. A few months ago there was in a daily newspaper a small item from Paris. It raised the interesting question of diversion of rivers. This article is entitled, "Diversion of rivers could 'brake' earth," and reads as follows:

> A U.S. scientist warned Wednesday that proposals to divert large rivers in North America and Russia could slow the earth's spin or make it wobble.
>
> Dr. Raymond L. Nace research hydrologist with the U.S. Geological Survey, said proposed river diversions to supply water to thirsty southern areas could shift weight from the pole toward the equator and slow the earth's spin.

Not being a scientist, Mr. Speaker, I have no idea whether that would be a bad thing or a good thing. It does illustrate, however, that many learned people realize that the diversion of rivers, a massive engineering scheme, would have drastic effects on our environment. If ever our fresh water is to be exported, we want to be assured that our future needs are given precedence, and that the region which I represent will benefit greatly from such exportation and will not be adversely affected. If this act succeeds in preventing further pollution and restoring presently polluted waters to their original state, and if it provides for greater utilization of the great resources that we have, this government will have earned the gratitude of the people who live in the land of lakes and forests, namely, northwestern Ontario.

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to congratulate the minister on his excellent speech on November 20, at which time he introduced the bill now before the House. The minister is obviously thoroughly familiar with the problems of pollution and the devastating effect it is having upon our environment. The minister's way with words, his great oratorical ability, is all the more appreciated when one realizes that the bill he introduced to deal with this very serious problem is nothing more than window-dressing. The government's grandiose plan is designed to accomplish nothing.

One thing that can be said for this government—it is consistent. When it makes up its mind not to do anything, it does not do anything. I need only draw the attention of hon. members to the government's great plans to cure regional disparity, its promise of a just society and to deal with rising costs and unemployment. These are things this government promised to tackle. It promised them in the same vein as it now promises to tackle the serious problem of pollution.

A large number of people in my riding of St. John's West were seriously affected by pollution and the effects of it on their livelihood last year because of what happened in Placentia Bay and St. Mary's Bay. Their livelihood was affected, and indeed in many respects completely destroyed by the results of pollution. These people have first-hand knowledge of what pollution can do to them. They share my disappointment with the government's wishy-washy, meaningless approach to the entire problem. To say it falls short of the desired objective of such an act is the understatement of the year.

The people of this country were led to believe—and I speak with some authority for the people of my riding—that once enacted, this legislation would have the necessary teeth to prevent another Placentia Bay tragedy, and would in fact be capable of effectively dealing with the problems of our environment and its pollution, generally considered to be one of the major concerns of Canada, in fact North America, in this decade of the seventies. Instead of seeing presented

to the House legislation with teeth and able to deal with the problem effectively, we see legislation that is complicated and largely ineffective.

• (9:20 p.m.)

For example it deals only with water and does not touch upon soil or air pollution. Even as it concerns water, it does nothing to improve the interdepartmental maze or sort out the federal jurisdictional problems as among the various departments of government. It does not make provision for the establishment of national standards for water quality, equipment or monitoring. It does, in fact, still leave it for one province or one area of the country to encourage industry, because of lower standards of pollution control in other parts of the country.

There is no indication that the federal government is going to put up any money for pollution control. There is no provision in the act for preventive measures. Areas not designated will apparently wait until their waters are polluted before receiving attention. There is no provision for equal treatment by the federal government of one water quality management area compared with another. In each case everything will be done by separate agreement. One of the other inefficiencies of this proposed legislation is the absence of criteria to justify the amount, or percentage, of federal involvement in each case; and as I mentioned before, there is no fixed cost-sharing formula. The measure provides for the setting up of water quality management agencies, dumping the problems of water management and pollution control on these agencies without giving them sufficient power to carry out their functions.

Some of the questions that should be answered by the minister during the second reading stage of this bill are the following: Will the local agencies have the facilities or knowledge to carry out what will be expected of them? Will they have the power to collect the fees they will be authorized to collect? How will they enforce collection, and are they taxes to be charged against the land? I believe these questions have a very serious bearing on this measure and must be answered before the bill is given approval by the House.

I mentioned at the outset that the minister did an excellent job of introducing the bill. He showed the House that he has a thorough knowledge of the problems of pollution, and expressed a need for immediate attention. I am sorry to say that is where he stopped. It should be said, in all fairness, that the minister cannot be expected to perform miracles or wave a magic wand and have the problems of pollution disappear. After waiting patiently for this legislation, and having listened to ministers talk about its "all-cleansing power," the least we should expect is a measure that might provide some hope for our people.

For my part—I think I share the views of my colleagues on this side of the House—I had visions of a national department or agency being set up to co-ordinate pollution control efforts of all departments and to deal effectively with water quality as part of their over-all approach. I had visions of a bill that would deal with water quality as part of a national priority for pollution control, one which would commit the necessary funds from federal tax revenue. I hoped that the government would establish national minimum standards for water quality management, not just for special areas, and provide for pollution prevention on a national basis.

Getting back to the pollution problem experienced last year in the waters of Placentia Bay as a result of the establishment of the ERCO plant in that area, I see nothing in this bill that would have altered the course of events there had it been in effect at that time. I submit that the Fisheries Act gives the government a greater degree of authority to deal with pollution of our waters than anything embodied in this bill, that is, if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) is prepared to exercise his authority.

In the case of the pollution of Placentia and St. Mary's Bay, the minister was not prepared to act with the necessary haste because while he was pussyfooting, the waters became more polluted, the economic plight of those affected worsened, the destruction of marine life in the area continued and the cause of pollution became harder to remedy. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, not unlike his cabinet colleagues, has been heard to say on a number of occasions about the Placentia Bay episode, as well as on other occasions when the subject of pollution control has been raised, that the shortly-to-appear Canada Water Act would be the answer to the problem. Surely, the minister was not serious, nor did he expect to be taken seriously by the Canadian people when making such utterances. Surely, the minister must have been aware of the meaningless and ineffective attempt being made by the government to deal with the problem, at least as indicated by this bill.

The problems experienced by the people of my riding last summer were probably unique to all of Canada. All of us have talked about pollution and the dangers and serious effects it will have upon our environment; but the people in my riding were the victims of this terrible tragedy. A large number of them had their livelihoods affected. Indeed, in many respects their chance to earn a living from their trade and vocation completely destroyed.

A number of questions with regard to that tragedy have not been answered. I am now trying to get these answers from the government. This government had knowledge of the problem that would exist with the establishment of the phosphorus plant. It has been suggested that reports were exchanged by the federal government and the provincial government, the company itself and the Bedford Institute of Oceanography. I contend that the people of that area who suffered this injustice have a right to know all the facts concerning the pollution of their water, the cause of that pollution and whether it could have been prevented by the federal government and the provincial government. I hope the information I have requested will be forthcoming in the very near future because the people are entitled, as I am as a Member of Parliament, to it.

The House is entitled to this information. I ask the government to take the necessary steps to ensure that the information which I am so anxious to obtain is made available to me. I consider it my duty as a Member of Parliament to join my colleagues on this side of the House in their efforts to have the Canada Water Act amended so that it will contain the anti-pollution measures needed to save Canadian waters. I am sure we have the support of all Canadians who, like us, are demanding an end to the continual corruption of our natural environment.

Our party has consistently demanded tough federal action to deal with pollution. The government has responded to our demands and the demands of the Canadian people with the Canada Water Act—a pitifully weak and wishy-washy bill which in my opinion betrays the hopes and expectations of all Canadians.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take a brief part in this discussion of the Canada water bill, I do so very conscious of the fact that the people in the part of Canada from which I come, the lower mainland of British Columbia, are perhaps more conscious and more concerned about the dangers of pollution in all its forms than the people in any other part of the country. In British Columbia we now have more than two million people. Over one-half these two million people live in less than one-half of one per cent of the land area of the province. I am speaking of the lower mainland area from which I come. There is a concentration of population comparable to that of many older industrial countries of Europe.

Through that area flows the Fraser River, into which over the years the waste from homes and industry has been discharged. The people of the lower mainland of British Columbia are extremely conscious, and daily reminded, of the problems and health hazards of pollution either by water or air. I should like to briefly cite three or four recent developments in this area in regard to pollution. First, a week or two ago the International Salmon Fishery Commission approved an investigation of the Fraser River to determine the level of the pollution and the extent to which the pollution there is responsible for the reduction of the fishing runs over the last several years.

Second, next year British Columbia will be celebrating the centennial of that province's entry into confederation. It has been seriously proposed to the centennial committe of British Columbia that a major project which might be undertaken would be the cleaning-up of the Fraser River starting in 1971, the year of our centennial of confederation. In the knowledge that the federal government has granted the province of Manitoba for its centennial celebration this year the sum of $6 million or $7 million, which I think is excellent, the people of British Columbia are looking for at least a similar grant for the purposes of their centennial celebration in this coastal province.

Another development of public concern with relation to pollution in British Columbia is the organization and spread of a voluntary, anti-pollution organization called the Society for Pollution and Ecology Control, in short SPEC. This group has branches in many parts of the province; the organization is growing almost each week. The concern of this organization is to find out how individuals can work to combat air, water and land pollution. I believe this organization is doing an excellent job and is setting a good example to the public authorities in British Columbia in this field.

I see that the minister responsible for piloting this legislation through the House is here this evening. I should like to refer him to a bulletin put out by the SPEC organization concerning what they are looking for from him. I believe they are too optimistic, but in any event this is what they say under the heading "Joe Greene is Coming to B.C.":

> At the end of Jan. J. J. Greene Fed. Rec. Minister is coming to B.C. to meet with his provincial counterpart Mr. R. Williston. We are all aware of the complete lack of commitment in the area of pollution control on the part of the provincial government. We urge each and every SPEC member, their friends and associates to write Joe Greene in Ottawa immediately urging him to be tough in his dealing with Williston and Bennett. Many SPEC members say they want to do something. Here is their oportunity. WRITE: The Hon. J. J. Greene, Federal Recreation Minister, Parliament Buildings Ottawa Ontario.

I hope the minister has noted what I said is expected of him. I doubt very much whether he will live up to the expectations of the people who put out this bulletin, but I hope he will. So far I have been speaking about the reaction to the water bill and to the subject of pollution by the people of British Columbia. However, the same feeling exists in a great many parts of our country. Pollution in all its forms is a collective problem. Private enterprise has not only failed to deal with this problem but is actually the chief culprit.

If one could express in a phrase what the people in my part of the country want from the government in respect of pollution control, I would say it is an all-out national war effort led by the national government against all forms of pollution. After looking at this bill which we are discussing, it would seem that instead of that we are getting from the government a sort of quiet diplomacy aimed at gaining a truce which would be acceptable to private enterprise or, in this case, big industry. The legislation before us is really too liberal and too late. It will add another administration in respect of water control. We have many such organizations now. The Glassco Commission some years ago pointed out that in Canada no less than 168 water control administration agencies were either federal or provincial. No doubt a few more have been added since that time.

The proposed legislation will create further legislation. At the present time I believe we have four or five federal statutes, a notable example of which is the Fisheries Act. If the government had the will to do so, it could really clamp down on water pollution across the country with the authority it has. The proposals before us will mean the employment of more experts and the spending of more tax dollars for the purpose of examining the problem of pollution. But I am told we already have 13 or 14 government departments carrying on this work. This bill might have been good 10 or 15 years ago as a start along the right road, but today I am afraid it will further pollute or further muddy the waters in which pollution breeds.

There are several kinds of pollution in Canada, about which we have heard very eloquent speeches in recent days. There is water pollution, air pollution and land pollution. These are all evil and must be met by a collective plan led by the federal government. But there is another type of pollution which perhaps is equally injurious to the public. This is constitutional pollution. This type of pollution is with us and is growing through the years. We have the situation that in respect of many fiscal matters, either federal or provincial, the federal and provincial governments say that they cannot do this or that because of the constitution.

The constitution was made for Canadians; Canadians were not made for the constitution. I contend that if the present majority government had the will, it could control pollution under existing legislation. However, if it does not think it can, I would suggest that it has just as much a responsibility in this regard as it has for pollution by liquor in respect of drinking drivers. Action in this regard was taken recently under the amendments to the Criminal Code. I suggest that the government equally has a responsibility in respect of pollution of water.

If we can outlaw pollution by liquor, why can we not at the same level outlaw pollution by water? The federal government could rally the whole country behind it, if it would declare war on pollution of air and water. The public is sick of talk, delay conferences and workshops. The public is anxious, ready and calling for action at the national level for clean air and water. The people want a massive national attack on pollution. Having in mind what it did in respect of liquor pollution, I am sure that if this government gave the people of Canada the same kind of leadership in the area of pollution, about which so many thousands are concerned, it would do a great deal for national unity in this country.

• (9:40 p.m.)

It is at this level, the level of a common denominator among our problems, that the

federal government could really take the lead and rally the people of Canada behind it. Had it done so in this case, I am sure no province, no city, no industry could have withstood such an initiative. But the government has failed to take such a lead. It is a great pity, in the circumstances, that hon. gentlemen opposite should have missed the boat, thereby letting the country down.

The measure before it does not commit the treasury to any expenditure to help the provinces or the municipalities in their efforts against pollution. It fails to set national water standards. If passed it will simply add legislation to existing legislation. The onus is still left with the provinces and the municipalities. This bill is not good enough. It should be rewritten with the 1970s in mind rather than the 1940s.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting for some time for the opportunity to express the views of the Ralliement créditiste on Bill C-144 and I have heard in the House well-researched speeches explaining the positions of the various parties.

It seems to me that this bill is stirring up a debate such as we have seldom seen in the House. For once, all hon. members, on the government side as well as in the opposition, recognize with one voice the urgency of getting down once and for all, to the task of preserving Canada's natural resources, especially its water resources.

However, even though we rejoiced at first sight at the introduction of this bill, we do not approve of it unreservedly.

The basic principle of the water conservation policy is therefore to provide on the one hand, for a sound administration and on the other hand, for the most rational utilization of Canada's water.

The bill before us now rests upon undeniable facts, namely that we have in Canada huge water reserves but in view of the shameless waste of such wealth, the federal government is at last compelled to action.

We fervently hope that the measures the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) has in mind do not come too late.

The federal government has decided to take action but, paradoxically, it does not say a word about how much money should be invested to control pollution to any effective degree.

In my opinion, Bill C-144 is an excellent description of global policies but it fails to indicate, from the practical point of view, anything that might lead us to believe that the government is serious about this problem which, according to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources should be given a priority.

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we have shamefully squandered our wealth, in the past. And there is no doubt that we must do something now. But I doubt whether this is possible without money.

The minister makes no bones about saying this bill is a joint and global undertaking. Joint, because of the hope of ensuring the participation of the provinces, and global, because it aims at pooling all the conceivable initiatives, whether regional, municipal or provincial, in a huge program devised to eliminate pollution.

In consideration of what, if the provinces did not agree to support this pollution control, the federal minister would keep the right to act on his own. This is one of the privileges he secures for himself in the bill.

We are guilty of having squandered our water resources. We have invested a lot of money in industry and trade. However, we have lacked inspiration, foresight and wisdom; we are investing, on the one hand, to improve the situation while, on the other hand, we are squandering our wealth in the most shameful way.

We have completely forgotten our natural resources; our water policy was non-existent. A release published by the minister's office says that some order will be put once and for all in the bureaucratic and juridictional maze. I shall come back to this in a moment, but I suggest that we shall really have a basic problem to solve.

In the past everything was left to chance. When a provincial government was asked to help in the solution of a pollution problem, we got the following answer: This does not come under our jurisdiction. This belongs to the federal government. However, when the federal government was asked to solve the same problem, the answer was that it did not come under federal jurisdiction.

I have here the letters of a provincial minister and of a federal one which expose the problem created by pollution. The bureaucratic and jurisdictional maze with regard to water pollution is such a huge problem that Bill C-144, in my humble opinion, will not solve it.

Water Resources

During the month of November 1969, I had the opportunity to consult with the Quebec Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, with the Quebec Minister of Game and Fisheries, as well as with the federal Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis).

It was about the problem of water pollution in the St. Lawrence river. Indeed, a fisherman of the Lotbinière riding used to catch two eels a day on average after having invested $5,000 in fishing equipment. This situation is common in my riding.

When this problem is referred to various governments, because it has water pollution as a direct cause, they claim, in view of the bureaucratic and jurisdictional intricacies, that it is not their responsibility.

I would say that Bill C-144—and that may be its greatest failure—will not bring a solution to this problem. In order to call the attention of the minister to this matter, I will read a letter of the Quebec Associated Deputy Minister of Trade and Industry, Mr. Maurice Lessard, dated November 10, and I quote:

• (9:50 p.m.)

The Department of Tourism, Game and Fisheries has referred to us your letter of October 20 concerning the fishermen of your constituency plagued with water pollution.

Water pollution is a major problem with which all governments are concerned; these last years, pieces of legislation have been introduced at all levels to control that plague and counteract its ill effects. However, some time will have to elapse before we can see their beneficial effects.

This means that the inconvenience about which the fishermen of the Lotbinière constituency complain are similar to that suffered by a very great number of fishermen in the province of Quebec. We deplore such a situation, but no legislation at the present time provides for assistance to offset the inconvenience that you outline.

I was then inquiring about the provincial government policy on water pollution and as can be seen, I did not get any reply.

I had also written to the Quebec minister of Tourism, game and Fisheries but I will not put the reply on record. However, I should like to call the members' attention to the other side of the picture, that is, what the federal government thinks about the problem. I have in my hand a letter from the minister of Fisheries and Forestry, dated August 14, 1969, and I quote:

Sir:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 14th expressing your concern about the fishermen and the fish likely to be affected by the pollution of the St. Lawrence, from Montreal to Quebec.

Unfortunately I must remind you that under an agreement, fisheries management in Quebec comes under the juridiction of the province, more specifically under the Department of Tourism, Fish and Game.

In the event that such steps as you suggest should be taken, they will no doubt be prepared by that department.

Yours sincerely,
Jack Davis

According to the two ministers, this seems to close the matter. What do we see? The problem is still there and dead fish litters all the shores of the St-Lawrence. Moreover, swimming is prohibited. The water stinks. Our great river, one of Canada's matchless resources, has become a national disgrace.

Neither the provincial nor the federal government tries to find a global and joint solution, as the minister put it, to solve the problem. They pass the buck and say: This does not come under our jurisdiction, this is the responsibility of such and such government.

The minister claims that Bill C-144 will solve the problem.

I have here a communiqué issued by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, which is entitled: A new Water Act designed to unravel the bureaucratic and jurisdictional maze.

What a problem! The department acknowledges itself the problem to such an extent that it set it forth in a press release.

It reads in part as follows:

Hon. Otto E. Lang, the minister responsible for energy and water resources, has stated that the proposed Canada Water Act just announced by the government is aimed at unravelling the bureaucratic and juridictional maze which so far has stifled all initiatives concerning control over pollution and conservation.

What high-sounding words to say nothing!

The people of Canada are increasingly worried by the failure to undertake a long term project and by the lack of co-operation at all levels of government.

The release continues, and I quote:

The federal government must take the initiative, in a concerted action—

I dare anyone to find in Bill C-144 the excerpt which elaborates what the minister means by "take the initiative", and "a concerted action".

Under cover of a new piece of legislation, and with the help of the huge publicity machine, Canadians will be made to believe that the pollution problem is settled at last.

Also, we shall be made to believe that the provincial governments are in this fight till the end and that, right now, there is no longer any co-operation problem. Now, you will note that in the preamble—and this is

one of the problems I have raised recently—the minister takes the initiative and goes it alone in the fight against pollution.

What guarantees have we that before using this privilege he has granted himself, the minister has accepted to co-operate with the provinces so that it will be a total fight?

In the past, in this field as in so many others, the ministers, under cover of an act, have resorted to all kinds of reasons to avoid taking action.

Some may doubt my words, but if we consider how pollution control will be financed, we are flabbergasted and necessarily disappointed, since we cannot foresee any financing means.

In conclusion, may I say that the bill is in itself excellent, considering the government's slowness in taking action to control pollution in order to protect our very rich water resources.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I should like to express reservations with regard to federal-provincial, interprovincial and intergovernmental relations in this field.

Finally, I suggest that the financing provisions of the anti-pollution program will merely contribute to an increase of Canada's indebtedness, since to finance these measures the governments through their various agencies, depatrments and corporations will have to borrow at exorbitant interest rates and thus put Canadians into greater debt.

The fight would be a truly serious project if the government adopted effective means of financing, in other words if it used the Bank of Canada, since this concerns the development of a natural resource which does not belong to the minister nor to any particular Canadian but to all Canadians. Considering that this resource is here and now public property, it seems to me that the financial instrument which belongs to all Canadians, the Bank of Canada, should be responsible for the financing of such programs. Then we could say the minister is really serious and that he is not misleading the population.

To conclude, I wish to say again to the minister how grateful I am for this bill, and I would like him, in turn, to acknowledge that the financing of sewage disposal programs by the Bank of Canada, at interest rates not exceeding management rates, would be most useful. We could thus finance sewage disposal plants and municipal projects in that field.

At the present time, this is a major factor of debts for the municipalities, and if the minister agreed to use this method, as proposed by the Créditistes, we would have a genuine solution to the problem of pollution, and we would not get Canadians deeper into debt.

[*English*]

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

HOUSING—INQUIRY AS TO ALLOWANCES

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, November 27 last, I directed a question to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) in charge of housing, with regard to housing allowances. This question was prompted by a submission by Mr. H. W. Hignett, president of CMHC, when he and his officials presented a brief to the Senate Committee on Poverty. In that brief it was suggested that a guaranteed annual income and system of housing allowances would help as part of a drive to provide decent housing for every Canadian.

In a report in the *Globe and Mail* of November 26, Mr. Hignett was quoted as saying that these steps were necessary, and they would have to be coupled with an expansion of the supply of housing for all income groups in both the public and private sectors. He also warned that exclusive reliance on private production and distribution methods to provide an adequate stock of houses would harden the dangerous trend to physical segregation of income groups in the country's big cities.

• (10:10 p.m.)

He also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that if the trend were to continue that housing was determined by the income of the individual, we would have the segregation of homes based on the income of the occupants. He noted that cities like Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver were prime examples of the segregation trend that was taking place.

With regard to housing allowances, Mr. Hignett said the system put forward by CMHC would mean an income supplement to families and individuals to acquire housing of

their own choice in the private market. Housing would have to meet a required standard and there would be limits on household income and rent. Mr. Hignett said that the advantages of the scheme are that it gives people a greater choice as to where they live and how they live than public housing, allowing for increased diversity and mixing of neighbourhood populations. He said:

> It allows greater flexibility in helping those whose problem is not necessarily inadequate or poor quality housing, but rather the proportion of their income spent on rent which prevents them from properly providing for other necessities.
>
> Finally it does not identify those in receipt of subsidy in the way that occupancy of public housing does at present.

He and his officials pointed out that this system has worked with some success in countries like England, the United States and Sweden. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the president indicated that CMHC predicted a rent reduction in public housing, that the six-year old scale with regard to rent geared to income was being reviewed and that in the near future changes would be made, with a corresponding increase in subsidies paid by the federal and provincial governments to meet operating losses in public housing projects.

Mr. Speaker, I recall that when the estimates came before the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, the former minister in charge of housing indicated that we would have some form of housing allowances in the near future. That was a year ago, and to date we have not had any. I welcome the statement by the president with regard to how CMHC feels in this important area.

Michael Wheeler, the former executive director of the Canadian Welfare Council, set forth in an article in "Canadian Welfare" for September-October, 1968, the pros and cons of a national housing allowance. On page 3 of this article he said:

> The allowances could be used to advantage in conjunction with non-profit and co-operative sponsored housing and also with existing public housing; rents for these dwellings would be set at a level sufficient to cover debt charges and management costs without subsidy and the tenants would then be entitled to a housing allowance designed to ensure that their gross incomes were sufficient to pay an approved rent after deducting the cost of a defined level of consumption varying with size of family.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we would take into account the available income of a person and then try to determine the average basic expenditure with regard to the necessities of a household and the number of people in it, not taking into account items like housing, and from that a housing loss would be determined.

In the Nevitt scheme which is available in England, for example, if the monthly joint income of the husband and wife is $360 and the monthly basic expenditure for a family with two children is $285, the amount available for housing is $75. If the actual gross then were $100, the housing allowance would be $25.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the many ways in which we could increase our supply of housing and lessen the burden with regard to heavy rents. I hope the minister will not refer to the housing loss as applying exclusively to private accommodation, but will apply it also to public accommodation. I look forward to his answer and I thank him for attending here this evening.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I return the compliment and thank the hon. member for his remarks which are, as usual, quite valuable. The president of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation was speaking before the committee in the other place and had reference to many options which we are examining in the search for better forms of housing for low income citizens. I have examined the transcript of his comments, and to set the record straight I think it should be recognized that it was a statement of options to be considered rather than a statement of commitment to any one at this stage.

It is an interesting concept, and the more sophisticated approach of giving people a free choice through income to seek their own type of accommodation intrigues me. However, I should be less than responsible if I said that that sort of thing will be brought in in the foreseeable future. I doubt very much whether it will be.

Touching on some of the other points raised by the hon. member, we are looking at revisions to the rent-to-income scale. We shall be talking to provincial governments very shortly about changes pertaining to the rent-to-income scale, and these will do many of the things the hon. member mentioned in his comments. We have offered the provinces a formula relating to housing allowances. As a matter of fact, we are negotiating with the Minister of Trade and Development of Ontario to see if he wishes to go ahead with the acquisition of existing housing units

which are now vacant in the city of Toronto. The houses would be taken on a prime lease of between three and five years and we would, of course, offer the federal subsidy as if these were newly-produced, public housing units. This would disperse the units throughout the community and would alleviate the shortage to some degree.

I am anxious to look into the public housing interim policy as soon as possible. I mentioned in a comment in December that this matter had taken longer than I had expected, mainly because of the very definite need to consult with the provincial governments. We have all their recommendations, the last one coming in just prior to the Christmas holidays, and I am hopeful that we can put before the provinces a composite recommendation. We shall keep the hon. member's comments in mind in any changes we hope to introduce at least in the 1970 program.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—NIGERIA—CANADIAN ACTION FOLLOWING CEASE-FIRE

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, on January 14th last, I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) if he would address a protest to the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. U Thant, following his statement that the UN would not tolerate or recognize a secession in Nigeria. Furthermore, I asked on what authority he took it upon himself to make such a statement and whether he had jurisdiction to declare that present boundary lines were immutable.

Moreover, immediately after U Thant's statement, the Russians found a valid excuse to ship to Nigeria powerful guns which crushed Biafran resistance. In my opinion, when the Secretary General of the United Nations makes a pronouncement without being authorized to do so he shows irresponsibility. The African countries inherited boundaries established by former colonial powers and a number of governments object to them.

Moreover, I know that the Secretary General of the United Nations was well aware that the rebellion of Biafra was the result of a series of assassinations and the Secretary of State for External Affairs also knew that England having some economic interests to protect had only to undertake some military operations on July 6, 1967, which were only supposed to be a march designed to prevent the Shell Company from paying to the Biafrans 90 per cent of its production.

The Secretary General of the United Nations answers that Russia was also an arm supplier. It is true that Russia supplied some arms. After the events of Prague and Budapest, we have nothing to expect from that country. Since we are making a stand against the communist ideology, we should not, in my opinion, consider as normal the strange alliance between Russia, Great Britain and the United States.

When the Cameroons wanted to recognize Biafra, the American delegate, Mr. Joseph Palmer, was sent to that country to say that American aid would be cut off if the Cameroons took such a step. This only appearance of Mr. Palmer on the scene of the Nigeria-Biafra conflict was a turning point. Besides, through its secretary John Foster Dulles, that country often declares: "The United States have no friends, only interests."

In this conflict, even Pope Paul VI expressed the fear of retaliation. He is against the massacre of unarmed people. It seems to me that if the United Nations did not intervene to promote a peaceful settlement of the war, they had no right to condemn the secession of Biafra. I ask myself the following: On what authority do the United Nations or U Thant act this way? The world is so full of areas of friction and conflict that such a clear-cut attitude appears provocative.

I conclude therefore that the United Nations Secretary General is at the mercy of English and American trusts, and his attitude will lessen what little regard countries may have had for his authority. Through such gestures, the UN wants to act as a world government which would have the right of life and death over all nations, and soon it will be said that the control exercised by the UN and its Secretary General represents an economic dictatorship and that without their permission nobody will be able to live.

Mr. Speaker, if the Rockefeller Foundation, Standard Oil, Esso and the Manhattan Bank supply more assistance to Lagos University than to seven of the poorest states of the American Midwest, because there is no oil in Kansas, we have a clear proof that U Thant is the puppet of those financial tycoons who do not hesitate to destroy a nation in order to protect their interests. To let 4 million people die to keep, in collusion with the United Nations, the control of the oil reserves of a country, constitutes in my opinion a criminal act.

Mr. Speaker, when Canadians are misinformed by the C.B.C., when the parliamentary secretary to the minister falls back on

the statement of the Secretary General of the United Nations, when he schemes to prevent the opposition from telling the truth, he is as responsible as U Thant who, up to now, has not shown the slightest indication that he was ready to ensure the shipment of relief as quickly as possible, in the hope of saving human lives.

It seems that the Charter of human rights states clearly that each man is entitled to life, freedom and security, that all human beings are born free and enjoy equal dignity and equal rights, that any individual is entitled to freedom of religion, speech, meeting and association, and that nobody can be held in slavery or bondage. It is added that any person has some effective recourse before the courts concerned, against acts that infringe upon the fundamental rights recognized as his under the constitution or the law.

Taking the rights of the individual into account, the Canadian government should strongly protest before the UN which has gone beyond its rights, to make sure that such errors will not happen again. Otherwise, the Secretary General of the United Nations should yield his post to a man imbued with social justice, for nowadays, many people speak of freedom, but very few concern themselves about it.

Mr. Jean-Pierre Goyer (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, accusation by association is an old tactic of Communist parties, and I am surprised to see that the hon. member seems to be using it with regard to the Secretary General of the United Nations.

In any event, I believe the hon. member intended to allude to the reply given by the Secretary General to a question put to him during a press conference at the time of his trip in Africa.

It certainly does not behoove me to interpret what the Secretary General has said, and all the less so because I have not had the opportunity of reading the text *in extenso*. In any event, I should like to refer the hon. member to paragraph 6 of resolution 1514 adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations during its 15th session, on December 14, 1960, and I quote:

> Any attempt towards the partial or total destruction of the national unity or territorial integrity of a country is incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations charter.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.18 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, January 20, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES (WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE)—ACCURACY OF "GLOBE AND MAIL" REPORT

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. In this morning's issue of the Toronto *Globe and Mail* there is a report on certain exchanges that took place in the House yesterday in which there is attributed to me a statement that is the very opposite of what I actually said.

Mr. Trudeau: It happens all the time.

Mr. Benson: Join the crowd.

Mr. Bell: Impossible.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The Ottawa chief of the *Globe and Mail* has already apologized to me personally.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: I never get any apology.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Perhaps he should get his name in the paper too. In any case, I feel that the record should be corrected. The offending sentence in the *Globe and Mail* reads as follows:

When Mr. Trudeau said he expected to make an announcement "in due course," Stanley Knowles (NDP Winnipeg North Centre) said sarcastically: "I hope the phrase 'in due course' will not take as long as it usually does."

Mr. Speaker, I understand the confusion. In fact, I learned yesterday afternoon there was some confusion so I went to the office of the Canadian Press to find out what that bureau put out over its wire. I have in my hand the words the Canadian Press sent out, which were as follows:

Mr. Trudeau said it is and the government will report to the House "in due course." Stanley Knowles NDP—Winnipeg North Centre said he hopes "in due course" takes as long as it usually does.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry my subtle sarcasm was not understood. When I suggest that "in due course" sometimes takes a long while I have in mind a certain commission which was appointed in 1965 and took two years to make its report, following which it took a year for the report to be translated and then there was a white paper which is still before a committee. It is that kind of pace which I would like to see if and when this matter is dealt with. Indeed, if the Prime Minister has any idea of acting on this matter in this Parliament he can count on me to oppose him, all the way.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

CONCURRENCE IN FIFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau) moved that the fifth report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, presented to the House on Friday, January 16, 1970, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

MOTION FOR CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE—RULING BY MR. SPEAKER

On the order: Motions—Mr. Yewchuk:

That the first report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development presented on December 16, 1969, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: The House will recall that yesterday, when the motion listed in the name of the hon. member for Athabasca was called, the President of the Privy Council raised a point of order concerning the propriety of placing the notice of motion by the hon. member under Routine Proceedings. The basis of the submission made by the President of the Privy Council was that in the absence of any authority from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development the hon. member for Athabasca

could propose his motion, since it purported to concur in a substantive proposal, only as a private member's notice of motion. Later in his comments the minister suggested that the House should not adopt a practice whereby a private member might raise a substantive question by means of a motion to concur in a report of a standing committee rather than by the other methods provided for such under our Standing Orders.

There may be considerable merit in that position, but on this occasion it is the sole and only duty of the Chair to look at the notice of motion to ensure that it has been prepared in accordance with the practices and usage of this House.

The most important question is whether it is competent for any private member or any unauthorized member of a committee to propose a motion to concur in a report of a standing committee. It is apparent that there is a dearth of precedents to which the Chair may revert for guidance in regard to the question now being considered. At the same time the Chair must not disregard any precedents that in fact exist.

The precedent of May 23, 1932, and that of May 19, 1947, both of which were cited by the President of the Privy Council yesterday, seem to establish the point that a member who is not a member of a committee may move concurrence in a report.

A review of the *Journals* for 1964-65 will indicate that no fewer than four different members moved concurrence in various reports of the Special Committee on Procedure.

An extensive search of the records of the House has failed to disclose that any objection to a motion made under circumstances similar to those now under review has ever been made. Taking into account these precedents, few though they may be, I am of the opinion that the motion may be proposed by any private member.

The next point to be reviewed is whether the notice of motion has been properly placed on the Orders of the Day. Notwithstanding the persuasiveness of the submission made by the President of the Privy Council to the effect that private members or unauthorized members of a committee should not be able to raise substantive questions in the manner proposed by the hon. member for Athabasca, the provisions of the report of the Special Committee on Procedure, as adopted on July 12, 1955, and recorded at page 944 of the *Journals* for that date, make it obligatory to place a motion to concur in a report under heading "Motions." That provision reads as follows:

> That motions for concurrence in reports of any standing or special committee, for the suspension of any Standing Order, or such other motions made upon routine proceedings, as may be required for the observances of the proprieties of the House, the maintenance of its authority, the appointment or conduct of its officers, the management of its business, the arrangements of its proceedings, the correctness of its records, the fixing of its sitting days or the times of its meeting or adjournment shall be listed, when notice is required, called and disposed of under "Motions."

The relative words in this citation of course are, "motions for concurrence in reports of any standing or special committee." The motion to concur in the report is, I suggest, in its proper position on the Order Paper.

By way of conclusion I should like to make the following observation and suggestion, if I may. Under our new Standing Orders the standing and special committees have assumed a more important role in the legislative process. For obvious reasons our authorities do not take account of this development. In view of the decision I have taken to allow the motion of the hon. member for Athabasca to stand under motions and in light of the necessary proliferation of committee reports, there is the risk that the business announced each Thursday by the President of the Privy Council could be seriously disrupted by committees who feel their reports should be debated rather than government business. This was the point made very forcibly and clearly yesterday by the President of the Privy Council and it is a difficulty which the Chair fully recognizes. My suggestion would be that the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization might like to examine this situation to suggest ways in which the business of the House can be arranged in order to reconcile the demand of committees to have their reports brought forward for debate with the requirements of government business.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been some consultations between the parties on this point and agreement reached to stand the hon. member's motion for today's sitting and also for tomorrow. Perhaps I could ask that the matter be allowed to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baldwin: At the request of the government.

Mr. Trudeau: At the request of the government.

NATIONAL PARKS

RENTAL INCREASES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Under the provisions of Standing Order 43, Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent of the House to move a motion which I will present in a few moments. Recently there have appeared in the press and in correspondence expressions of grave agitation and concern by both commercial and residential leaseholders in the national parks of Canada as a result of demands being made on behalf of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development for rent increases under long existing leases of up to over 4000 per cent. This has created a great deal of controversy and unrest. As a matter of fact, it goes to the root of the long-festering struggle between the residents of Jasper, Banff and Waterton National Parks in the province of Alberta and the officials of the parks branch. In addition, Mr. Speaker, yesterday—

Some hon. Members: Order, order!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I am allowed to explain the purpose of my motion.

An hon. Member: Briefly.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member says he is allowed to explain the purpose of the motion. I understand the Standing Order allows him to explain the urgency of the motion.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Banff townsite a plebiscite was held by the residents and on Saturday I am told a similar event took place in Jasper townsite. The question was whether the people wished to remain under the jurisdiction of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Because of the urgency of the matter I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lethbridge (Mr. Gundlock):

That the whole question of recent rental increases demanded of commercial and residential leaseholders in the national parks of Canada by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the circumstances leading to the holding of a plebiscite by the residents of Banff National Park on January 19, 1970 be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs for investigation and report to this House.

I ask the unanimous consent of the House to move this motion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West. Under the terms of Standing Order 43 the question cannot be put unless there is unanimous consent. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUBMISSION OF CRITERIA TO CONFERENCE ON PRICE STABILITY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance arising from the press release of the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission on the matter of the proposed conference on price stability. Does the government intend itself, or through the Prices and Incomes Commission, to submit specific pricing criteria, to use words used by the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission as another way of referring to guidelines or specific restraints?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is a great relief to know that my hon. friend, who indicated earlier in the session that he was against the Prices and Incomes Commission, now thinks it may be making progress. Although the Prices and Incomes Commission has indeed secured a great deal of co-operation from business, industry and the professions and has been supported by the government, I believe it will be the objective of this meeting to work out criteria and it will not be for the government to impose criteria upon industry and business in this country.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his lecture and for the small bit of information contained at the end of his remarks. May I ask a supplementary question. Will the government feel committed to arrange the work before the Prices and Incomes Commission or will the government reserve, until after the conference has taken place, its decision on whether any restraints actually approved of will be supported by the government?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I think there is a general belief that it will be best for those who are going to be involved in voluntary restraints to work out the criteria. Of course, the government has all along supported the efforts of the Prices and Incomes Commission, which is a good deal more than the opposition has done.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of the minister's suggestion that everything is to be left on a purely voluntary basis, what comment has the minister to make on the indication by the chairman of the commission that if violations take place the commission will resort to the government for sanctions? Will the minister indicate to the House what sort of sanctions the government might impose in the case of violations of the criteria that may be agreed on?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, we have from the beginning supported the laudable efforts of the Prices and Incomes Commission, and when they approach the government for support we will do everything reasonable to support them in their very laudable efforts.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister not relieve the mind of the Leader of the Opposition and the minds of the people of Canada by indicating that he is taking steps to persuade the automobile insurance companies to hold back on their announced premium increases, which in some cases will be in the order of 13 per cent?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, having just returned to Ottawa today after visiting the wonderful new city of Thunder Bay, I have not had the matter brought to my attention. I have not had an opportunity to deal with this matter, but at the suggestion of my hon. friend I will look into it.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I take it from the reply by the Minister of Finance that the government does not have in mind any specific sanctions in case of violations?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, this government keeps thinking, which is more than the opposition does.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the continuous rise in consumer food costs, is the Prices and Incomes Commission making any attempt to determine such price increases being made by the food processors and distributors concerned?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the minister who usually answers for the Prices and Incomes Commission is not here. However, I will refer the hon. member's query to the commission.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. Is the minister not aware of the Prime Minister's statement to the effect that only two-thirds of his cabinet are worth while?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

SCIENCE COUNCIL

CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF CHAIRMAN

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Science Council of Canada must be free to function in the best interests of the public and in view of the fact that its present chairman, Dr. O. M. Solandt, is also vice-chairman of the Electric Reduction Company of Canada, a firm which has contributed substantially to water pollution in Canada, is the government giving consideration to ending this serious conflict of interest by requesting the resignation of Dr. Solandt?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond.

Mrs. MacInnis: The Prime Minister was rising to answer, I believe, Mr. Speaker.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get help.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. MacInnis: May I ask a supplementary which may help? I would like to help and I direct this supplementary to the Prime Minister for his consideration. Since Dr. Solandt has publicly discounted the importance of phosphate water pollution, and since his firm is the sole manufacturer of phosphates in Canada, will the Prime Minister investigate this matter and indicate to the House what action the government intends to take?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): A supplementary question to the Prime Minis-

ter. Will the Prime Minister look into the recent conviction of ERCO under the Combines Investigation Act for maintaining a monopoly against the public interest, and Dr. Solandt's position as chairman of the Science Council and vice-president of ERCO?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the fact the Prime Minister was seeking advice from him when the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway asked her question, I would like to go straight to the fount of knowledge of this government and ask the President of the Treasury Board—

Mr. Trudeau: Where is this presidential system going?

Mr. Lewis: —whether the government is considering asking Dr. Solandt to resign as chairman of the Science Council in view of the obviously evident conflict of interest because of his high office in the corporation to which reference has been made?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think in any instance where we as a country endeavour to secure the part-time services of a distinguished citizen of Canada, some incidence of conflict of interest is bound to arise. If the man heading the Science Council of Canada had no other interest than that, he would not be a distinguished Canadian. In the present circumstances I think one has to take into account one's view as to the ability of Dr. Solandt to rise above this type of conflict, and in him we have confidence.

Mr. Lewis: Would the President of the Treasury Board undertake at least to consider searching for another qualified person who would not be tarred by a conflict of interest which can do nothing but harm to the work of the Science Council of Canada?

Mr. Drury: The government is always on the lookout for good and better people. When the hon. member suggests that we might look for a replacement for Dr. Solandt on the Science Council on the basis of the representation he has just made, the answer is no.

Mrs. MacInnis: Can the minister not find somebody who is not connected with a firm which was fined $40,000 for offences against the Combines Investigation Act?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the principle advocated by the President of the Treasury Board is the principle which the government is following in accepting members into the cabinet who have a conflict of interest—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rephrase my question to the Prime Minister. Is the principle which is advocated by the President of the Treasury Board accepted by him when considering as candidates for cabinet office hon. members who have outside interests in corporations—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

AIR TRANSPORT

ACTION TO END POLLUTION BY JET PLANES

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): My question is intended for the Minister of Transport but in his absence perhaps the Prime Minister will take it. In view of the fact that the United States government has advised all its commercial airlines that they must end pollution of the air by jet engine smoke by 1972, does the Canadian government contemplate issuing a similar directive to our own airlines?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, I am taking the question as notice and shall submit it to him as soon as he returns.

[*English*]

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question with regard to pollution by jet engines and I wish to direct it to the Minister of National Defence. Has the minister ordered a similar conversion to clean burning fuel systems of jet aircraft within the military service?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL PARKS

ALLEGED REMARKS BY MINISTER TO RESIDENTS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and

Northern Development. Did the minister tell the residents of Banff, Jasper and certain other national parks that if they did not like the situation in the parks at the present time they could leave? If not, what did the minister say?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have some doubt as to the form of the question. I would not think it was in order for an hon. member to ask whether or not a minister had made a certain statement outside the House. Perhaps the question might be rephrased.

Mr. Nesbitt: Thank you. As Your Honour might expect, there has been considerable controversy in the press and the other media in connection with this matter. In order to clear the air, so to speak, I thought the minister might like an opportunity to make a statement. Possibly I could put it this way: would the minister make a brief statement to the House, perhaps by asking to revert to motions, on the subject of leases in the national parks?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): I can make a very short answer to that. With the permission of the House I will table a letter written in January, 1962, when the then Minister of Northern Affairs, the hon. member for Brandon-Souris, announced the policy which was to come into effect today—the policy of the opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Would the hon. member for Oxford kindly resume his seat? I gather that the minister has asked leave to table a document. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nesbitt: Now that we have heard those interesting remarks by the minister, perhaps the hon. gentleman will answer the question he was asked.

Mr. Chrétien: I have just said—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Rocky Mountain.

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Rocky Mountain): Bearing in mind the results of the plebiscite held in Banff yesterday, which showed clearly that 80 per cent of the people of that community are dissatisfied with the present method of administering the townsite, will the minister deal with the citizens of Banff and Jasper in a reasonable and sensible manner from now on rather than make the kind of ill-informed statements attributed to him in the press last week?

Some hon. Members: Hear hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Chrétien: While I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on the question of the member for Rocky Mountain because I did not have the opportunity to answer. Concerning national parks, the policy of the government is always to put the interests of the Canadian people before those of businessmen.

[*English*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker I have a supplementary question for the minister arising from a question asked previously by the hon. member for Rocky Mountain. Is it the view of the minister and the government that citizens of the national parks who do not like the unfair tactics of the government should secede and join the provinces?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

INDUSTRY

COPPER—AMOUNT RETAINED FOR DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I understand his department recently issued a new directive to the copper producers stipulating the amount of copper which must be retained in Canada for domestic consumption. Can the minister give us some idea of the percentage which must be retained and the extent to which the new directive differs from the directive issued only a few weeks earlier?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The amount is 23,500 tons a month in the next two months, which is about 55% of the monthly tonnage of refined copper produced in Canada. This is based on average supplies of the first six months of last year, a period when supply was the highest in Canadian history. As I said

the other day "legitimate needs" are difficult to assess. This tonnage is less than the fabricators could use at the price of 57 cents but it might be equal to what they would have asked for had it been 66 cents.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Do I take it the minister is saying that the amount set aside for domestic consumption is less than the Canadian fabricators could use? If this is the case, may I ask what value is there in holding the price down to 57 cents if the users cannot buy any copper?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

EXPO '67

INQUIRY AS TO DISPOSITION OF CITÉ DU HAVRE

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grace): My question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. Is the minister now ready to make an announcement with respect to the development or disposal of the Cité du Havre property in Montreal?

Some hon. Members: Order Paper.

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubt whether particular urgency attaches to that question. If there is such urgency it is not apparent to me at the present time. The hon. member might wish to give notice of the question for consideration at the time of adjournment.

AGRICULTURE

ACTION TO LOWER TRACTOR AND COMBINE PRICES

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue. In view of the fact that the Barber Commission report on farm machinery prices, just released, contains the shocking information that Canadian farmers are being gouged by the machine companies to the extent of at least $2,000 per item through the overpricing of tractors sold in Canada, what action is the government contemplating to meet this serious situation?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Coté (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, there is a recommendation in the report that asks for the imposition of a reverse dumping duty on these importations. This has never been done and right now there are no such duties being applied.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Finance give consideration to the provision of a tax incentive to all-Canadian companies such as Versatile in order to lower the price of farm machinery?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, this is a broad policy matter the hon. member is asking about. I think all policies such as this would normally be announced during a budgetary statement.

Mr. Nesbitt: I was only asking whether the minister would consider the matter.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Revenue, and I might say I was not able to hear the answer he gave to an earlier question. In view of the recommendation contained in the interim report on farm tractor prices to the effect that the government should in certain circumstances impose a reverse dumping duty on tractor imports, will the minister inform the House whether or not reverse dumping duties are now or ever have been applied to Canadian imports—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the impression that the hon. member is repeating the question which was asked previously.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I did not intend to repeat the question. Perhaps the answer was an appropriate one but I could not hear it.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Mr. Speaker, I said that the so-called reverse dumping duties are not now applied nor have they ever been applied to imports into Canada.

POLLUTION

PHOSPHATES—REPRESENTATION AT IJC HEARINGS

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources whether officers of his department are engaged at the hearings of the International Joint Commission being held this week in certain places in the United States and in Ontario concerning the reduction of phosphates?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, officers of my department take cognizance of all hearings of the IJC. I am unaware whether they are physically present at the hearings this week, but I will take notice of the question

and give my hon. friend an answer at the next sitting.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether the federal position on the IJC proposal that phosphates should be banned by 1972 is being propounded?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, when the IJC report in this regard came out we took immediate action. This question has been given study by an interdepartmental committee. Some of my officers returned from Sweden only yesterday I believe following a specific study of the situation, and I hope to have a comprehensive report within a few days.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I preface my question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development by saying how much I enjoyed the radio broadcast he made to the citizens of the Northwest Territories on the occasion of their centenary during which he used such phrases as—

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Does the hon. member intend to ask a question?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Oh, indeed, Mr. Speaker, indeed. Because of the fine phrases the minister used during that radio broadcast I should like to ask—

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Don't be impatient. I should like to ask the minister when he will be making a statement, either in the Northwest Territories or to the House, about the question of self-government for the Northwest Territories?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have already made a statement in the House about this matter.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Minister has just engaged in misleading the House when he said he made a statement to the House about self-government for the Northwest Territories. He did no such thing. If he made any statement it was for continued colonial status.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

FINANCE

REQUEST FOR REDEEMING OF PERPETUAL BONDS

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in view of the extremely low interest rate of 3 per cent on Dominion of Canada perpetual bonds I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he will consider calling in these bonds which are held mainly by elderly people and those on fixed incomes, and also in view of the fact that yesterday they were quoted at $36?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, when people buy perpetual bonds they are buying an interest rate. In effect the bonds go on forever. The perpetual bonds issued have changed hands a great many times, and in most circumstances people generally buy at a price that will produce the kind of interest rate they want. This is the nature of perpetual bonds.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the interest rate of 3 per cent would substantiate the minister's remarks. However, will he give those people who are in possession of these bonds the opportunity to register them and give proof of date of purchase, and will the government then withdraw them up to say the year 1955?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, one would have to look at this very carefully. For example, if the government redeemed perpetual bonds at par someone who bought them at $47, for example, would make $53 per $100 invested.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interfere but it seems to me this is becoming a debate between the minister and the hon. member.

POLLUTION

ACTION RESPECTING CONTAMINATION OF SASKATCHEWAN RIVER BY MERCURY

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry say what action, if any, has been taken to eliminate or control the mercury pollution of the Saskatchewan River, which has been acknowledged by the government?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the source which I

identified the other day in the House of Commons is the plant of the co-operative producing soda and chlorine near Saskatoon. The necessary steps have been taken to make sure the effluent stream containing mercury is kept within the plant itself. Mercury is meanwhile being removed by treating the effluent.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, does this mean that the pollution of the Saskatchewan River by this mercury effluent has been discontinued?

Mr. Davis: The pollution from that plant has certainly ceased, and we think it is the principal, if not the only, source of mercury pollution. However, it will take a spring freshet to flush out the river completely.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries whether any of the compensation he announced earlier will be paid to those people who caught fish that were contaminated or will the federal government contributions be made to a general pool for distribution?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there is no question of compensation to fishermen in this case because all the fish they have been able to catch has been bought from them at the going market price. The fishermen have not suffered in any way. There is still the question of recovering the amounts paid to the fishermen by the federal government because we have had to destroy all the fish in question.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, could the minister indicate at this time how long the purchase of contaminated fish by the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board will continue?

Mr. Davis: I cannot be certain. However, it will continue as long as the level of contamination observed in the fish comes anywhere near the United Nations standards with regard to mercury.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, in view of the poisonous effect of mercury has the minister taken any steps to make certain that no fish caught in this area are bootlegged to another lake which may be clear of mercury so that they can then be sold?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, this is the main reason we have continued to pay what would have been the market price and, indeed, have followed the upward trend in prices normal at this season of the year. There has been no price incentive whatsoever for fishermen to sell to anyone else and under the freshwater fish legislation there is no legal buyer other than the Freshwater Fish Corporation.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands on a further supplementary but I must remind hon. members that we are running out of time.

DUMPING OF MINE TAILINGS IN QUATSINO SOUND

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question about the application of the Utah Mining Company to dump into Quatsino Sound some 9.3 million gallons a day of tailings which have a quantity of cyanide residue. What action is the minister's department taking to prevent this dumping which could be very detrimental to the fishing industry of Vancouver Island?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We have been keeping this situation on the west coast under very close review. My department does not issue permits to pollute or dump any effluent in the fisheries waters of Canada. Its powers are well known in respect of imposing fines. So individual mining companies like Utah Mining Company have kept in close touch with the department and have cleared their processes and practices with the department. We believe they will be following the right procedures.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Government House Leader. Has there been any departure in the order of business set out for the House by the House Leader last Thursday? I am particularly interested in the second reading of Bill C-175 respecting the Canadian Saltfish Corporation since there are a number of people in the five provinces concerned who are quite anxious to be here for that debate.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): It is difficult to predict the order of business without some firm agreement as to the time each particular measure will take. I expect there might be some agreement to conclude the debate on the Canada water bill in the early afternoon tomorrow.

It is hoped to follow that with the four financial bills. At the present time it would look as though there would be no prospect of reaching the Fisheries items I have mentioned before Thursday of next week, it being assumed that on Monday and Tuesday next week there probably will be a debate on a motion in respect of a constitutional committee.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

SCOPE AND EFFECT OF AUSTERITY PROGRAM

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the criticism levelled at the government by a former prime minister, Mr. Pearson, suggesting that the austerity program now being followed may do irreparable damage particularly to such institutions as the National Film Board, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he is prepared to review the across-the-board application of this policy and reconsider its effect on such institutions as are causing special concern to Mr. Pearson?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all it is not an across-the-board expenditure cut. The guidelines, as the hon. member knows, made certain exceptions and also made certain provisions for increases in other departments. The suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition, if applied to the Film Board, would certainly apply to almost every department and there would be no reduction in expenditures of the federal government. There would also be no surplus and we would be blamed for not combating inflation. The opposition should take a clear position on whether they want the government to spend more, or less. If they want us to spend more they should state that quite clearly and we will thank them for the mandate.

INFLATION—INCREASE IN RATES BY B.C. HYDRO

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance having in mind his efforts to restrain inflation in Canada by getting agreements from various industries to refrain from rate increases at this time. Would he consider taking similar action in British Columbia where B.C. Hydro has announced a 15 to 20 per cent rate increase, which is an inflationary measure?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier I do not think I can approach everybody in Canada who increases the price on anything. What the government has indicated is its support for the efforts being made by the Prices and Incomes Commission, which in addition to consulting with industry, business and labour has been consulting with the federal and provincial governments with a view to having general restraints on a voluntary basis in the country.

POWER

MINAS BASIN—PUBLICATION OF STUDY

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In light of the recent press statement concerning Minas Basin tidal power, may I ask the minister when we will receive this most important study and whether the government has decided yet whether or not it will be made public once received? It has been over a year now since the study was completed.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I might answer the latter half of the question first. No decision has yet been made concerning publication. I am instructed the report will be made available soon. I am not sure whether that is the "soon" of yesterday or of other days, but in any event that is the information I have.

Mr. Forrestall: Could the minister say whether it is being held up because of the translation or because of governmental or departmental studies?

Mr. Greene: It is held up within the administrative structure of government but whether because of translation or otherwise I have not been informed. I will inform myself and if that is the particular reason I will instruct the hon. member accordingly.

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

DISCUSSION BETWEEN OTTAWA AND QUEBEC RESPECTING FRENCH-SPEAKING IMMIGRANTS DESIRING TO MOVE TO ALBERTA

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Considering the great number of French-speaking immigrants to Quebec who apparently wish to settle in another province, could the minister tell us whether he discussed that

matter with the Quebec Minister of Immmigration? If not, does he intend to?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not had any discussion. In the circumstances I do not see the need of such a discussion.

COMMUNICATIONS

NORTHERN CANADA—INQUIRY AS TO INVESTIGATION

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Communications. In light of the current difficulties encountered in respect of telephone communication with the northern parts of Canada, could the minister say whether there will be a detailed investigation into communications in the north and would he undertake specifically to study the frequent and prolonged breakdowns in telephone communication between Hay River and Uranium City?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, we have already formed an internal committee in the Department of Communications to investigate the reason for delays not only in the area of telephone communication but also in respect of the provision of telegraph services.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—NUMBER OF PROTESTS

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Could the minister indicate to the House approximately how many protests he has received in respect of the white paper on taxation? Are they in the hundreds or in the thousands?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON USE OF PHENACETIN AND EXPERIMENTS WITH MINI PILLS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare I wonder if I might address a question to his Parliamentary Secretary. If he does not have the answer he might give notice of the question to his minister. In view of reports from British Columbia that doctors there are banning the use of phenacetin, a drug used in headache pills, can the government say whether this action would be supported by the department, and would the minister also make a statement in respect of reports that Syntex Laboratories are testing or experimenting with certain mini pills?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubt whether questions such as the one being asked now by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre should not normally be placed on the Order Paper. It is always difficult for a non-medical man to determine whether or not there is any urgency to such a question, but I would think that generally speaking this is the type of question that would normally be placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe there is some urgency, and that is why I thought it would be appropriate to ask the question today so that it could stand as notice for the minister tomorrow.

IMMIGRATION

ENTRY OF DANIEL COHN-BENDIT

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Yesterday I asked him about the entry of a troublemaker, a known activist, Danny Cohn-Bendit, alias Danny the Red. The minister, knowing very well that this person has been barred from France and, I believe, the United States—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should ask a question. He cannot make a statement.

Mr. Paproski: My question is: in view of yesterday's disturbance by Danny the Red and Stanley the Gray in a court of law in Montreal, would the minister see fit to deport this individual immediately and send Stanley along with him?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PROGRAMS TO COPE WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Would he take advantage of the first opportunity on motions to make a statement to the House outlining the nature of the programs which the federal government has to offset forced unemployment in the Atlantic region, in accordance with the statement which he made on national television on Sunday evening?

IMMIGRATION

ENTRY OF DANIEL COHN-BENDIT

Mr. Steven A. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I hope that I can receive an answer from the minister. I consider this to be a very important matter. If we can afford to have such hoodlums come to Canada and not look after the Jewish population in Poland, then he should be able to reply to this question.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that I am not administering the immigration laws of either France or the United States, and under Canadian immigration law this person is not prohibited. I do not intend to take the hon. member's description of "troublemaker" as a basis of preventing admission to Canada. We intend to apply the normal policy, which I think has stood up and which has been supported in this House and elsewhere, with respect to these cases. With respect to the rather snide comment made by the hon. member in reference to our treatment of Jews from Poland, somewhat similar to the comments he made about immigration from Asia—

Mr. Paproski: On a question, of privilege—

Mr. MacEachen: —I would want to tell him—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the minister was speaking to a point of order. I gather that the hon. member is now rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I should be impugned at any time by any member of this House intimating that I have any racial discrimination, as the minister has just been doing—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Your words speak for themselves.

Mr. Paproski: —or by innuendo, and I don't want him to carry on in this way.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to co-operate with the hon. member and follow his standards of behavior. His words on that occasion are in *Hansard.*

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister might like to reply to the question, and I understand the Minister of Finance also has to reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate.

Mr. MacEachen: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, a very important question was raised by the hon. member on a point of order, with the implication that somehow this government was eager to admit such persons as Cohn-Bendit and prevent the admission of Polish refugees. I stated yesterday, in reply to a member of the opposition, that we were treating refugees from Poland in a very sympathetic way, and our record in that situation is above reproach. I offered to discuss this matter in greater detail with any member of the opposition because the success of our program to help these Polish refugees depends to some extent on the manner in which—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As I already pointed out, the question period expired a few minutes ago. But at the same time the question by the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate got lost among the points of order and questions of privilege, and perhaps the minister might like to reply to it at this time.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON PROGRAMS TO COPE WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will consider the representations made by the hon. member.

• (3:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—NON-CONFIDENCE MOTION—USE AND SUPPLY OF GRAIN STORAGE FACILITIES

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie) moved:

That this House condemns the government's failure to make full use of existing facilities that are

available for grain storage, its failure to provide adequate additional facilities, its failure to adopt and implement a system of payments for the resulting storage of grain on farm lands, by reason of which failures the farm grain economy and dependent industries are suffering serious and continuing harm.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a press release on December 5 last, issued by the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang), stated in part:

On October 15th of this year the Prime Minister announced that the complexities of international grain marketing problems combined with the importance of the grain trade to the Canadian economy, had led to the decision to make grain marketing a focus of effort by a minister without general departmental responsibilities.

This seemed to send off the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang). It was like a quotation from Shakespeare. We knew there was thunder and lightning. We knew there were announcements, with heralds, and there was a blast—

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Of hot air.

Mr. Korchinski: I suppose of hot air, and the minister made his entry. Since then, we have had occasion to observe his operations.

I think he wanted to impress the world with the fact that he had just entered the ministry, but if he has impressed the world he certainly has not done anything for the western farmer. He has not done anything to put a few dollars in his pocket. Oh yes, Mr. Speaker, after that he made a few announcements.

He cushioned the blow for the Wheat Board. He cushioned the blow for the railways. He cushioned the blow for himself. He set up a grains group, and this group was to take the brunt of the attack. After a series of mishaps last year the Wheat Board reckoned that it had better clear itself, and the railways wanted the minister to make their lives a lot easier in connection with arranging their box car allocations.

The importance of my motion may well be emphasized by the questions that were asked in this House last week. Anyone who cares to look at *Hansard* will notice that not only did the Official Opposition ask questions pertaining to this particular problem but so did the NDP. Even supporters of the government asked questions pertaining to this problem. I say, good for them. But where does it end? Does it stop with a question or can we expect members of the government to emphasize their concern by voting in favour of this motion? I hope that the NDP would show their concern by voting for it. I also hope that members of other opposition parties would show their concern in other parts of this country where there are difficulties. Many members must have had questions asked of them during the Christmas recess and I hope they take the opportunity to express their concern by way of a vote. When the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was in western Canada last year he was peppered with a little bit of wheat but that is a small inconvenience for a public man to suffer when you consider the difficulties encountered by most of the people in western Canada. To a large extent, the difficulties stem from the action of this and the previous government.

When people tell me that they can no longer borrow money at 5 per cent interest, I remind them that it was the Liberal government that insisted it was going to make borrowing easier. I am a farmer myself and my operation requires a lot of financing but I cannot borrow money at 5 per cent any longer. Farmers are renewing their notes.

There was a series of articles in the Toronto *Star* setting out some of the farmers' difficulties. When the Minister without Portfolio was appointed his seat mate said, "You know, the east does not understand the west." The minister's big role was to convince the east that they had to understand the west. He did make an announcement to the effect that he would be the champion of the western farmer.

I have been through a few campaigns in my day and one of the criticisms levelled during them was that I did not know enough members on the government side. After all, Saskatchewan used to send 17 members into the House of Commons but with a Liberal government we did not get an opportunity to express our point of view to the cabinet. Now, we have that opportunity and what a wonderful thing it is except that mum's the word.

Instead of sending boxcars to pick up the wheat, the minister sends inspectors with the RCMP. At the Lakehead there is space available for 70 million bushels and this represents almost a one bushel quota per farmer. When you consider that the grain from the western half of the province of Saskatchewan will be shipped to the west coast, it represents more than a one bushel quota. Yes, there would be approximately 85 billion bushels taken in on the one bushel quota. The grain from the eastern half of the province would be taken to the Lakehead and Churchill.

During the election campaign the minister declared, "I am the man who will speak for you in the Liberal cabinet, I will do everything possible." Why is he not speaking? What is he doing?

An hon. Member: Nothing.

Mr. Korchinski: Nothing. I would not mind if he did anything, but he annoys people in the process because he has made it very nice and comfortable for the railways and he has found a way out for the Wheat Board. Now, I have supported Wheat Board action over the years though I often wonder what wisdom there is in it. I think I have a right to question it. I have also acted as chairman of the local wheat pool and know their concerns. I also know that it is this government that raised the interest rate from 5 per cent to the 9½ per cent I pay now. The gentleman referred to in the Toronto *Star* report only paid 9 per cent, but he was lucky.

It is not only the interest rate that bothers me. I know there are some who would question the authority of Joe Caplan and say he had no right to act as he did in connection with rapeseed. However, he has provided me with some figures on the volume of wheat sales. The figures do not mean anything until translated into percentages in terms of world sales. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to put this table on record. It shows the figures from 1953 to 1968-1969 for the volume of sales and the percentage in terms of world trade. I think this table is important because of what is behind our complaint. So with your permission, Mr. Speaker, and with the permission of the House may I include as an appendix to my remarks in *Hansard* Table 3 of a report entitled "A Farmer's Reflections on Grain Marketing" by Joseph Caplan.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Our complaint is simply this. We have the necessary volume of space available at the terminals. There is space there for 70 million bushels of grain. We do not want to cram all that space immediately with every available bushel of grain because we must have some working room. It seems that the minister in charge of the Wheat Board who represents a western constituency, is more concerned about the efficient operation of terminal elevators than about the welfare of our farmers. He is afraid that a man here or there will be laid off. These men who are laid off will receive unemployment insurance in any event. High interest rates are driving many people out of business and if the minister thinks that his policies work for the ultimate benefit of the farmer he had better revise his thinking.

The government set up this nice Grains Council. We are supposed to be fighting inflation and yet when organized labour asked for a 30 per cent wage increase, its demands were met. According to a report tabled the other day, the banks have enjoyed tremendous increases in earnings. We told the Minister of Finance in 1967, I believe, that with increased bank rates farmers were going to suffer. And what do we find? We find that banks have enjoyed increased earnings of between $154 million and $250 million odd. With your permission, and with the consent of the House, I am also prepared to table supporting figures included on pages 2233 and 2234 of *Hansard* as an appendix to my remarks.

I have some figures before me which indicate the elevator price for wheat, oats and barley. I want all members in the House to remember that not everybody produces No. 1 wheat and that last year, because of damp grain, few farmers were paid on the basis of No. 1 wheat for their grain. There were all kinds of wheat grades last year. The last time I obtained the No. 1 wheat price for my crop was in 1961 when there was a drastic shortage of grain.

May I also include as an appendix to my remarks table 1 of the document entitled, "1969 Elevator Prices for Prairie Grains" indicating that as between the 1966-67 crop year and the 1969-70 crop year, there has been a drop in initial prices, even when one takes into account the 20 cents per hundredweight freight charge, ranging between 25 per cent and 30 per cent. What other segment of our economy can claim to have suffered as much in the name of fighting inflation? I do not think anybody can absorb losses ranging between 25 per cent and 30 per cent and still stay afloat. These remarks apply not only to wheat but to barley, oats and other grains. I hope Your Honour and the House will permit the pertinent document to be appended to my remarks in *Hansard* since, if one is to make a careful analysis and study of the situation, it is essential for one to see the figures.

Farmers have had reduced incomes. What must they do, therefore? They must look for increased sales. But what is the picture? Last year the situation was difficult, and no doubt the minister will tell us that special circumstances prevailed last year. There was damp

grain and we had to have special quotas. But in the last 20 years I do not remember a situation in which farmers had not delivered any grain beyond the initial quotas by the middle of January. It is over six months since we made our last delivery, and anyone who can live on the income derived from 400 bushels at $1.20 a bushel is a miracle worker. And what is our minister doing? He is staggering sales in order to make things nice and comfortable for a few men at the Lakehead and because he is worried that a few men, who will receive unemployment insurance anyway, may be laid off. He could not care less about the farmer who will have to make his payments at the end of December and who must now pay 9½ per cent interest on loans he formerly obtained at a 5 per cent rate.

He could not care less about the men who are going out of business but he does want an efficient system of grain handling. It all looks very good on paper. Nowadays it is hard to find anyone who goes into town especially on Saturday night and stays longer than is absolutely necessary. At one time we were worried about our villages; but now we should be worried about our towns because they are suffering also. You can no longer depend on a businessman being there when you need him and you can no longer expect the machinery dealer to be in business. Our costs of production are high enough but now we shall have to travel 50 or 60 miles in order to get a machine repaired at prices which the Barber Commission called outrageous.

Seven years ago I with members of the Liberal party and of the NDP sat on a committee of this House which looked into this matter. The Committee came to the conclusion now reached by the Barber Commission. It has taken seven years for this miserable government to come to that conclusion. And what is it doing? The Government is setting up another committee to see what is to be done. What must we do to convince this government that we now have to pay 9½ per cent interest on loans for machinery that is $2,500 overpriced? No one in Britain, France or anywhere else pays more for farm machinery than we in Canada but this government still sets up another commission. Are we supposed to sit here while the children go unattended and communities fall apart? In the meantime the minister sets up commission after commission. I have pleaded with the government before. It is not only members in my party who have been pleading with the government but I also hear expressions of concern from the government side. This is what disturbs me.

• (3:30 p.m.)

When the Prime Minister visited western Canada all he could utter was, why should I sell your wheat? I say to the Prime Minister that we want to live in Canada.

There was a four page report in the Toronto *Star* on the subject of separatism in western Canada. It is not separatism that we want. We are as good Canadians as will be found anywhere in Canada. We have taken our lumps in the past but do not compare us to beggars.

Much of the beneficial results of the legislation on our books is defeated by other governmental actions. We have regional development areas yet the banks in my area are charging the same rates as are being charged in Toronto. The Prime Minister stated that Toronto and the province of Ontario are contributing to inflation. I ask the Minister without Portfolio whether he thinks Saskatchewan, Alberta and Manitoba are contributing to inflation. I dare him to make that statement. He knows that is not the case.

I intend to leave one thought with the government today because over the many years that I have been here I have found that the Liberal government can only absorb one idea at a time. I am not sure they will act but I think they can comprehend one idea. What I intend to say may not be received too well by some of the elevator companies. However my concern is for the farmer and his family who have for many years struggled, worked and manipulated in order to make a go of it. The minister has expressed himself to be somewhat in favour of this idea. The fact that the government intends to spend $71 million this year does not make any sense to me. It may be the basis for a very good speech indicating what the government is doing for the farmer but it does not make sense for the elevator companies to have this money in order to keep operating. It is not the elevator companies that are in difficulty but the farmers.

I am going to table a report which was provided by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. This is also another report by Joe Caplan. I want to incorporate these reports as part of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps this might be a good point to interrupt the hon. member and refer him to his requests submitted to the House in the course of his speech

that the documents to which he referred either be tabled or incorporated in his speech. When the hon. member first alluded to these documents he was content to ask that they be tabled. I reserved until the end of the hon. member's speech the occasion to ask the House whether there was consent to do that, but before asking the House whether there is any objection to the hon. member tabling these documents I should refer to his suggestion that these be incorporated as part of his speech. I suggest to the hon. member that it is contrary to the long established practice of the House that such documents be incorporated in a member's speech. If the hon. member wants to have part of such documents reported in *Hansard* as part of his speech, he has to quote them. In this way, they will appear as part of his speech.

There are exceptions to this general rule, such as official or ministerial statements, where official documents are, by consent of the House, allowed to be included as part of the ministerial or official government policy statement. This would not apply, I suggest, to a statement such as the one now being made by the hon. member.

I am not charging to the time of the hon. member the minutes I have taken to bring this to the attention of the House. In the circumstances, my suggestion would be that the documents to which he has referred might be tabled. These would then be available to all hon. members who might want to consult them in conjunction with the hon. member's speech.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the importance of these documents, the minister might be prepared to agree that they not be tabled or not be made a part of his speech, but made an appendix to *Hansard*.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have some hesitation about that departure from principle, especially in view of the variety of documents to which reference is being made. I would be delighted to have them tabled.

Mr. Speaker: From a procedural standpoint, I would have the same objections as those which I have just mentioned to the suggestion now made by the hon. member for Peace River that they be included as an appendix to *Hansard*. I think that, too, would not be in accordance with the established practice of the House. My suggestion should be taken into serious consideration by the hon. member that these important documents, tables and statistics, be filed for the consideration of members who may want to study them in conjunction with the member's speech.

Mr. Korchinski: I have four different documents that I am particularly interested in having incorporated as part of my remarks. I reserve the right to ask to have them incorporated as part of my remarks rather than take up the time of the House by making the same request for each one individually.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When I interrupted the hon. member, I thought he had concluded his remarks on this point.

Mr. Korchinski: Do I have permission to incorporate these tables into my remarks?

Mr. Speaker: I mentioned to the hon. member that this would be contrary to the practice of this House. I have sat in this Chair and have very often heard hon. members seek the same privilege. The question was never put to the House. Of course, the House is master of its own proceedings. Of course, if the House wants to have any documents, statistics and tables incorporated into a member's speech and appear as part of *Hansard,* it has the right to do so, but it would be a very serious departure from a long established practice. I suggest we should think twice before we allow this to be done. If this is done for the hon. member for Mackenzie it should be done for every other member and instead of receiving *Hansard* at eleven o'clock the next morning, we may not get it until 5 p.m. or 6 p.m. the next day.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. Korchinski: I am quite willing, if Your Honour will allow me, to table these documents as part of the proceedings.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Korchinski: How are we to get round this problem? It is evident we must put some money into the hands of the farmers. Over the last 15 years the amount of money put into the hands of the elevator companies, not only by the federal treasury but by the farmers themselves, is in the order of $974 million. If we were to distribute this money among the farmers, something positive would be accomplished. I realize it is difficult to do without any storage at all, so there is one proposal I wish to leave with the government. It is that they should set up a series of inland terminals. Let us do away with a lot of the

temporary storage facilities which have accumulated profits for their owners for years. Take the case of a 20,000 bushel capacity storage facility in a temporary building for which some $2,500 a year is paid. At this rate, the building has been paid for time and time again.

The next thing the elevator companies will want will be handling charges. Bearing in mind that one half of the world's surplus of grain is in Canadian hands, it is time the government came out with a storage proposal for farmers. This would help to put money where it is most needed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Korchinski: It would also cause the elevator companies to realize that for the last 30 years they have not reorganized their system.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member but I have to interrupt him again, this time to call his attention to the fact that the time allotted to him has expired; he can continue only by unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Korchinski: I shall not take up much more time of the House. I want to say simply this; it is time the government realized that it is not important we should have elevator systems in this country. It is important, though, we should have farmers who are making a living. By implementing a farm storage program, the government would be able to put the money where it is so badly needed.

If an adjustment is necessary, as predicted in the economic report, let us make it as easy as possible for people to get out of the business of farming, and avoid forcing them out needlessly.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Official Opposition should have chosen this day to bring to the attention of the House, of the government, and indeed of the people of Canada to the situation which exists on the prairies, placing emphasis on the storage and handling of grain and urging the government to consider ways and means of improving the present state of affairs.

As I come to the end of the time allotted to me today, I shall introduce an amendment on behalf of the New Democratic party which we hope will contribute toward a solution if the government in its wisdom chooses to take some advice. It badly needs some advice. I suppose I would be safe in saying that it has succeeded in allowing the wheat economy of western Canada to drift into the worst position it has occupied since the 'thirties. I say this in the light of the experience of one who has farmed continuously in Saskatchewan since that time, and as one who has been active in farm organizations there.

The Department of Agriculture has lately put out an official news release advising the farmers that they should reduce acreage next year to 20 million acres—the extent of our marketing ability in the year to come as far as the department can see. If anyone cares to do the calculation he will find that a reduction to 20 million acres means a reduction of around 5 million acres in the coming year, equivalent to a reduction in productive capacity worth between $90 million and $100 million. This would be a reduction of about the same size as was effected last year. Hon. members can look at the net figures; anyone can carry them into the House and quote them; they are published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. But what we are talking about in real terms is the productive capacity of the farms in the west, and it is the productive capacity of these farms, together with the saleability of the product, which will make or break the prairie economy and, particularly, the Saskatchewan economy. This is what we are talking about today.

We do not have to look far for evidence of what is happening and what is likely to happen. The *Globe and Mail* is carrying a series of articles on the outlook for 1970. Their reporters have been going from one part of Canada to another. The particular article before me appears under a sub-heading: "Hard Times in Farming Likely to Continue". The writer says that the cash position of Canadian farmers is a major factor to be taken into account when assessing the outlook for the companies which sell machinery and other supplies. In other words, those people the Barber Commission were talking about, the machinery manufacturers who have been stealing the farmer blind in western Canada, are going to find that the object of their depredations, like the turkey after Thanksgiving Day, has been picked pretty clean.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The article, in part, reads:

The farm market at present is in a depressed state and projections by federal Department of Agriculture economists show gloomy prospects in the coming year and probably the next two years.

Then, it reads:

> Provincial governments are offering farmers some assistance, particularly in diversifying from grain production into livestock, but this is spotty. The federal government is cutting programs as part of the federal austerity policy and there is little likelihood of any new assistance from that quarter.

This last statement in the article I have just quoted, if it is a true assessment of the situation—and from my personal observation I cannot quarrel or disagree with it—would indicate that provincial governments, particularly the government of Saskatchewan, has made some attempt to deal with this situation. Whether what they have attempted to do is right or wrong I do not know, but they have tried.

It has been announced that the government will lend money to farmers to increase production. What the outcome of that will be remains to be seen. In any event, there have been some shortcomings. Action should have been taken already but it has not been taken. Therefore, there will be some difficulties in this regard. I do not intend to go into these this afternoon.

What has been the contribution of the federal government in respect of the situation it knows exists? The government could not help but know this situation exists because, as the previous speaker said, never before in the history of western Canada have we reached the middle of January and found the majority of our delivery points not yet on a one bushel quota. The government's contribution has been to jack up the interest rate on farm improvement loans and farm credit loans. If we do have to make a shift, the result of this increase in interest rates will make it more difficult for the farmer to decide where to get the money to do the job. This decision will be difficult no matter which of the limited alternatives he decides upon—beef, hogs, dairy cattle or oil seeds.

In spite of this situation, subsidies are being reduced rather than increased. The proud boast of the Department of Agriculture is that it will progressively phase out bonuses or premiums on grade quality hog production. The sad irony of the situation is that during meetings of the agriculture committee, we have learned that the Department of Agriculture has been saddled with the task of deciding the manner by which the income of dairy farmers is to be reduced to the extent of $10 million. The division has already been decided to take away that $10 million but we have not yet decided where to prick this industry in order to let out the blood.

[Mr. Gleave.]

We are now faced with price reductions and a reduction in income from wheat. The January 15 issue of the *Western Producer* gives the price of Wheat Board offerings for last year and this year. For No. 4 wheat the price is approximately 30 cents below that of a year ago. For No. 3, the price is approximately 22 cents lower. The price for No. 2 is 13 cents lower and the price for No. 1 is 15 cents lower. I have not referred to the fractions of $\frac{5}{8}$, $\frac{3}{4}$ and so on in which our prices are usually quoted.

In the face of this situation, we received a statement from the Minister without Portfolio, as reported in the January 17 issue of the Saskatoon *Star-Phoenix*, under the byline of Stirling King. The heading on this article reads, "1969 Final Wheat Payment now remote, says Lang." This final wheat payment is no further away than I thought it was going to be five months ago. This is exactly what the *Star-Phoenix* meant when it referred to the payment as being remote. It means that for the 1968-69 crop year, unless the government decides to do something, farmers cannot expect final payments of any significant size on spring wheat.

The least the government can do under these circumstances, and I suggest this to the minister whose constituency is adjacent to mine, is guarantee to the wheat farmer of western Canada that he will receive not less than the floor price under the International Grains Arrangement for the wheat he delivered in the 1968-69 crop year. This amount would at least help to save the economy of Saskatchewan from continued disintegration.

If we can believe a report which appeared recently in the *Globe and Mail*, certain industries are to be curtailed in Saskatchewan. This will result in the disintegration of small businesses in small towns because they depend on farm production. When these businesses disappear, the services they provide farmers will also disappear. Not only will the livelihood of these businessmen be eliminated, but the farmers will lose their services.

The argument for the government to do something constructive to prevent this happening is actually the reverse of the government's stated policy. According to government statements, regional differences in Canada must be eliminated. Equality of opportunity and income in various regions of Canada must be provided. This is the other side of the coin. If it is decided by the advisers to the government that an adjustment has to take place in respect of farm operations in

western Canada, it is up to the government to bridge the gap between now and the time such an adjustment takes place. This is more than a moral obligation, it is an economic necessity because it will cost a great deal more to correct this impending disaster than it will to prevent it.

• (4:00 p.m.)

This is the main point I want to make to the government this afternoon. The space at the Lakehead or some place else can be filled, because it is merely a matter of moving cars. But what about the over-all policy with regard to storage? What is to be the real policy and what are to be the real decisions in respect of how much grain we will keep in storage? Is there to be a real decision as to where we will keep it in storage and how much we will be ready to pay to keep it in storage? These decisions have not been made; they have been avoided for the last number of years. The farmer in western Canada will accept answers if they are given to him. He will live with a policy if it is established. But he cannot live when there is no policy and when he does not know where he is going. He cannot, and neither can the economy of the nation or the economy of a part of a nation, live under circumstances in which the people do not know where they are going. If they do not know where they are going, they surely cannot plan how to get there.

It is answers of this type that are being awaited. The Canada Grains Council has been sitting for a year—or standing or sleeping, we do not know which. I hear some reports in Saskatoon that people have said some nice things about it. Possibly we may get some answers. Since my time is expiring, I should like to move the following amendment, seconded by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton):

That the motion be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding thereafter the following words: "and that this House urges the government to give immediate consideration to the taking of steps to deal with the prairie farm crisis by: 1. Providing a deficiency payment for the 1968-69 crop year sufficient to assure the farmer a final return equivalent to the $1.95½ minimum price established under the International Grains Arrangement, and 2. Appointing a Transport Controller to co-ordinate the movement of all western grains."

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Possibly I might be given an opportunity to reflect on the amendment. I have just one or two initial reservations about it. First, I should like to discuss these with Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to delay the House and shall make a pronouncement on the amendment in a few minutes.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) refers in several respects to the use of storage facilities, the proper amount of storage facilities for the future and the place at which they should be. It was to this aspect the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) referred just before proposing his amendment.

I should like to say a few words about the issue which seems to have caught the interest of hon. members in respect of the storage question. The specific issue of course relates to the storage situation at Thunder Bay where, quite in the usual fashion, the amount of grain in storage at the close of navigation drops to a fairly low point. The drop this year took place very rapidly at the end of the period of navigation because of the flow of sales at that particular time and the requirement to move grain eastward from the Lakehead in those last days of navigation.

I emphasized to hon. members before, and should like to do so again, that this decline to a low point in storage at Lakehead facilities is a perfectly natural, normal and efficient thing to have happened. The question that is really fundamental here has to do with the most effective and efficient use of the grain handling and storage system. The Lakehead must be filled to capacity at the time of the opening of navigation whenever heavy sales are in prospect. This is the case this year, so it is important that we attempt to ensure that the Lakehead will be full at that time.

Normally, during the course of the navigation season, stored grain is used to supplement the additional inputs of grain throughout the period when meeting the demand for export, and at the end of the period the storage capacity is not nearly all used but is at a rather low point. There is ahead, of course, the period when navigation is closed and no grain is moving out of the Lakehead. Accordingly the storage space can gradually be filled again in anticipation of the navigation season.

The issue which has been put before this House from time to time is the speed at which that space should be filled. The interest of the farmer in a general way, of course, is to see that there is enough there to meet sales at the time navigation opens. I have given

assurance about that as being a matter of grave concern and grave interest to us. Beyond that, the most effective way to fill the storage space is to arrange the deliveries fairly steadily over the period, taking into consideration, however, the fact that generally speaking at the end of the period a marked increase in deliveries must take place. There is, therefore, a situation where there should be put into use a growing number of railway cars in the movement of grain toward the close of the winter season in preparation for the extremely rapid movement of grain which is required thereafter.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It is not in the farmer's interest to pay the additional storage costs of grain simply sitting idly in the Lakehead facilities, but more than that it is certainly not in his interest to have the whole system operate inefficiently and more expensively. I say to hon. members opposite that surely any time there is a choice between doing the thing efficiently and inefficiently, it would be better to do it efficiently and then find a way to pass on those savings to the producer. This surely should be the objective with regard to our handling and transportation system.

There is this year in prospect an extremely heavy movement of grain, and I want to emphasize this because of the important bearing it has upon the state and the condition of our handling system as we move on to the opening of navigation.

I indicated some few days ago the prospect of exports this year of 375 million bushels of wheat, and unusually high exports of barley. That figure alone should indicate the significance of the movement of grain in the remaining months of the crop year, but I would like to analyse it even further.

The hon. member for Mackenzie has referred to the slow movement of grain during the first part of this crop year, and I will come back to that. To the turn of the year about 115 million bushels of wheat were exported. Therefore, to reach the 375 million figure there must be an export of 260 million bushels between the beginning of January and the end of July. That means a very rapid movement of wheat indeed, particularly in the several months of open navigation from the Lakehead, when we will see one of the most rapid movements of wheat out of the country that we have ever seen.

I mention the fact that exports were slow during the first portion of the year. Our China contract had a gap of two months in it. We were paying the price in terms of sales for the period during which we attempted to hold the price at the International Grains Arrangement level, and that period is now behind us. Not only did this mean a slower movement of grain out of the country, to the extent of the 115 million bushels only which were exported in that period, but from the point of view of the individual farmer the problem was even greater during that time because of the fact that toward the end of the last crop year a very large quantity of grain was placed into box cars in an attempt to equalize quotas throughout the prairies. I am told that perhaps as much as 35 million bushels of grain were in box cars at that time. That is not an efficient use of a handling and transportation system, and it is not a use which really ought to commend itself to this House.

I would like to commend the hon. member for Mackenzie for having dealt briefly with the issue of storage, which I suggest is a phoney issue, and then turning his attention briefly to some of the fundamental questions which do face us, some of the fundamental problems which must be solved in the days ahead.

Surely, it is clear to most people that the problem with regard to wheat in this country is more one of too much wheat than of too little storage space. It is clear that we must examine rigorously the issue of how much inventory we ought to carry in this country, and particularly on behalf of the farmer how much inventory, he ought to pay for because he pays most of the costs. This is a decision which must be arrived at in a hard-headed fashion.

Most people have reached the conclusion that the inventory we have now is far and away too large, and that the emphasis should not therefore be on additional storage space but on reducing the grain that we have in store.

The hon. member for Mackenzie did touch on several other important questions, several of which again were referred to by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar. After we have examined with rigour the question of how much grain we ought in fact to store in this country, there is clearly the second question of where it ought to be stored. I have asked that question in that way quite a few times now in speeches throughout the prairie region. If I ask the second question, which is should it not be stored where it is least

expensive to store it, usually someone in my audience suggests that this means it ought to be stored on the farm.

I think it is important for us to face the proposition with regard to storage, as with our handling and transportation system altogether, we must look hard at the question of where and how we can do the job most effectively and at least cost to the producer.

We have some real challenges facing us with regard to the total handling and distribution system, and again I would like to commend the hon. member for Mackenzie for apparently reading the speeches I am giving across the country on this subject. It is certainly a real challenge to produce a system for today's needs which is as effective and efficient as possible, and to remove from the farmer's shoulders any cost which is unnecessary because it is the child of inefficiency.

This is the challenge which faces us, a challenge upon which I welcome suggestions from hon. members opposite, a challenge which we will be picking up in the days ahead in discussions with farmers throughout the country, because I say to them that in large measure the choice is their's.

What farmers are entitled to know is the relative costs to them of various systems which may be possible. Then, in large measure, they ought to have the choice as to which cost they will bear, considering the incidental burdens, or difficulties, or changes in their environment or way of living which are implicit in the system or systems. It seems to me that this is a thing in which we must all join. We must examine these questions now, not in a spirit of partisan politics but with a view to coming to grips with the issue itself of providing as effective a system for the handling and transporting and dealing with our grain as it is possible for us to provide. That is why it grieves me when hon. members opposite, instead of accepting this challenge to go to the country to talk to the farmers about the efficiency of the system and ways of changing it, choose to concentrate on whether there should be more bushels or not at a given point in time at Thunder Bay or, even worse than that, suggest we should not use the most efficient and effective system of moving grain into those elevators.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Instead, it has been suggested we should move that grain in a way that would entail more storage costs to the farmer, because in the ordinary case he pays for storage. What the government pays for storage is calculated on the grain in storage on August 1 and is not affected by the flow in or out of Thunder Bay during the year. More important than these costs involving small transfers from the farmers to the terminal companies are other costs involved in opposition members' proposals. They would have us use the elevator and transportation systems in an inefficient and unnecessarily expensive manner. Surely, hon. members opposite know that, the cost of inefficiency forced upon the railroad system is borne by us in the end, either by higher rates within the system or by subsidy payments through the treasury. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that is not the best use of our money; it could be used to much better purpose if we would run the system efficiently and pay the money saved direct to producers.

To the hon. members opposite I say, by all means accept this challenge; join with us on this side of the House in talking to the farmers of this country about the problem of quickly and effectively making the changes which will put the grain industry and the individual farmer in the best possible position to develop a viable and happy industry. There is no doubt in my mind there is a place in this great country of ours for the family farm and all we must do is see that those parts of the system which are touched or affected by the government are made as efficient as possible as soon as possible. This will enable the benefits to flow to the individual farmer.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the motion before us.

Opposition members have said time and again that it would be possible to solve the problem of marketing the supposed surplus of western grain.

It is quite normal, before going into the matter of grain storage, to talk about grain marketing. We know in eastern Canada, and particularly in Quebec, that it is possible to use up a good portion of the grain produced in western Canada.

We always wonder why the government did not promote the study of certain solutions and also why it will not tackle the problem.

Before talking about storage, I wish to say that the surplus should be stored and then ways to market it should be studied. Even if the eastern population is considerable, it is probably not considerable enough to con-

sume the western surplus production. That would be one way to market the surplus production because one must live in our regions and hear with his own ears our farmers' complaints.

It is stupid, as they keep telling us, that they should have so much trouble getting adequate supplies, when western farmers do not know what to do with their surplus production. This is an illogical situation. Our good farmers realize it and complain about it, of course. In reviewing this problem, we should first seriously consider the possibility of selling a good part of these surpluses in eastern Canada, especially in Quebec.

The motion under consideration reads as follows:

> That this House condemns the government's failure to make full use of existing facilities that are available for grain storage, its failure to provide adequate additional facilities, its failure to adopt and implement a system of payments for the resulting storage of grain on farm lands, by reason of which failures the farm grain economy and dependent industries are suffering serious and continuing harm.

The whole problem is being boiled down to a question of storage. My remarks were intended to widen its scope to a certain extent.

Surpluses must be disposed of, and to destroy them is a most stupid, not to say a most morbid, solution. Thousands of people are dying of hunger around the world. It is unthinkable that some produce that could bring relief to large numbers should be destroyed.

A study of the problem shows that elevators should be built across Canada and not only in the West. In 1962, the hon. member for Bellechasse asked that elevators be erected in Quebec. Had the proposals of the Ralliement Créditiste been heeded since then, this non-confidence motion might have proved useless today.

It is time the government pondered and considered a little more seriously the proposals made by the opposition.

It should, from now on, show at least its goodwill and stop saying over and over again; Sorry, nothing can be done.

• (4:30 p.m.)

We have surpluses that we are unable to sell, which would be the thing to do if we want to solve the problem. If not, we must stop accumulating them. However, such a measure would condemn many producers to unemployment and would eliminate the trade

[Mr. Matte.]

of a lot of people. This is unthinkable! And the government keeps on saying there is no remedy.

We reject this attitude, because we would like the government to show much more willingness and take concrete and effective measures. I therefore support the motion of non-confidence even though, in my opinion, we could also blame the government for its failure to seek solutions not only with regard to the storage problem, but also to the problem of grain marketing.

Some people should stop making profits out of storage alone, because it is indeed a ridiculous situation. Products should not be intended only for storage.

While the motion before us has some merit in that it puts the blame on the government, it is perhaps not clear enough. In fact, it might be possible to find all kinds of solutions to the grain storage problems but in the end, production would be intended for this sole purpose, which would be ridiculous. Marketing this grain should be our first concern.

Mr. Speaker, those are the remarks I wanted to make about this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to take part in this debate. Conditions I have seen and experienced first hand in my riding as recently as the early part of this month have convinced me that it is almost impossible to overstate the gravity of the situation facing the prairie community today as well as our national economy. I congratulate the minister for the apparent sincerity evident in the remarks and comments he has made on his tours across the country. I would agree with some of his suggestions, but we have yet to learn whether the government intends to act on them.

His closing remarks today indicated that he wanted the opposition to take up the challenge, so to speak. May I remind him that he is a member of government and that the government must meet its challenges, not challenge the opposition by asking it to solve the desperate situation in agriculture.

The producers of grain are in desperate straits. Mortgages are being foreclosed. I know of three or four large farms, lying between 20 and 30 miles of my community, on which the mortgages are in the process of being foreclosed. We have spent much time in the House discussing subjects like Biafra; but you will notice, Mr. Speaker, that not too

many prairie members were involved in the debate on Biafra, simply because we have poverty enough out west. We have our own problems out west and need not go as far as Biafra to find any.

There has been much talk about the huge assets of some farmers. The people down east and in Ottawa laugh at us, and say, "Why, some of these fellows are worth $100,000 and others are worth $500,000." These figures are bandied about, and when you speak of the poverty of the western farmer people laugh. I remind the minister that it does not matter how great your assets are or how much your land is worth, because, if you renege on your taxes for three years, all your assets become the assets of the state. How the minister expects the farmers on these pitifully low quotas to even pay taxes, let alone retain their holdings, even when those holdings are worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, is beyond my understanding.

When you foreclose on a farm you do much more than simply put a farmer off the land. These people are not only farmers; they are customers and taxpayers and contributors to the nation's export trade. Supposedly the government is most concerned about this matter and makes much of it. Nevertheless, on top of the load our farmers already have to bear, which in many cases is intolerable, we now have the proposals of Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) contained in the white paper. One proposal is that farmers be taxed on recaptured depreciation of equipment. For instance, when a farmer trades in a machine or a piece of antiquated equipment for a piece of new equipment, he will have to add recaptured depreciation to his income. It will have to be included in his income calculations. Also, the method of evaluating basic herds is to be changed. The value of these herds has been established through income tax returns, but that value will not be taken into consideration. Apparently the value of the herd will be its market value on V-day. These are all matters which lead members of the opposition and those involved in this country's agriculture to doubt the government's sincerity in dealing with agricultural problems.

When a farmer is put out of business, you start a process of economic subtraction that seriously affects not only local merchants, but community administrators and Canadian workers all the way back to the assembly lines of central Canada. Canada's trade is vital, as is its agriculture. Perhaps the minister may think that I am prejudiced in my remarks because I come from western Canada. May I, therefore, read what the Agricultural Economics Research Council of Canada has said about agriculture. I quote:

> On the basis of Canada's gross national product in 1967 of $62 billion, agriculture and its directly related enterprises generate a total economic value to the Canadian G.N.P. of $26 billion. (This) represents the measure of involvement of the agricultural industry in the overall economic activity of Canada—The $26 billion figure, equal to 42 per cent of G.N.P., excludes consideration of the effect of agriculture on the demand for other products.

Finally, the Agricultural Economics Research Council concludes with the words:

> —At this juncture Canada cannot afford to let agriculture disintegrate for lack of positive information, constructive policy and vigorous implementation.

This debate has been launched on the basis of unfilled storage space for grain under the jurisdiction of the Canadian Wheat Board, but this is only one facet of the whole problem. I believe the basis of the problem lies directly under the aegis of the government and the Wheat Board, and the system under which that body operates. The answer to the problem must be found in the same place. From the years 1953 to 1969 Canada's share of world wheat markets dropped from 30 per cent to 19 per cent; Canada's share of the barley market declined from 35 per cent to 11 per cent over the same period; and in the case of oats the figures relating to the same period show a drop from 51 per cent to 4 per cent. If we had a similar percentage of world trade to that which we had in 1953, and in many years since, we would be selling over 500 million bushels of wheat a year.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I wish to quote from the minister's press release of December 1, 1969:

> Mr. Lang also warned that farmers may have to reduce wheat acreage. But he stressed that the sales effort of the Canadian Wheat Board has maintained Canada's share of the world market in face of stiff international competition.

I do not know where he got the information that we have kept our share of the world markets. Admittedly, in the last few years there has been a decline in world wheat trade, but when I take figures from the FAO production yearbooks, I find that the long term trend for world wheat is double today what it was in 1953. In 1953 it was 856-odd million bushels. In 1969 it was 1,605,000 bushels. Over the long haul, world wheat trade is up. We certainly do not have any evidence

that we have maintained our percentage of world wheat trade.

I might also add a word about world wheat production figures.

Mr. Lang: Those are the ones that are up.

Mr. Downey: I am again referring to FAO figures. In 1953, the world production figure for wheat was something over 6 billion bushels. In 1969, the world wheat production was 10½ billion bushels. There is certainly a trend towards more world wheat production. The responsibility for failure cannot be sloughed off. This responsibility is right here with our government, Wheat Board and all the complicated machinery that we have administering the whole wheat and grain industry. The Canadian Wheat Board has exclusive power over the Canadian grain industry in every aspect of sales, except those within the province of origin.

It is probably true that the tremendous power now enjoyed by this centralized agency of government was largely conferred upon it with the agreement, and even at the urging, of the producers. However, this was many years ago in times that were vastly different. Conditions of world trade and production are greatly changed today.

In the desperate days of the mid thirties, a Conservative Prime Minister, the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett, created the Wheat Board to help farmers sell their wheat. It was, in its original concept, a help, not an autocratic and all-powerful government body. The concept of that day of the Wheat Board was that farmers were free to sell in the open market, selling only to the Board when the world price fell below that offered by the Wheat Board.

The exigencies of World War II persuaded the government to give the Board exclusive jurisdiction in the field of buying and selling all wheat produced for sale beyond provincial boundaries. After the war, barley and oats were added to this compulsory marketing set-up. Since that time, although it has no responsibility for purchase or sale, the Board has gained effective control of the trade in rapeseed, flax and rye through its control of storage and transportation facilities.

My chief criticism of this evolution of the Canadian Wheat Board from an agency of assistance to one of dominance and dictatorship is that the Board failed to measure up to the responsibilities that automatically went with additional power. This tight little group of five all-powerful czars accepted all the exclusive rights and powers thrust upon them by government and by events, but they neglected to keep abreast of events. They failed to keep up with the times, to modernize their methods and to shift to meet changes in the export and domestic markets. Most dramatically, they failed in their primary task of selling grain. They simply delegated this job to designated agents and became an agency for purchase and storage of grain. That is primarily their function today.

What the Canadian grain industry needs most in today's world market is a modern, aggressive sales agency, directly responsive to the demands of that market and in particular to the best interests of the Canadian producer. Under the existing system of selling, the actual sellers, the designated sales agents of the Board, have no direct interest in Canadian grain as such and no compulsion is on them to feel patriotic about Canadian grain.

The result in recent years has been that Canada has lost sale after sale to old and reliable customers such as Great Britain and Japan. Only recently Canada lost all of its share of the Japanese monthly tender for barley to the United States and Australia.

One of the most disturbing features of Wheat Board operations is the cost to the farmer-producer of their operations. The cost of storage, interest and administration are all deducted from the final payment to the farmer. Over the 15 year period I mentioned earlier, 1953 to 1969, the cost of storage in this country has mounted and has cost the producers and taxpayers almost a billion dollars.

If you visit the prairies, look around to see what we have for all these storage payments. We have supported an elevator system rather than people. Storage payments should be made to the producers. Instead, a vast inadequate elevator system of some 5,000 delivery points was built when, with modern transportation facilities, we could very well have gotten along with possibly 400 to 500 delivery points. We should have plants in the country that have drying, cleaning and blending facilities. Think of the assistance this would be in the eventual transportation and lining up of the appropriate type of grain to sell at our terminal markets.

Administration costs of the Wheat Board run at about $3½ million. I calculated storage costs and interest to be on an average of approximately $55½ million, but I notice in one of the minister's press releases that government costs this year will be in the order of

$71 million. These might be acceptable cost factors if the grain were moving regularly, but they are intolerable when the system is clogged and no wheat is moving. This static condition emphasizes one of the worst features of the present system of marketing grain: a premium is placed on the storage of grain in Canada, not upon its sale. Consequently, there is no real incentive to move it.

• (4:50 p.m.)

We often hear it said that Canada is not pulling its weight in the area of aid to less developed countries. Certainly, when we look at the figures it would seem that our contribution is one of the lower ones. But really we are doing a terrific service to mankind inasmuch as we are storing over half the world's grain surplus. Canada, at a tremendous cost to her own economy, is one of the world's largest food banks. Canada, which grows approximately one twentieth of the world's wheat is storing over half the world's surplus. If that is not an important service to mankind, I have never seen one. But can we afford it?

As I have said before, since 1953 the grain producers and taxpayers of Canada have paid out almost a billion dollars for grain storage to the terminal elevator companies, in return for an antiquated system of grain storage, an empire which is basically the same as it was 50 years ago. In what other area of our economy can we find the standards of 50 years ago applying today? At our present rate of wheat sales we are only revolving our wheat stocks every four years, which means that total storage charges, including handling, interest, and so on, are costing Canadian taxpayers and grain producers between 80 cents and one dollar on every bushel. Let us not kid outselves; we shall have to move this wheat even if we are obliged to take a little less on world markets. If we take a little less, the ECC could very well open up again as a market to us. At the present time the ECC is spending $300 million a year subsidizing its agriculture; it might not stand this expenditure for long if there were a slight drop in our prices. When we maintain or raise our price above a certain level, other countries subsidize their wheat growers; if we remain below that level we can move ahead.

What we need is a government supported basic floor price for wheat. I spoke earlier of the importance of agriculture to the whole national economic picture. If our economy is to continue to progress we must keep agriculture healthy. Many cut-backs have already been put into effect in agriculture and others are proposed. It was drawn to my attention the other day that support was to be withdrawn from straight-bred steer classes at the Edmonton exhibition next year. I cannot understand why we should be presented with cutbacks affecting agriculture while expenditures by other departments of government are increasing.

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

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Downey: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that other departments have increased their expenditures. Take the Department of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). In the last five or six years expenditures there have risen from something like $5 million to $342 million. Consider the basic policy which the CBC has laid down! I quote from the annual report for 1968-69:

> The Corporation's basic policy is that efforts to increase commercial revenues must not dominate program decisions.

Why should we have to put up with these cutbacks in agriculture in an area which we have shown to be so important to the Canadian economy while other departments are taking an entirely different attitude?

I shall not continue for much longer Mr. Speaker. As for the statement the minister made with regard to cutting down the practice of grain bootlegging, I say it is all very well for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board to make a virtue out of upholding the law, but it means nothing, and will accomplish nothing. If this country had been laid out properly to start with, the borders between Alberta and Saskatchewan and between Manitoba and Saskatchewan would not exist; this whole prairie region has, generally speaking, the same problems, the same topography and the same climate; it should be one province, under one administration.

It is all very well to talk about upholding the law. It is easy to make self-righteous statements, but it is something else for the farmer who must feed and clothe his family

with nothing negotiable but the grain that is sitting on his farm—grain he cannot sell for cash.

I want to emphasize one further point. We should not bind ourselves with red tape, rules, boards and commissions until we destroy our ability to be flexible. To function successfully in the marketplace of the world, our agencies must be flexible, in tune with world trends and demands. Canada's grain marketing agencies have forgotten this basic business requirement and this is why we find ourselves in the mess we are in today. There is evidence of this even in our domestic feed grain marketing arrangements. We spend our own feed freight assistance money importing United States corn into Ontario and Quebec while western Canada is sitting on a mountain of feed grain. It is time the government, working through all channels including the Wheat Board, got down to business in this country instead of being pre-occupied with a lot of wishful thinking, superfluous talking and announcements with which we have been plagued over the years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will recall that when the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) moved his amendment I expressed some initial misgivings about its admissibility. On reflection, I am prepared to admit it unless there are objections which I have not heard. My initial thought was that the first paragraph, dealing with deficiency payments, did raise a new question and that the amendment might have been out of order on that ground, but in the circumstances, and in view of the fact that this is an opposition day, I am prepared to give the hon. member the benefit of the doubt. On that basis, the amendment moved by the hon. member is now before the House.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): May I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no private members' hour today.

Mr. Benjamin: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: That is the best speech you have made yet.

Mr. Benjamin: You are just jealous! A few days ago I sought to initiate an emergency debate in this House concerning the use or misuse of the space available in the terminals at Thunder Bay. The Chair quite properly ruled against me, and I accepted that decision. I am pleased that the official opposition chose the topic of the plight of western agriculture today in order that we might have an opportunity to discuss this matter at some length with the government. May I say at the outset there is very little difference between the Minister without Portfolio and myself, and I suspect with all hon. members on this side, concerning the necessity to think about, plan and do something about the long term problems facing the agricultural industry generally. In relation to western agriculture, the whole system of grain handling, storage, pricing, planning, production and inventory needs to be thoroughly considered. Surely, there can be no argument on that score.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Certainly, the minister will agree that most of these items will take many months to consider. Some will take years to change. My colleagues the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) and the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) have or will deal with some of these aspects. Therefore, I should like to deal with what we must do in the interim while planning and discussing. We welcome every opportunity to co-operate with the minister and the government in order to arrive at new policies and programs.

What do we do in the interim? The farm cash income position and the whole of the economy of the three prairie provinces, as a result of low delivery quotas, have never been so bad as they are now. That is a broad statement but the facts bear it out. This is in great measure an emergency debate because an emergency situation exists.

It is incumbent upon the minister and the government to consider temporary emergency measures to deal with the present situation. We cannot just continue to accept, as we have during previous debates in this House, the admonishments of the minister that we should look at this in the long term and come up with long term answers. There has never been any argument in that regard, but the minister has not provided us with answers as to what should be done at the moment. He and his officials continue to use or misuse the idea that our grain handling system should be continued because that is the method which has been used before.

Having regard to the space at Lakehead terminals, the minister is wrong in suggesting that it is more efficient to fill that space gradually until the opening of the shipping season around the tenth or the middle of April. I make this statement partly from my

own knowledge about transportation and partly as a result of consultation with people actually involved in loading and unloading railway cars, terminals and ships. I have also consulted with people actually involved with the operations of elevators and those employed by the railways.

The practice being followed by the minister is backwards. I admit that at the outset the filling of space immediately will incur greater storage charges, most of which will come out of the farmer's pockets. That is not what the farmers are concerned about now. They are concerned about delivering some wheat and getting some cash, and they are prepared to accept some additional storage charges later on.

Let us consider the situation in respect of quotas now as compared with a year ago. The situation a year ago was even worse than normal. I am sure the minister will agree with that statement. A year ago we had delivery problems and problems regarding tough and damp grain. On January 12 a year ago, we had in the neighbourhood of 840 shipping points in the three prairie provinces on two and three bushel quotas. As of the same date this year, there were none on two or three bushel quotas.

I completely support the minister in his enforcement of Wheat Board regulations in respect of delivery, permit books and bootlegging. The tragedy is that as a result of the failure of shipping points in the three prairie provinces to deliver their unit or one bushel quotas, or even the supplementary quota of five bushels from the previous crop year, farmers are forced to go to inordinate lengths to obtain cash. Therefore, they are breaking the Wheat Board regulations. Farmers do not like to do this. The overwhelming majority of farmers support the Wheat Board. They will even accept penalties or fines when they break the rules. The fact is they have not been able to deliver grain and are desperate for cash. They are forced to go to these lengths.

It is time the minister adopted opposite measures in the practice of filling space at the Lakehead terminals. It is normal that at the end of the shipping season the terminals are nearly empty. It is normal to fill up this space in the wintertime. If the farmers could deliver their quotas during the wintertime, this would be of no concern. They would be happy to fill this space. As a result of not being able to deliver their quotas—and this has resulted in their desperate cash situation and extra effort is required to make space available at the country elevators so farmers can deliver these quotas and receive cash, in spite of the fact extra storage costs will be incurred.

The 60 million to 70 million bushel space in the terminals at the Lakehead is equivalent to a two bushel quota for all shipping points that normally ship to the Lakehead. This would include all the shipping points in Manitoba and half the shipping points in Saskatchewan and would represent about 31 million acres, some 62 million bushels of grain or over $100 million in farm cash income. Once this grain was delivered to the country elevators half of this amount would be used by the Wheat Board to cover cash advances. This would leave something over $50 million in the hands of the farmers. Such a program could be carried out within the next five weeks.

I suggest that the space at the Lakehead terminals could and should be filled by the end of February rather than by the middle of April. This would allow farmers at all shipping points in Manitoba, and at over half the shipping points in Saskatchewan, to deliver two bushel quotas some six or seven weeks earlier than would otherwise be the case.

The minister claims it is more efficient to complete the filling of this space close to the opening of the shipping season at the rate of 1,000 cars per day. He suggests it is more efficient to bring this grain in at the end of the loading period. I have talked with grain handlers at terminals and elevators, and they have told me that it is more efficient to unload a thousand cars a day at the beginning of this period when you have space for 60 million or 70 million bushels.

Terminals at the Lakehead, when worked on full capacity, can handle 1,200 or more cars per day. During the wintertime it is true that trains must be short, but it is certainly reasonable to suggest that 1,000 cars per day could be unloaded, and that this space could be filled by the end of February. The number of cars could then be reduced as the terminals were filled. When available space is reduced to 10 million or 20 million bushels there are fewer bins from which to choose for specific grades. There is also less space for drying grain. It stands to reason that when you unload up to 1,000 cars per day at the end of the period, when you have a shortage of space, you will have a backlog of 6,000 to 8,000 cars. It is much easier to unload 1,000 cars per day when you have maximum space at the terminal. I have been assured of this

by the head of the grain handlers union, by officials of the grain companies and by railway people. The reason the grain is not being handled in this manner is that it is more convenient for the railway companies to supply a larger number of cars later on.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I, for one, am not one bit interested in the convenience of the railways. I plead with the minister, because it is an emergency, to adopt the idea of filling this space quickly, thus providing space at shipping points which are eligible to ship to the Lakehead. This, in turn, would provide space at country elevators for the two bushel quota, thereby enabling the farmers to deliver the grain sooner than they would otherwise be able to do. When one looks at the performance of the railways, in spite of their protests and the assurance of the minister that everything is carefully planned, it smacks of sheer incompetence and indifference. A look at the DBS weekly report of car loadings shows that in the period August 1 to December 21 last, a period of about 20 weeks, 21,109 fewer cars of grain were loaded than in the same period in the year 1968. That was a slow and rough year. In this crop year 21,000 fewer cars were loaded. Compared to the year 1967, 29,000 fewer cars were loaded in the same period.

The minister assured the head of the grain handlers union at the Lakehead on Monday, January 17 that 3,000 to 4,000 car loads would arrive at the Lakehead. The information I have is that between 1,500 and 2,000 cars arrived during the week ending January 17, half the number the minister said would arrive. The Saskatchewan Wheat Pool states it could now handle, on a five-day week working three shifts a day, 400 cars a day and that they received during the eight working days between January 2 and January 13 an average of 71 cars per day. They are not even getting the 100 cars a day they had expected. The total number of cars under load was something over 4,000 fewer on January 14 this year than on January 14 a year ago. There were some 12,000 cars in transit and under load on January 14 a year ago and 8,400 on January 14 this year. There were 726 cars under load and in transit to the Lakehead on January 15 and that was an accumulation of two days of loading.

The whole thing has not been properly co-ordinated. This is the effect of an improper plan of the minister and his officials to gradually fill the Lakehead storage by the opening of the navigation season somewhere around April 10 or April 15. In the meantime, the farmers must wait seven weeks longer than necessary in order to get another one or two bushel quota to the shipping points which are permitted to move grain to the Lakehead. The railways may claim a shortage of equipment. This may not be an important matter, but I understand there are something in the order of at least 1,000 potash cars sitting idle. These are more easily and more quickly loaded and are more easily and quickly unloaded. Now, when there is a shortage, these cars are sitting around idle. It is true they must be cleaned in order to prevent corrosion, but there is no excuse for their not being used when they are sitting idle.

I ask the minister to review his program because this is an emergency situation. I agreed earlier that when conditions are normal what is being done now and what has been done before can be understood, but this is not a normal situation. It is in fact an emergency which affects not only the farmers of the prairie provinces. When one goes into the communities, talks to the small businessmen and employees and sees what is and has been happening in the last few months, and when one goes downtown in Regina and finds several business places vacant, one finds evidence of the situation which exists. When one finds people employed by farm implement plants and others who should be handling grain laid off, surely the minister will agree there is an emergency situation and that he should take extraordinary measures to fill the space in a record time. It can be done. The equipment and the men are available to do it. The space is available in which to put the grain. I hope the minister will agree that some other measure must be taken rather than the one he is taking at the moment.

The amendment to the motion calling for a guaranteed price for the farmers also calls for the appointment of a transport controller, who I submit should have complete authority and control over all aspects of grain movement between Vancouver and Thunder Bay. When we tried this system before it worked reasonably well, although there was room for improvement. This must be done again. Because of the confusion in respect of authority, and because of the great number of agencies involved, the problem is too difficult to be handled properly in the present way. So I hope the minister will do more than just appoint a co-ordinator for the terminals at Vancouver and the Lakehead. I expect he will appoint a terminal co-ordinator at the Lakehead, but I suggest over and above that, what

is needed is someone who would be in complete command, who would have the authority to act when action is required and when it could be taken much quicker than if it had to have approval of the minister or the House of Commons.

I hope, therefore, the minister will look at the plan he has for the filling of this space, will consult with those who have some knowledge of the situation and be prepared to change the plan and adopt an extraordinary technique in order to provide cash for the farmers now.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate I do so in the hope that today's discussion will do much more than simply focus attention on a few specific weaknesses in our present system of handling and marketing wheat.

I believe it is essential that all Canadians realize that these are merely symptoms of a general malaise that is sapping the strength of a large and important segment of our society and of an industry that is vital to Canada's economic well-being. I am hopeful that this discussion will at last bring home to the government, and the people of Canada, that the agricultural industry and the farm community of this country must be preserved in the national interest. The farm unit must be retained and strengthened for sound social and economic reasons. In the prevailing depressed state of the grain trade, individual farms are disappearing fast, properties are being broken up and going out of production and farmers are leaving the land for good.

• (5:20 p.m.)

One of the long-term contributing factors undoubtedly is the lack of adequate government support for agriculture. It has recently been calculated that federal government expenditure on agriculture works out to about $286 per person active in farming in Canada. In the United States, the equivalent figure is $1,287 per head for such things as research, extension, price stability and so on. The myth is firmly established in this country's urban areas, and apparently too in the inner circles of government, that Canadian farmers, particularly western grain producers, are a pampered political pressure group that prospers on government hand-outs at the expense of other Canadians. The per capita figures on government expenditure in Canada and the United States that I have just quoted give the lie to that myth.

But there is other sound evidence to the contrary. For instance, the net out-put per man in commercial industry in Canada has increased at an annual rate of 3.5 per cent since 1946. In the seven major industrial groups used in that calculation, agriculture was best with an annual rate of increase of 5.5 per cent. Since 1961, the rate of increase has been even better. Agriculture's net output per man shot up to an annual rate of 6.5 per cent while the productivity of other commercial industry declined and limped along at 2.9 per cent. This dramatic increase in productivity has been made at the expense of farm labour and agricultural employment. But while the purely agricultural population has shrunk, agriculture as an industry has contributed in an outstanding manner to national productivity and national prosperity.

A recent economic survey in the United States showed that some 30 per cent of all employment in that country was farm based, that is, dependent upon the requirements of the industry of agriculture in its widest sense. I do not know of any similar study for Canada, but I believe it would be even higher than 30 per cent in this country. With this in mind, I am sure the government owes it to western agriculture at this point in time to take a good look at its present condition, and to be ready with subsidies, either in the form of payments on farm stored grain or acreage payments for this coming year. These measures would tide Western agriculture over this very difficult period of its existence.

Despite that fact that agriculture today enjoys only 11 per cent of Canada's total merchandise trade, it still accounts for more than $1 billion a year in balance of payments credits, and as recently as three years ago this was nearly $2 billion. These figures alone I believe are enough to give Canadians some rough idea of the magnitude of the agricultural industry and of its tremendous importance to our business and social life.

One of the major afflictions besetting the industry today is a situation regarding the grain trade. One cannot talk about the grain trade without immediately coming slap up against the Canadian Wheat Board and the other government apparatus that has grown up over the years to handle what, in all important aspects, is really a federal government monopoly.

I have no wish to throw stones at the Canadian Wheat Board, or to make life more difficult than it already is for the board and its members. I think they are probably as much victims of circumstances and government disinterest and lethargy as they are of a failure to keep abreast of the times and the

changing world market. To begin with, Mr. Speaker, I believe the name of the board is wrong and misleading. The Canadian Wheat Board has exclusive jurisdiction over all aspects of trade in grain outside the province of origin. In addition, it effectively controls the trade in oil seed by virtue of its powers over storage and transportation facilities, although it has no responsibility for the export or sale of such produce.

This makes the problem of the Wheat Board a very complex one. The members control the purchase, movement and sale, and I believe each of these aspects requires separate detailed study and radical over-haul. At the very least, the apparent failure of the board to handle adequately its responsibilities with regard to the grain trade in existing conditions calls for a formal and extensive investigation. I am not suggesting a punitive type of investigation, but one the aim of which would be to find better ways of doing what needs to be done.

The fact that the transportation pipeline for grain has become hopelessly clogged while terminal storage facilities stand half empty shows that the Wheat Board has relapsed into being an agency for the storage of grain, not for the movement of grain. This problem is aggravated by instances where flax, rapeseed and other oil seeds cannot be sold to foreign buyers because they have not been placed in a position to be shipped readily. These oil seeds, being beyond the board's responsibility yet dependent upon the board's transportation and storage facilities, come off second best. This is doubly unfortunate when the world appetite for such products is said at this time to be almost limitless.

I believe it is vital that the actual relationship of the board to the producer be studied with a view to improving the flow of market information. The movement and storage questions must be studied individually and, of course, the outmoded Canadian system of merchandising and selling must be drastically reviewed.

The fact that Canada's share of the world market has declined from 30 per cent in the crop year 1953-54 to 19 per cent in 1967-68 is reason enough to investigate. These figures are only for wheat. The situation is even worse when we look at two other grains for which the board has sole responsibility as regards sales, namely, barley and oats. In the year 1953-54 we enjoyed 35 per cent of the world market in barley. By 1967-68 this had shrunk to 14 per cent. Oats were even worse off, declining in the same period from 51 per cent to 5 per cent.

To my mind, one of the most serious deficiencies of the present system is its failure to provide up-to-the-minute market information to the producer. The events of the past few years have demonstrated this many times over.

Last October, in an address to the Saskatchewan Institute of Agrologists, Mr. J. E. McWilliam, president of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, noted the dramatic changes in the world market picture resulting from the increased production of new varieties, changes in demand due to new methods of baking, and other changes in the traditional areas of export sales. He said in part:

> The awareness of these developments by the Canadian producer has been rather remote, due to our separation of the market system from the production end of our market system.

He went on to mention other changes in the area of new demands, notably feed grains. I quote:

> The demand for feed grain is the fastest growing segment of the export agricultural field. It has increased from 13.6 million tons in the years 1935-39 to 42.4 million tons in 1967. This is over a 300 per cent growth factor in 30 years which is a tremendous market potential.

Last year the Wheat Board was selling barley for export at approximately $1 a bushel. In September, the board dropped the price of export barley in one day by approximately 23 cents a bushel. In other words, it seemed to have arrived at the stage where it felt our barley had to be competitive on the export market. When we place this fact beside the substantial demand for flax and rapeseed and then consider that the majority of grain producers were not even aware of the demand abroad for these products, we can appreciate the dire need for better information for the primary producer on potential markets, and for closer liaison between the seller and the producer.

Another instance of the failure to keep abreast of changes in the market place, and failure to disseminate vital information to the producer, is found in the radical changes brought about in Great Britain by the adoption of a new baking method. In this traditional market Canada sold 78 million bushels in 1960. In 1968, this amount was reduced to 55 million bushels. The decline was caused by a radically new system of baking adopted in the United Kingdom, whereby bakers there can utilize up to 80 per cent soft wheat and

get by with as little as 20 per cent hard spring wheat. In addition, this soft wheat can easily be secured by Britain in soft currency areas, thus saving the expenditure of hard dollars.

Coupled with that is another change made by our chief export competitors. The United States, Australia, and Russia too, have all swi ched over to a system of a guaranteed uniform protein basis. This appears to be what today's customers want, and yet Canada persists in selling wheat that varies in protein content from 12 per cent to 15 per cent.

When we consider that Japan is making plans to adopt the new British baking system which requires higher percentages of soft wheat and a guaranteed protein content, we would be blind if we did not see the import for Canadian producers and Canadian export sales. This is one of the chief reasons for my desire to see a thorough and impartial study of our whole system of handling and selling grain, not with any idea of trying to pin blame on anyone or any agency but rather to try to evolve a system that is more adequate, more flexible and more suited to the conditions of the modern market place.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I have no wish to labour my point about the importance of the agricultural industry to Canada. To my mind this is quite evident to any thinking Canadian. But I do wish to emphasize that I believe it is the urgent duty of the government to help an important segment of our na'ional economy which today is in serious trouble. A large number of our people are directly or indirectly dependent upon the industry of agriculture both for export and domestic use, and the high levels of taxes paid by this industry are vital in maintaining such things as our extensive social and welfare services, not to mention many hundreds of small municipalities.

As an example of the situation of farmers in my own province of Manitoba, in 1969 the actual cash income, from all sources, of farmers was about $250 million. The value of production was about $450 million, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. This means that about $200 million worth of grain is still in the storage bins. If this grain is not moved and turned into cash, disaster will ensue and not only will the farmers of Manitoba suffer but many thousands of Canadians from the prairies to the Atlantic coast.

I urge this government to regard the situation in agriculture as one of national crisis and to take immediate, effective action to modernize the whole system of buying, transporting, storing and marketing our grain crop whether it be wheat, barley, oats, flax or rapeseed. We have the skills, the know-how and the adaptability; all we need is action and leadership at the national level.

Mr. D. R. Gundlock (Lethbridge): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to take part in the discussion on what the minister in charge of the Wheat Board described as a phony issue. When I look across the House I am reminded of the many times that we, the opposition in this chamber, have been accused of being a great nuisance and worth nothing. We have been told that the other side of the House received the mandate of the people and therefore we might just as well save our breath. Mr. Speaker, I wish people who gave that mandate were in the galleries today to see the empty seats on the other side of the House.

An hon. Member: Count your own.

Mr. Gundlock: This is no phony issue. The minister invited us to talk to the farmers, to listen to what they said and to tell them what a good, efficient job he is doing. Well, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask him—

Mr. Lang: You missed the point.

Mr. Gundlock: —why he does not even listen to the farmers who sit with him at the Privy Council table. Does he not receive advice on the shipping and handling of grain from any of his colleagues? Does he ignore the fact that there are dozens of people directly concerned with this problem—and I mean directly? In 1932 I worked on a farm. In 1936 I managed a large farm, and in 1939 I had my own farm.

I think it is about time the minister responsible took some of the advice he gives. What better place is there for a farmer to speak than in this chamber? I know a farmer cannot speak personally, but as an MP he can speak, in spite of what the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has said about an MP not amounting to a hill of beans. I take exception to that remark, although as a matter of fact I think he has said worse. I have heard that the Prime Minister has 30 advisers.

Mr. Baldwin: He should have more.

Mr. Gundlock: Perhaps he should have another name for them—trusties. They are

trusted all right, but we do not see or hear anything of them. I have heard it said that as a person goes through life he is lucky if he has one trusted friend. The Prime Minister is exceptionally lucky; he has 30. But why does he not listen to those who sit around the Privy Council table? I do not find fault because he listens to the people he trusts—I do not mind that at all—but he does not have to believe them and pass on their advice.

This is not a phony issue, Mr. Speaker, but one of the most important before this country today.

Mr. Dinsdale: Hear, hear.

Mr. Gundlock: It is not confined to western wheat or grain growers; it is felt all across the country. One has only to read the newspapers from coast to coast to learn that the trouble in this very important area of the Canadian economy is making itself felt in other facets of our economy.

The minister goes across the country making speech after speech, saying the same thing. On December 1 he said that the Wheat Board had maintained Canada's position in world exports. I do not know where he gets his figures. Honest and worth-while contributions have been made in this House. We on this side do not oppose simply for the sake of opposition. Many good suggestions have been brought forward, but the government does not listen to them. Indeed government members are not even in their seats there is only one minister here this afternoon.

Mr. Baldwin: Shame.

Mr. Gundlock: They are the party with the mandate of the people, and I repeat—I only wish the people could see that they gave their mandate to empty seats.

Mr. Dinsdale: They would be awfully disillusioned.

Mr. Gundlock: The minister talks about blocks of cars. I do not know what it is, but it is supposed to be a great improvement in the shipping of grain. However, the rapeseed growers are having trouble moving a very small amount compared with the wheat involved. Where is the block system and where is the improvement, Mr. Speaker?

I should like to remind the minister that I am a farmer and I have not had a quota on my farm for nearly a year. But still he talks about equalizing quotas. This does not make sense to me and I think I have very good reason to speak about it. I ask the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, why there has not been a quota on my farm since last May.

Mr. Lang: Did you get your deferred delivery permit?

Mr. Gundlock: I am talking about the quota. There has not been a quota on my farm since last May. What can we do without quotas when we are supposed to deliver wheat and other grains under the quota system? I should not have to spell it out, but I suggest that the system is run on financing, borrowing money at 9½ per cent, whereas the average rate of interest paid—and I know whereof I speak—is about 15 per cent. After two or three years of not selling the product, this not only creates a hazard but makes it darned hard to live.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) went to Chatham and set out some guidelines. I think he is the one who is being guided. He said:

> We in the federal government do not make trade decisions based primarily on one commodity or class of commodity. The people of Canada demand and rightly so that we should take into account the interests of the entire Canadian economy and make what is, on balance, the best decision.

The government does not take any one commodity or any one facet into consideration. I refer to the automobile pact, with which we are all very familiar so I need not go into detail. If that pact does not take into consideration one particular facet of our economy, I should like to know what does. Another example with which we are familiar is the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Although we are discussing the Canadian economy and the grain producers of Canada, I think it is pertinent to consider this example. As I understand it, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is financed to the tune of nearly $.5 billion. Again, that department will be involved with a special part of the economy. Yet when we raise in the House one of the most important issues affecting the economy of Canada, we are met with deaf ears and empty seats.

Just four years ago wheat was our No. 1 export. A few months ago it was about fourteenth, and where it stands today I shudder to think. When an important facet of the economy such as wheat deteriorates so quickly, what are we to do? I suppose because I am in the opposition no one will expect me to offer suggestions, but I raise two points. First, I

suggest that the facet of the Canadian economy which we are now discussing should at once be treated at least as fairly as other facets. Other countries show more respect for our grain.

May I also remind the minister that there is in the world less wheat on hand than there was one year ago, and much less than there was ten years ago. There is on hand only enough wheat for one year's supply. There is not a glut in any way, shape or form when you have only one year's supply. A drought in Canada or in any of the great wheat supplying countries would change this picture. But we are told to cut down, cut down, cut down on wheat production. We are cutting down; we cannot get rid of our wheat. The minister should be cognizant of the fact that there is only one year's supply of wheat in the world, and he should be careful. We do not have to do the cutting down, because mother nature can do that very well.

Other countries in the world are looking at Canadian agriculture, even though our own government does not seem to be interested in it. The Japanese government has entered into a direct contract with growers for delivery to Japan of a rapeseed crop to be grown on hundreds of thousands of acres in Canada. It seems that other countries realize our potential and our own government does not. The government's attitude just does not add up.

When the Minister of Agriculture spoke in Chatham he reminded the people that there is one good thing in this situation: the consumer has been the major beneficiary. That is only a smokescreen put out by this government. To say that the consumer is the beneficiary, when the cost of living is higher than it has ever been, when interest rates and unemployment have never been higher, is nonsense.

How can a member of this government go around making fatuous statements like that? I am sure he was putting up a smokescreen because he wanted to divert people's attention from the real problem which he hates to face. He is a farmer and rancher; therefore, I cannot understand why he should be talking about these so-called guidelines and flexible programs. I agree with him that we should be flexible in our approach to agriculture, but where is the flexibility? There is absolutely none. A moment ago I told hon. members that it is nearly a year since we had a quota on our farm. Where, then, is the government's flexibility?

Several hon. members said this afternoon that space for grain is available at the Lakehead. The minister said, "Why do you not tell farmers what a good, efficient job we are doing? We want to get this space filled by April or May". I ask, why not fill it now? What would be the difference? Action such as this would make a difference to people who have not had a quota for a long time, who have no money in their pockets and who are paying, and have been paying for two or three years, ridiculously high rates of interest.

There ought to be another name for interest rates like that, because no one in agriculture or industry who has to find money under these conditions can look forward to making any kind of profit. I ask, why not fill the storage facilities now? Why must the government be what it considers orderly and efficient in this regard? The minister may call it flexibility, but it is no such thing. The government cannot even move a few loads of rapeseed to the coast and get them shipped to overseas customers. That is how flexible it is.

What else could we do? We could change our system of grading, because that is long overdue, and bring in a system that would encompass the protein content of wheat. This system is being used by buyers, particularly high class buyers such as millers and distillers as well as many of our overseas customers. I think they know more about our crops than the government does. They know what regions produce wheats containing large amounts of protein.

I point out that millers and distillers in particular consider wheat with high-protein content much more valuable than wheat with low-protein content. If we could introduce a new grading system along these lines, we might be able to introduce a two-price system on the domestic scene and, in addition, charge two different prices to export customers who would be quite willing to pay more for high-protein wheat. I will leave these thoughts with the minister; I suppose he will have to read them, because he is not listening to my remarks.

What can we do immediately? I strongly advocate that we immediately pay farmers for on-farm stored grain. If we paid for grain in storage that way, it would mean that farmers would receive about 18 per cent of the value of their crop, which would just about equal the interest which they pay on loans. I believe this would help our farmers, and we could do it immediately. We should do it if we are serious about giving to our agricultural sector the consideration that we give to other facets of our economy.

• (5:50 p.m.)

The government could go a little further. I am not talking about money that comes from the treasury and is provided by the taxpayer. This system could be paid for by the farmers, because they are paying now. I have heard it said that they do not pay it, but if they were paid for farm-stored grain, the government would not have to pay storage on amounts above 178 million bushels because it would not be in the elevators.

The payment should be made to the farmers. Let the elevators be handling companies. I do not mind saying that. I have belonged to elevator co-ops for 30 years and I believe their position should be that of handlers. Railway companies are shippers. We have never had any real complaints from the railway companies as shippers. I do not see any cause for so much talk. Ministers are running around the country talking about a new boxcar system. There was never any trouble delivering wheat when there were sales.

According to the minister, the Wheat Board has maintained our world position. I again say that I fail to understand this, because some world exporters have lost only 2 per cent or 3 per cent of their position in the world market. Others have lost 4 per cent, 8 per cent or 15 per cent. Canada, Mr. Speaker, has lost 45 per cent of its world trade. How does the minister explain that? Here again he is using the Wheat Board as a scapegoat. They are not salesmen; they are buyers. They are the sole purchasing agent. I am sincere when I say the minister uses the Wheat Board as a scapegoat.

How can the minister say that we have maintained our place in the export of grains when in fact we have lost nearly 45 per cent of our market? The whole thing just does not add up, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, the government shows absolutely no interest in this problem. I am serious when I say that the minister does not even know what he is talking about. I have talked to the farmers and listened to what they have said. I hope that for once the minister will listen to what they say through farmers who are members of the House.

Mr. Dinsdale: They are willing to subsidize a sales agency under the Wheat Board.

Mr. Gundlock: The government will probably turn it into a Crown corporation, appoint its friends to the corporation and thereby get the responsibility off its back.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam).

[Mr. Gundlock.]

Mr. Southam: Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House to call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair to resume the same at eight o'clock.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate and I should like to begin by complimenting my hon. friend from Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) for having introduced this motion of non-confidence in the government with respect to its agricultural policies and, more particularly, with respect to grain storage and movement.

If there was ever a period in Canadian history during which the people of Canada, especially those who live on our farms, had no confidence in their government, that time is now. Time and again members of the opposition have sought to adjourn the House to discuss agricultural problems; hundreds of questions have been directed to the government on the subject, opposition days were used for the same purpose last fall. Today, once again, we find the official opposition devoting its first opposition day to the subject of agriculture. Surely, in these circumstances, the government should finally come to life and take remedial action.

I listened very carefully to the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt when he spoke before we adjourned for the dinner hour. What did we hear? We heard that this motion was a phony. Just imagine a statement like that coming from a new minister who is charged with the responsibility for looking after the interests of western agriculture. I was never more surprised in my life. I am sure the government's supporters will have red faces for some time over this statement. In regard to grain storage at the Lakehead he referred repeatedly to normal conditions. But, let us face it, these are not normal times. Indeed, the times are most abnormal. The minister referred re-

peatedly to the efficiency of the present system, quoting pious platitudes. At least he appreciates that a problem does exist. His remarks—thank goodness—were at least an improvement over those of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) on the last two or three occasions when he spoke during a debate on agriculture. On those occasions all we could discern from the hon. gentleman's statements was that the farmers "never had it so good".

This afternoon the minister talked at length about long-term planning and policies yet to be formulated. In the long haul, long-range planning is, of course, important. We all realize that policies concerning marketing, pricing, storage, transportation, production and quality have to be reviewed. But what about plans for dealing with the present emergency? I would remind the House that at the present time wheat sales are the lowest for several years. Moreover, farmers are receiving the lowest prices in years, the lowest quotas in years and the lowest net income—if any at all—in years. At the same time, input costs are the highest in Canadian history. All this has resulted in more people than ever leaving or wishing to leave our farm communities. The total effect has been to place the agriculture industry in the most serious position it has occupied in our time. To add insult to injury, the minister tells us there will not even be a final wheat payment this spring. This is another indication of how bad things really are.

I ask the minister: What does the government intend to do to meet the cash crisis on western farms? If hon. gentlemen opposite have not already made up their minds, let me make a couple of suggestions. First, steps should be taken at once, not a week or a month from now, to move wheat into the space presently unoccupied at the Lakehead. I understand that 60 million bushels could be accommodated there, and that if the railroads would provide 1,000 cars a day—and they have done so before—this amount of grain could be stored at Thunder Bay within six weeks.

This would mean something like $75 million of new money being placed in the hands of farmers in the eastern part of Saskatchewan and all of Manitoba, a sum represented by approximately a two-bushel quota, even after they had paid back a portion of their cash advances. It is true that if we allow time to fritter away the grain will eventually move to the Lakehead and fill up this space three months from now. My point is that the farmers need this cash today, tomorrow and the next day; they require it very soon in order to meet the commitments of spring seeding operations.

The second suggestion I have is, I feel, an important one which would take up the serious slack caused by the absence of a final payment this spring. I have made it on other occasions in this House. It is that the government should make a substantial acreage payment available. This should amount to at least $2 an acre up to 400 acres. A larger payment would be even better, provided the treasury, whose accounts are now showing a substantial surplus, would loosen up. Assistance of this type was forthcoming on three occasions through legislation brought forward by a government I had the honour to serve. It proved very effective in conditions which were far less trying than those which now exist. If the government wishes to approach the problem in another way, it could introduce wheat acreage reduction payments with the stipulation that the money made available be used to establish livestock herds of cattle or pigs.

I believe a further suggestion should be put forward at this point. I have made it on previous occasions and the minister told me he would take note of it. I have heard it put forward in many areas of western Canada. It is this: farmers would appreciate a moratorium in connection with repayments due under the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the Farm Credit Act and the new farm machinery legislation. If these demands were postponed for one year, I am sure it would assist the farming population to a great extent in meeting the present emergency.

• (8:10 p.m.)

In any event, the problems of agriculture require immediate action. If the House wants evidence of prices in the west, let me read some newspaper headlines. I have before me the Toronto *Daily Star* of January 17, 1970. This indicates that even in eastern Canada people are beginning to appreciate the situation. The headline is, "The disenchanted prairies". The next headline is, "Gusher of prairie discontent will alter our future". The next sub-heading is, "Alberta leaders start looking enviously at the fruits of separatism". Those are headlines in just one newspaper.

Let me quote again from the Toronto *Daily Star* of the same date. The headline is, "Prairies rage at grain glut and money famine". The next sub-heading is, "A Manitoba farmer goes carpentering". Another heading is "It's

really worse now than the 30's". The next sub-heading states, "People are fleeing the prairie". Another sub-headline states, "Wheat pool demands 'federal help or else' ".

Let me refer to an article in the *Leader-Post* of December 19, 1969. The headline reads, "Early grain movement requested". That is what we have been talking about this afternoon and this evening. Another article appearing in the *Leader-Post* of November 15, 1969 had this headline, "Elevator system on prairie must be rebuilt says Winter". Another headline is, "Grain surplus made last year frustrating". Another is, "Hard times in farming likely to continue". Another headline reads, "No storage space for bumper crop". An article, again in the *Leader-Post* states, "Lull in grain-handling hit".

So goes the story, Mr. Speaker. Every day when you pick up the paper you see indications that this crisis is becoming worse. In conclusion, let me beg the indulgence of the House in quoting for the record an editorial which appeared in the *Western Producer* of Thursday, January 8. This is a very interesting article and is very applicable to the present situation. It should be read thoroughly by every individual who lives in an urban centre in order that he may become aware of the importance of the agricultural industry to the economy of Canada. This article reads in part:

> The agricultural economy's research council of Canada has performed a valuable service to Canadian farmers by spelling out the value Canadians derive from the presence of a strong agricultural industry in this country. It did this in a statement to the Canada Grains Council which was reported fully in the *Western Producer* for October 9. The statement is worthy of careful re-examination.
>
> What the economic research council reported in essence was this:
>
> "On the basis of Canada's gross national product in 1967 of $62 billion, agriculture and its directly related enterprise generate a total economic value to the Canadian GNP of $26 billion."

Imagine that figure! It further states:

> "(This) represents the measure of involvement of the agricultural industry in the overall economic activity of Canada ... The $26 billion figure, equal to 42 per cent of GNP, excludes consideration of the effect of agriculture on the demand for other products."
>
> Finally, the economic research council concludes: "—at this juncture Canada cannot afford to let agriculture disintegrate for lack of positive information, constructive policy and vigorous implementation."
>
> What the council took into account in arriving at its figure of $26 billion for industry included: gross agricultural production, the "value added" in processing these products in Canada, the return at retail level and lastly a "multiplier factor" to take account of services rendered in the whole process including agricultural commodities and their products in position where consumers can use them or they go into the export market.
>
> These economic concepts of "value added" and the "multiplier factor" are common to the economic analysis of implications in production of all raw products. They are an element that has been frequently overlooked in assessing the importance of agriculture as a stimulant to further business activity.

I think this is a very good article and I commend it to those hon. members who are particularly interested in agriculture. I was very interested in the remarks of my neighbour, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), who on a number of occasions has voiced some very good suggestions that I have supported. They have also been made by other hon. members. I will listen very closely to learn what excuse that hon. member has for not supporting the amendment now before the House.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I should like to comment on a charge made by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) in an earlier debate on agriculture. I am sorry he is not in his place this evening. He called me a "paper tiger", apparently in reference to the fact that I adhered very closely to my notes. I wish to apologize for doing that then, and for doing the same thing today. I offer in explanation the fact that I have been active in farming ever since I finished high school in 1927, and I have only a little over one year's experience in this awe-inspiring chamber. I therefore have not overcome a certain amount of nervousness when I rise to speak in this House. I have not yet succumbed to the temptation to fortify myself with stimulants or sedatives, as obviously some hon. members have.

It is all very well for the hon. member for Timiskaming to criticize me, but he should remember—and I hope Your Honour will take this into account—that he has practically made a career out of being a Member of Parliament and I am only a freshman, so to speak, even though two-thirds or more of the members are younger than I. I might add that I am quite willing to submit my notes to any handwriting expert to verify that they are my own. I might also add that some speeches I have heard would have been improved by a little thoughtful preparation.

May I now say a few words about the motion itself. I agree that there has been a large degree of failure of those responsible,

including ultimately the government, to make adequate use of our grain storage facilities in Canada. The extent of the government's failure lies mainly in the fact that until recently it relied on the voluntary co-operation of the owners and operators of the storage facilities, the labour unions, the railways, the exporters and all others involved in the movement and storage of grain. This co-operation has not been forthcoming in adequate measure.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) is rising to ask a question. I should point out that it is the option of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to accept the question or not.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have about 20 minutes to deliver the material I have here. If at the end of my speech I have time, I will be glad to answer questions. Hon. members will recall that I have on several occasions urged the government to follow a previous precedent and appoint a transport controller who would have control over boxcar distribution as well as terminal and other storage facilities. If this had been done a year or more ago, I believe grain farmers, the grain trade and all Canada would be better off today. However, this was not done, partly because the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) had too many other important things to look after and was forced to accept bad advice given him by some of his advisors.

Most farmers, and I hope most hon. members, were very pleased and encouraged when the government appointed the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt as the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, who would devote his full time to the urgent problems of the grain industry. By doing this the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government indicated their concern for western farmers. They showed that they recognized the size and the seriousness of the problem by giving one minister exclusive responsibility for the Wheat Board and for the grain industry, something that had never happened before. I say again that this was a tremendous forward step.

One of the benefits we have already derived from that unprecedented appointment was evidenced in the recent announcement by the minister of the appointment of a co-ordinator for the movement of grain and the operation of the terminals at the port of Vancouver. A detailed study had proved the need for such a co-ordinator. In response to a question I asked in the House, the minister indicated that a similar co-ordinator will likely be appointed for Thunder Bay before navigation opens in early April.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Farmers are very pleased with these appointments because they indicate the government is genuinely concerned about the past bottlenecks and difficulties and is willing to do something to prevent a recurrence. They also hold the promise of a better service being provided to our customers. This eventually should be reflected in better sales, which is the best way to solve our grain problems. This should always be uppermost in the mind of those who attempt to find solutions. I am sure it is the primary concern of the minister in charge of the Wheat Board.

I should like to warn the minister again that I am not as confident as he concerning the ability or willingness of the railroads to move the large quantities of grain which will have to be moved in the last four months of this crop year. I urge him to watch their performance very closely and to immediately appoint a boxcar controller if they fall even a little way behind. For heaven's sake do not let them put off measures to effectively equalize quotas until the last month or two. It cannot be done in this manner, and if it were attempted we would again be in the intolerable situation we experienced last summer.

Grain farmers have three main concerns. The first is that they want as much grain as possible moved into the markets. Second, they want an equitable sharing of those markets among grain producers through an improved quota system. Third, they want the best possible price consistent with the first two objectives. Incidentally, the rational and orderly use of our storage facilities would probably save the farmers money.

In passing may I also say I am happy to note that a special committee has been set up to make specific proposals in the very near future regarding revision of the grain quota system. I suggest to anyone interested who reads or hears these words that he or she should immediately submit to the Wheat Board their ideas about quota reform. I also point out to the minister the urgency of publicizing the new quota regulations before spring seeding starts, because they could have an important effect on rationalization of production.

No doubt the minister is studying the most effective methods of transporting, storing and marketing our grain. I am confident everything will be done without undue delay to make the best possible use of all these facilities. I would be surprised if such a study did not reveal the need for more storage facilities at the west coast and possibly overseas. It may well reveal the need for more interior terminals which would dry our grain if necessary, clean it, blend it and prepare it for direct loading into ocean-going vessels for our customers. These interior terminals could receive grain directly from our farm trucks. Enough of them strategically placed could eventually supersede our present elevator system, which with some exceptions, has remained relatively unchanged since trucks came into common use by farmers.

With regard to farm storage payments, I have never been convinced there would be any over-all advantage to farmers if they paid themselves through the Wheat Board for storing grain on their own farms. I am still of that opinion, so long as delivery opportunities remain reasonably equal. On the other hand, recent developments, including the block system of grain gathering and transportation, may result in a continuing inequity in respect of delivery privileges. If this should happen—and we should be able to judge this by July 31—then I say steps should be taken to pay the farmers for their authorized production of grain, with a small holdback, while it still remains on the farm. Furthermore, those farmers who are not allowed to deliver their normal quota should be paid a reasonable amount for storing that grain until it can be accepted.

It is a great temptation to digress and talk about many other farm problems such as the many desirable and necessary changes in the quota system, the expansion of markets, market research and production advice, a more realistic two-price system, what final payment may be expected this spring, and the need to set up separate accounts in the Wheat Board for Durum and bread wheat. Then there is the matter of the cash shortage, the reformation of the Wheat Board, the International Grains Arrangement, and a new grading system.

I hope to persuade the government—and I have already spoken to some members of the government about this—to change the Wheat Board Act, if necessary, in order to make sure the Wheat Board accounts for Durum wheat are kept separate from those for other types of wheat, so that at least the Durum producers will receive a final payment next spring on their 1968-69 deliveries.

Mr. Speaker, I could talk about all these things but I shall attempt to stay within the terms of the motion before the House. Before I sit down, however, I wish to anticipate some remarks that may be made later, possibly along the line of the remarks made on November 18 in a similar debate by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). In effect, he said I should vote against the government if I had the courage of my convictions.

My position is quite clear. This is related to something the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain (Mr. Southam) just said. I was elected as a Liberal and will, the Lord willing, remain a Liberal at least until the next election. But this does not mean I must be silent if I do not agree with the government's actions or lack of action. I have told my constituents, and I firmly believe it, that I can do more for them as a member of the government party. I believe I have accomplished a few things—more than I could have accomplished as a member of the opposition.

I further believe that the Liberal Party, even with its admitted imperfections, will continue to govern this country in the foreseeable future. If I thought I could do a better job in the opposition, I would cross the floor. The parties opposite, I believe, will remain in opposition for a long time and I might look forward to a long and ineffectual career. I submit that the two small opposition parties have no hope of ever becoming the government. The official opposition is so split, and so badly in disarray, that I cannot imagine any revival of their fortunes for many, many years.

I believe I was elected because my constituents wanted a representative on the government side of the House. I shall continue to speak up in the House on matters affecting my constituents whether or not my opinions differ from those of the government. The Liberal Party is big enough to welcome a difference of opinion within its ranks on many subjects. I shall continue to battle for my constituents in the House, in caucus and on every other possible occasion. But I shall not indulge in the foolish luxury of voting against the government and thereby risk alienating the only federal political organization which is in a position now, and will be in my opinion for many years to come, to do something effective to solve our problems.

In closing, I say it would be fine if farmers could deliver enough wheat now to immediately fill the Thunder Bay terminals. This would permit those who have grain piled outside to get it under cover. It would let us use the roads before they become completely clogged with snow or before the spring thaw makes them impassable. Most of all, it would get some badly needed cash into the hands of grain farmers. But one must balance these considerations against the need to make rational use of our transportation facilities, to maintain a steady movement to the west coast and to have our system geared and adjusted to the much expanded movement which will be required after navigation opens. We must consider, also, the fact that about 111,000 farmers have already obtained over $250 million in cash advances since last August 1, some of this being taken out since January 1.

Perhaps there is good reasoning behind the minister's decision to have a steady but increasing flow of grain to Thunder Bay this winter, ensuring that the terminals will be at capacity well before navigation begins about April 10, instead of a crash program as suggested by opposition speakers, followed by weeks of stagnation.

An hon. Member: What is your quota?

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Nothing. I agree that there are many serious problems in respect of our grain industry, but I do not believe the matter raised in the main motion before us is as vital as many other aspects the opposition might have selected for us to discuss today. For these reasons, and others, I cannot support the motion of the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) even though he is a fellow Saskatchewan grain farmer.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member who just spoke inform the House why he felt it necessary to state publicly that he does not use stimulants or sedatives before speaking?

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the minister's protestations this afternoon in regard to inefficiency in making use of available commercial storage, and in spite of the shocking and irresponsible statement he made that this motion was just another phony issue advanced by the opposition for political purposes, the very low quota situation prevailing on the prairies and the fact that there is a reported 70 million bushels of unused storage in the terminals at the Lakehead, to be filled at leisure between now and the opening of navigation, are, to put it mildly, beyond comprehension. Even allowing for about 15 million bushels working space, the 55 million bushels needed to fill the remaining space would bring a welcome infusion of income to the cash-short farmers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan served by the Lakehead terminals. There is certainly no question of not being able to find selected grades, since a variety of grades were harvested in good condition in that area last fall, and the local elevators could supply almost limitless quantities of any variety.

Apart from cash advances, delivery to the elevator system is the only means grain-producing farmers have of turning their grain into income, unless of course they are willing to accept the lower prices offered by feed mills and by others in the feed supply business. Any withholding of grain storage space, with the farmers in a critical cash position, does not appear to be in their best interest. In fact, if this practice were to become commonplace, the request for payment on farm-stored grain would become even more valid because the Wheat Board is the sole grain handling agency. The minister speaks of the cost of this storage to the farmer as the main reason for the empty space, but this is of little comfort to the farmer who has to borrow money at extremely high rates of interest, and even less to the man who has used up all his credit and cannot borrow at any cost.

The low quotas which the farming community has experienced in the last two years —and there are indications that this condition will prevail at least for the foreseeable future—mean that the farmers will continue to bear the burden of storage facilities, grain deterioration, interest charges and other expenses connected with the proper care of the grain, without receiving any compensating financial benefit. Under these circumstances it is to be hoped that the government will seriously consider some form of compensation being made to farmers who provide proper storage on the farm.

Another problem that will loom large as spring approaches, and the Wheat Board has arrived at its final figures on the 1968-69 grain pool, is that it is doubtful there will be a final wheat payment out of the pool, regardless of what the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) says, and this for the first time since the 1940-41 crop year.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Muir) has intimated that I said there would be a final payment. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): I took the hon. member to intimate that there would be a final payment. When we read *Hansard* I think we will see that is the inference he was making. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) in charge of the Wheat Board approached this subject cautiously the other day. However, he left the impression that he believed the assumption that there would be no final payment was correct. Furthermore, since the initial payment basis for No. 1 Northern at the Lakehead was reduced from $1.70 last year to $1.50 for this crop season, farm income is reduced at this critical stage and works a real hardship on farmers who because of lack of space were unable to fill their quota before the end of the last crop year.

The announcement by the manager of the Farm Credit Corporation in Saskatchewan that payment arrears in that province were running at about 20 per cent of outstanding loans, compared with less than 1 per cent during the previous 15 years, is a sad commentary on the situation in the prairies. This unhappy situation is compounded by the fact that some farm equipment dealers are barely hanging on and others have already given up the ghost. When the lack of orders begins to be felt in eastern Canada, this will no longer be just a regional problem; it will become a matter of national concern. The opposition has tried many times to point this out, but the government refuses to listen. All available statistics would seem to indicate that a further reduction of wheat acreage is desirable, but at least up to the present neither the government nor any of its appointed boards or commissions have been able to offer alternatives that could achieve this objective without causing embarrassing surpluses in other grains.

Short-term objectives such as feeding more hogs, or long-term objectives such as raising more cattle, may be ways to spread the risk or, to put it more appropriately, to diversify farm operations; but they do nothing to meet the pressing problem of cash shortage which conceivably could reach crisis proportions before seeding. The federal government must accept responsibility in this area if agriculture is to remain a viable industry and thousands of farmers are not put out of business because they are unable to sell enough of their products to pay expenses. I need hardly suggest to the government how this could be done; there are many precedents which the government could follow in regard to assistance for the agricultural industry.

Assistance to help establish industry in various parts of the country is a continuing program. A classic example is the subsidy paid to the automotive industry in working out the U.S.-Canada automotive agreement, and the subsequent payments that were made to that industry last year. A comparable amount paid to western agriculture in the form of acreage payments would give that industry a much needed boost and the nation as a whole would reap dividends. While the government hopefully, may be giving serious consideration to this suggestion which has been brought to its attention on several occasions by members of the opposition, I hope that in the interim everything possible will be done to open quotas in order to make available much needed cash.

The minister has told us he is going across the country talking to the farmers about their problems. He invited members of the opposition to join him in this so-called crusade. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers of western Canada are thoroughly fed-up with talk by ministers, government members and commissions, and are looking for action from those who are responsible for the transportation, storage, distribution and sale of grain. In this respect, no amount of government waffling, no amount of academic discourse from the minister, and no further delay can relieve the government of its responsibility to adopt policies which will enable agriculture to remain solvent in the face of disaster.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister without Portfolio, the member for Saskatoon-Humboldt (Mr. Lang), spoke this afternoon in the debate, we heard the same soothing words that we have heard from government benches for the past year and a half, a cover-up operation for the inaction of Liberal government policy or failure to take concrete action to help the western farmer deal adequately with the present crisis. He invited members of the House and people in the west to join in the challenging task of coming up with changes to improve the present system; then he made a call for efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I did not think any Liberal cabinet member would have the audacity to come into the House and invite members of the opposition or anyone else to join them in getting more efficiency in grain-handling and marketing problems. After their handling of the problems of last year—damp grain, inefficient boxcar allocation, transportation difficulties, low prices and export figures—I did not think any Liberal minister would have such nerve. With such a dismal record, I should think shame would prevent them issuing such an invitation.

Let us look at some of the latest quota figures. I have a statement dated January 19, 1970, which shows that over half—that is, 894—of the delivery points in the prairie provinces are still on a unit quota while the other 893 points are on a one-bushel quota. This compares with over 900 delivery points which were on either a two, three or four-bushel quota at the same date in the last crop year. In the minister's province of Saskatchewan, and mine, at the present time there are 540 delivery points on a unit quota and only 419 on a one-bushel quota. Is this a record of which to be proud? Will it encourage anyone to join the minister or the Liberal government in proceeding to meet the great challenge of the future?

Mr. Speaker, it seemed to me that the minister may even have had visions of grandeur when he invited everyone to join with him, that perhaps he would be the Messiah to lead the west out of its wilderness. But I think most people have realized that they cannot look to the Liberal government or a Liberal minister to lead them anywhere except into deeper trouble. I suggest it will take more than the same old words to deal with the present crisis. The farmers are sick and tired of the bungling evidenced by the present situation. They want performance, action, policies and a square deal. That is all they want, but many of them feel they are being "taken" in more ways than one.

Last Friday the report of the Barber Commission on farm machinery costs, dealing particularly with tractors and combines, was presented to this House. The report noted that in 1968 prices for various tractors in Britain ranged from $837 to $2,287 lower than in Canada. This has been common knowledge for some time, but in spite of questions from farm organizations and others the Liberal government put off the evil day when they would have to face the facts.

The commission report went on to suggest that multi-national corporations, such as are represented by the large farm machinery companies, are independent of the national authority which applies to individual companies. At the present time there is no international authority to exercise control over them. With Canada's industry and trade largely in the hands of multi-national corporations, the independence with which these companies operate has far-reaching implications. The farmers of western Canada have recognized this situation for a long time and now expect the government to take concrete action in dealing with the report of the Barber Commission.

When it comes to elevator companies, I have one example before me of a farmer who sold malting barley to the Pioneer Grain Company. I think the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) has knowledge of this company. The sale was for 1695 bushels. I saw the invoice and it contained a list of deductions as long as your arm. First of all, government inspection and weighing, $4.50; cleaning, a half cent per bushel. Then there were 415 pounds of screenings for which he received 99 cents credit; removal of stones, five cents per bushel—although in this case the land was stone-free—elevator and handling charges, 3¾ cents per bushel; service charge, one cent per bushel; storage for 34 days, $19.21 total. This was because the farmer had asked that the cheque be made out in 1970 because he preferred to receive payment then for income tax purposes. Interest on freight—again this was because the farmer asked for his cheque in 1970 even though the grain company had the grain at its disposal and probably moved it into its own market channels—for 39 days was $1.62; bank exchange, one-eighth of one per cent. These deductions were made from the farmer's cheque before he received any money for his malting barley.

Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said in this debate about the transportation tie-up at the present time and over the past year. I suggest that the railways are guilty of gross negligence in dealing with this matter. My information is that in the last three months of 1969 the railways were 8,000 cars short of what the Canadian Wheat Board asked them to place in Lakehead positions. This situation is partly responsible for the situation at the Lakehead. Is this another example of efficiency?

At the present time the railway companies are taking cars out of grain movement, claiming this is because they have introduced the block system which will ensure greater efficiency. But they did not have enough cars in operation in the first place. It is probable that there will be another pile-up at the Lakehead on April 1 when the navigation season opens.

Mr. Speaker, the economic effect of the present situation is obvious. With the shortage of cash, farmers are not able to pay their bills. We already have reports of what is happening regarding payments due on Farm Credit Corporation loans. We also have many examples of reduced employment on the prairies. Many people are moving from Saskatchewan, in particular, for this reason. In my own city of Regina the cement plant closed down for the first three months of 1969 and it will probably be closed for four months this year. In 1969 it was closed for a total of 18 weeks. Some of the major motor car dealers are experiencing considerable difficulty, as are the farm implement dealers. As the member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) pointed out, we have never seen so many "For rent" signs on premises on the main streets of the city.

There is a population drain from Saskatchewan greater than anything seen since the time of the previous Liberal government prior to the election of the CCF government. Last year the population of Saskatchewan decreased by 6,000. Add to this figure the natural increase in population, and we see that the situation is really much worse than that figure indicates. Thus, the income situation in Saskatchewan is quite desperate for many farmers, yet we find that the government has failed to deal with this situation.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Farmers find it very frustrating when ministers and spokesmen of the Liberal party and the government point to cash advances as the big thing that was done to help farmers. Mr. Speaker, everyone acknowledges the important role of cash advances, but everyone knows that they are not a solution to pressing problems. Farmers become increasingly frustrated and resentful when they find Liberal Party spokesmen and government spokesmen falling back on this sort of argument. Is it any wonder that at the present time there is talk for secession in the west? There is no need for this sort of talk. It is not the way people really feel and it is not what they want to do. But this type of situation arises out of frustration and resentment because of the failure of the federal government to take any concrete action and to review grievances over the past year.

[Mr. Burton.]

It is for that reason that my colleague the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), seconded by myself, moved the amendment which asked the federal government to consider a deficiency payment for the 1968-69 crop year sufficient to assure the farmer of a final return equivalent to the $1.95½ minimum price established under the International Grains Arrangement.

I suggest that a case can be made for this amendment on the ground that the International Grains Arrangement was entered into by Canada as a nation. It was not entered into by the Canadian Wheat Board, the farmers or the farm organizations; it was ratified by Canada as a nation. When Canada entered into that agreement, by implication it also made the commitment to its farmers that they would be paid at least the minimum grain prices over the life of the arrangement. We see what is happening this year. The Minister without Portfolio made it quite clear that there will be no final payment on the 1968-69 crop pool. We feel that this is the very least the federal government should do in dealing with the present situation.

The second part of our amendment calls for the appointment of a transport controller. Recently, after months and months of pressure, we had the announcement of a transport co-ordinator or controller at the Vancouver terminals. It seems to me that the appointment of this official supports and backs up the need for our having an official with the authority necessary to deal with all aspects of grain movement in the prairie region and right through to the Lakehead. I think it should be made clear that the block system is not the final answer to transportation problems. I think it should be said that it is a help, but that it does not deal with the total transportation situation.

Thus we see the record, Mr. Speaker. The problems of farmers and of agriculture have probably been debated more than any other topic in this House over the past year. Is it any wonder that the events of the past year and the inaction of the government have led to despair? Finally the government comes along and says, "It is too late to do anything about the problem because the time to deal with it is past." That is the government's usual way of getting out of many situations.

I could quote a number of figures to show the dismal record of the Liberal government in dealing with agricultural problems. I have noted in particular that over the past few months, whenever agriculture has been debated the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has quoted the 1963-68 average figures and compared them with the 1958-62 average figures. While this is very nice, and I suppose the minister has his own reasons for trotting out these sets of figures, we want to know what has happened since he became Minister of Agriculture. It is a rather dismal record, Mr. Speaker.

Farm cash receipts have gone down steadily since the minister assumed office. We have a dismal record with respect to farm markets, with respect to export sales and export prices. I will not go into statistics at the present time. This afternoon we heard a speech from the Minister without Portfolio in which he criticized some aspects of the motion before us. He did not deal at all with the amendment that was moved by my colleague. His address in the debate this afternoon reminded me of a lecture in a law school such as he might have delivered at one time. It is perhaps a good idea for the minister to keep in practice, because I predict that he will be back in the classroom before too long.

It is also good to know where the Liberal backbenchers stand on this question. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I do not doubt his sincerity in wishing these problems to be solved. I have noted that he has made some very fine statements in various parts of the country, and on occasion in this House. He has from time to time asked for a number of very useful things. But it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to anything important, he is not listened to by the government. More important than that is the old saying: Talk is cheap. It is how the hon. member votes that counts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Burton: We want to see how the hon. member will vote this evening. He has indicated that he will vote for the government. It is his right and privilege to decide how to vote. It seems to me that unless the hon. member and other Liberal backbenchers representing agricultural areas in the west support our amendment, they will make it quite clear that they are not in favour of a deficiency payment or the appointment of a transport controller. I suggest if they really mean what they say, those Liberal backbenchers will support the amendment moved by my colleague. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is time they put their vote where their mouth is. We have had enough talk in this situation.

In addition, we have to ask where the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the rest of the western members of the cabinet stand on this matter. We have a number of cabinet ministers from the west; they are called upon to do the government's dirty work whenever the powers that be within government circles say "No" to requests from the west for farm legislation or assistance to farmers. Either that, or they do not understand the situation; they cannot have it both ways. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if they have any guts at all, the western representatives in cabinet will tell the Prime Minister and the cabinet, "If you want us to continue in cabinet, you will have to approve better policies than you have up to the present time." They will have to say, "We now have a bankruptcy of policy."

If they are not willing to do this, if they have any integrity they will have no choice but to resign from the cabinet. On the other hand, if they are content to sit on their little pedestals of glory until the next election, that is their choice. In that event, I suggest that the people of western Canada will deal very harshly with them at the next election.

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, although I do not come from a farm constituency, the area I represent depends to a great extent on the well-being of western farms and the western economy. I do not like to pre-suppose anything, but I dare say I feel very much as the proposer of the motion feels about the west and the western economy.

The hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) and I both have in common our geography. We are both people who earn our living in, and both of us call home, that part of the country west of the Lakehead. We are both conscious of a feeling of alienation in this country that we call home. There is a feeling of alienation in the world generally and in western Canada specifically.

Some of us have a vague feeling that the last 100 years have somehow let us down. I think this feeling has some justification, because in 1867 when Canada became a confederation as we now know it, the combined liabilities of the original colonies that

came together were composed, to the extent of 60 per cent or so, of debt for transportation and canal systems that had been built up with the expectation that they would get the cream of the trade from the western United States. Our people did not get it. The people of the United States outfoxed them by building their own canals. Thus, the colonies of the regional parts that became Canada were in great trouble and in great debt. Their inspiration was that if they could only persuade the other colonies to the west of them to come in, somehow or other they could utilize these assets which were built but not paid for such as the canals, railroads and other facilities with which they were stuck. There is no doubt we in the west were consciously or unconsciously considered a colony by the original part of Canada when we joined confederation 100 years ago. There is a vague feeling still of discontent and disappointment in the 100 years that have passed.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) mentioned the matter of tractors a moment ago. This is another nail in the coffin. In Winnipeg there is a tractor company that makes profits which are certainly healthy by any capitalistic standard, yet it undersells other farm machinery companies in a market stretching from the Peace River to Texas and from the Rocky Mountains to Pennsylvania. This indicates there must be something wrong with the farm machinery business, if a medium sized manufacturer in Winnipeg can do so well and still undersell the big fellows.

I think this feeling of alienation will grow if the government does not accept the challenge offered to it by Mr. Barber's report and look into this matter. The government has muscle. It must be able to do something about manufacturers who ride roughshod in the manner that Mr. Barber has indicated.

I must say reluctantly that I was disappointed when the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) presented his motion. While I agree with his sentiments and feelings of frustration, I cannot agree with his motion. The motion in substance censures the government for its failure to use its existing facilities, failure to provide additional facilities for grain and the movement of grain and for the failure to implement a system of payment for grain stored on farms, by reason of which failures the farm grain economy is suffering serious harm. I think the hon. member missed the mark on this motion. The amendment does not help either, because it talks about deficiency payments and a transport controller. I think this also misses the point.

Mr. Korchinski: How would you have worded it?

Mr. Osler: In my mind this is the mark of irrelevance. The farm grain economy is suffering harm, not from these minor details which anybody could tinker around with whether they were bright or stupid, but because it is growing unsaleable crops and grades of grain that cannot be sold. This is a hard fact. It is a fact that I, as a westerner, do not like to admit; but I think the beginning of wisdom is to admit hard facts and act on them.

Our own surveys have belatedly begun to show this. The FAO underlined the fact by saying: Thank God we are liable to have a food surplus in the world in the next little while, and those who grow food in bulk had better watch out because they may be in financial trouble. This is something for mankind to rejoice about. It is something the people of western Canada have to consider seriously. Let us not waste time, then, with motions, amendments and talk about facilities and details. Our facilities have more grain in storage now than they have had in the last two years.

Last year there were 497 million bushels of grain in storage; the year before there were 504 million bushels, and this year there are 516 million bushels. Grain has therefore been moved and put into storage. All we are really saying is that the world has not bought as much grain as we have grown and would like to sell.

An hon. Member: What about the quotas?

Mr. Osler: I will speak to the hon. member later. I repeat, there is something wrong with western agriculture today, but the items referred to in this motion are irrelevant and wide of the mark. Vague feelings of alienation are shared by the hon. members for Mackenzie, the member for Regina East and myself. Westerners will not be served by having these vague feelings of alienation fanned, deliberately or otherwise, by members of this House. The problem is a deep one and must be looked at in a long-term manner. The farm organizations who asked to see the Liberal members from Manitoba during the Christmas recess to talk about their problems were unanimous in saying that the long-term

approach that is appearing looks good. The Grains Council looks as though it may work and will be a good, long-term solution.

I submit the appointment of a Minister without Portfolio to be responsible for grain was a good thing. We have a good man for this job. The block system for boxcars is also good. The fact that serious people are considering the modernization of the standards of grading grain is good, and I understand this House will be asked to make amendments to the Grains Act to this effect. Developing market research and forecasting activities, which this industry never had before, is a good thing. The member for Regina East spoke of diversification that is causing the Japanese to look for oil seed facilities, etc. All of these are good.

Predictions indicate that the demand for grains will catch up with supply during the next decade. On the other hand, if there is a slack in the long-term industry, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion will help to pick up that slack. This was evidenced in my own hometown last month when Boeing located there. The federal government assisted in this venture to the amount of approximately $1 million.

In the long term the federal government is facing up to the situation. It appears that ultimately the correct decisions will be made, divorced of politics, by the men who should make them in this free economy of ours. I refer to the people who live at the head of the Lakes and west of there who are mostly concerned with the grain trades.

Everyone I talked to in the Winnipeg area told me there is a healthy feeling of co-operation, co-ordination and long-term optimism. People are putting aside their petty regional, bickering politics—I do not mean this in a "political" sense,—and grappling with the long-term problems. It will not be too long before the people of western Canada start looking after their own knitting in a way they have not done before. When this happens, they will not have to look to politicians other than for genuinely political decisions.

• (9:10 p.m.)

In the short term, I suggest that because this country has been involved in politics up to the armpits in the grain trade in the last 80 or 100 years, politicians cannot pull right out just because the people themselves are beginning to make decisions in a sophisticated, twentieth century way, as they should be doing.

How does one maintain now the ability to produce at present levels, so that opportunities can be seized when present levels of production are again required in the next five or ten years? How does one see these farm people through the present crisis without wrecking this wonderful producing machine? How does one help individual farmers to get through this cash crisis period without encouraging people, falsely from an individual point of view and, I would say, sinfully from the point of view of the country as a whole, to grow unwanted grain? How does one help them without falling into this trap? These are the matters we should be debating today, not details which, I maintain, have been brought forward with the best of good faith by hon. members but which are wide of the mark.

To fill the Lakehead terminals now, as some have suggested, would accomplish little. Some farmers might receive small amounts of instant cash, but the handlers at the Lakehead would soon run out of work because the elevators would be full; they would be laid off after a couple of months. More important, the pipeline feeding through to the Lakehead elevators would soon have done its job. Then boxcars would be dispersed all over the country even more widely than they are today; it would take God knows how long to get the railroads cranked up to do their jobs properly so that when navigation opened they would be able to feed the Lakehead again.

Is it not more sensible to arrange for a crescendo of build-up, so that when navigation opens things will be running full blast at the only time it really matters? The figure of 1,000 boxcars a day has been mentioned. They would have to be hastily assembled, then dispersed, then reassembled again. I maintain it is better to do what is being done now. Hon. members should not forget that grain is moving at the present time; about 20 million bushels a month are moving to Vancouver, grain is moving steadily to Halifax, and the Lakehead will be going full blast when navigation opens. Grain cannot move out before that, because neither the government nor the opposition parties can persuade the ice to melt earlier on the Great Lakes. I note that 375 million bushels will be moved during this crop year, 260 million bushels in the final six months. There will be lots of work for everybody when the ice goes off, and nothing will

be gained by trying now to move more than is being moved.

To get back to the original argument, grain is moving at the rate of about 20 million bushels a month. Everybody in Canada is benefiting from this movement, except the farmer. It does not matter where we live—Halifax, Montreal, Toronto or Winnipeg—the movement of grain through the country is creating jobs for people, for oil workers in Alberta, for the railway men, for grain brokers, for vessel brokers, for insurance men—for everybody who is in any way connected with the trade however remotely. Everyone, that is except the farmer.

Farmers who survive this short-term crisis will ultimately benefit, too. At the moment, what is keeping the wolf from the door is $252,700,000 worth of advances, which is good. It cannot be ignored. True, these are only loans, though no interest needs to be paid on them. The people of Canada, who are benefiting from all this movement of grain, are taking up the slack, helping the people of western Canada, by paying interest charges on these loans of $252 million, as well as by paying some storage fees. That is just about all.

To get back to the story of confederation, I have no doubt that the long-term solutions which are being worked out by this government and by private individuals of great competence will ultimately see western Canada through this crisis. However, I suggest that the people of Canada as a whole, and we as parliamentarians who represent them, are not being very good Canadians or acting as deeply committed partners in confederation, nor are we acting as very intelligent people, if we do not keep pressure on this government to come up with ways and means of helping these farmers get through their short-term crisis in a manner which will not delude them into growing a heck of a lot more grain, but in a way which will assist them to get through this period of changeover, by diversifying their operation or contracting it to a point at which only the amount of grain presently needed will actually be produced.

This is a challenge to Canada which will not be met by putting forward motions which inadvertently seem to be futile, like the one we are discussing this evening, or motions like the one to abolish the Senate which everyone knows is an illegal proposition, brought into the House to waste its time.

[Mr. Osler.]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Who said so?

Mr. Osler: Instead, what we must do is find ways and means of helping these people through a short-term—

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

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there could be a more opportune occasion for a debate on agriculture, or more urgent need for such a debate. As we all know, this is the first day since the resumption of the session on which the official opposition has been able to designate the subject of the discussion to take place in the House. I thank my colleagues on this side for agreeing to have this debate on agriculture. It is obvious that the government does not want to discuss our farm problems.

• (9:20 p.m.)

The federal constituency of Marquette is mainly a rural riding. During the Christmas recess I had the opportunity of touring my riding and talking to many farmers and businessmen. I have never seen the western economy in the deplorable condition it is in today. The lack of grain sales and the existence of the largest wheat glut in our history is affecting everybody in western Canada. Many businesses will be lucky to survive this year, and most farmers are desperate for cash.

According to figures released by the Canadian Wheat Board, as of January 5 in Manitoba there were 271 delivery points on initial quota and 51 delivery points on a one-bushel quota. For the benefit of hon. members in this House who do not understand what an initial unit quota means, it means that all the income these farmers have received since July 31, 1969, from grain is approximately $500. How would anybody like to survive for six months on $500?

Mr. Bell: That's even worse than $30 a week.

Mr. Stewart (Marquette): The government might say that the farmer can get cash advances up to $6,000 in any one crop year. This sounds good, but an individual has to be a mighty large farmer to qualify for the full amount of $6,000. The average farmer in my area, and I stress the word "average", is lucky

if he can get $1,500 to $1,800. I say to the government that when we start talking about farm income at this time we are getting pretty close to the poverty level.

During the last crop year farmers only reached a four or five-bushel quota, and from all indications their deliveries will not be any higher this year. I have told this House before, and I repeat, that our farmers cannot exist on a five-bushel quota. This low quota has existed for three or more years and there has to be a day of reckoning. This day is fast approaching if our family farm operations are to survive.

I support the motion this party has placed before the House. Farmers should be paid storage on farm-stored grain. Under present conditions farmers are asked to carry abnormal amounts of grain and it is not their fault that we have a glut of grain. There are other things this government could do to help the farmer. It should investigate the possibility of overseas storage facilities for unsold grain. I understand that at the present time the only grain in this forward position is sold grain. Most grain moves through Rotterdam or Tokyo. Often a customer wants 200,000 bushels or less in a hurry, perhaps in five to ten days. Because we have no unsold grain in this forward position, we cannot take advantage of these orders. I realize these are not large sales, but small sales often lead to large sales and we should investigate every possible way to sell more grain.

The government must look at our entire sales policy. No matter what figures you look at, we are not getting our share of world markets. I realize all wheat producing countries are facing problems similar to ours; however, nobody has lost a greater share of markets than Canada. This situation cannot be allowed to continue. Not only must we stop this downward trend in sales; we must recover the markets we have lost. Whenever I am home I hear farmers questioning the effectiveness of Wheat Board sales. These farmers want the Wheat Board but they feel it is slow to react to market conditions. Perhaps it is time we had a shake-up in the Wheat Board, with no appointees serving for more than five years until we see how effective they are.

The government must show leadership in facing up to our agricultural problems. It should, through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, set up a special sales force to assist the Wheat Board in selling our surplus grain. The government should eat, sleep and talk grain until we sell our surplus and recover our markets. Let the government become aggressive about wheat sales. It has been stated that if Canada had maintained the share of world trade in wheat, oats and barley we had 15 years ago, we would have no surplus of grain today.

Until this government has recovered our wheat markets there must be immediate assistance to western farmers. This assistance could be in the form of an acreage payment to tide the farmers over the present serious situation. Our party has asked many times during this session for acreage payments. The need was never greater than it is now. Acreage payments do not represent a long-term solution to our agricultural problems, but at least a substantial acreage payment would tide the farmers over until the government came up with an effective long-term policy. Surely, a government that can wipe out Expo's debt to the tune of $125 million, and give $80 million to the Ford Motor Company, can give the western farmer a small slice of the pie.

We have contended that no other industry could survive the cost-price squeeze the farmers have been faced with in the last ten years. This was never brought more to light than by the special report on farm machinery prices tabled in the House last Friday. This is a prime example of how the farmer has had to sell in open world markets, yet buy his equipment in a protected Canadian market.

I have received many letters from constituents who indicate their alarm over recent government action. I should like to quote from a letter I received last week from a constituent who is a farmer. He said:

> Hon. Otto Lang's attitude to farmers selling grain at below Wheat Board price seems to indicate a total lack of understanding of western farmers' problems. No one would willingly sell his grain at less than market price unless he was desperate for cash. Surely instead of attacking farmers, Mr. Lang would do better to spend his energy on finding legitimate ways for the farmers to obtain cash for their product.
>
> Another thing, this is not the time for the government to cut back on funds for agricultural research. Agriculture is not to blame for the present inflationary trend and the government should be making every effort to help the farmers function better, not make things more difficult for them.

This letter is very indicative of western feeling. Other members wish to speak, and I will

not continue much longer. Before I close there are several points I want to stress to the government. The situation in western Canada is very serious, and time is running out. I believe it is time the government got off the cultural kick it is on and got back to the bread and butter issues facing this nation.

When people see their lifetime work going down the drain, they become desperate. This is happening to the farmers and people of western Canada. They are fed-up with talk of Quebec separation and ask what is the point of saving Canada if we cannot survive economically in the west. No matter what meeting I attended during the Christmas recess, I found this feeling. This is not meant as a threat that western Canada wants to separate. The people there feel, as we all feel, that Canada is a great nation with a wonderful future. However, let me again stress to the government that the situation in western Canada is critical, and it is a shame that this should happen because of lack of action by the government. The government seems to have two speeds in facing up to agricultural problems—slow and very slow. Let us have immediate action from this government to alleviate the serious situation in western Canada.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, during my few remarks this evening I do not intend to add to the waves of criticism that have been washing over the Canadian Wheat Board in recent months. I believe there are faults both in the make-up of the board and in the manner of its operation. Many of these faults have already been mentioned. It is my firm conviction that the board has been largely the scapegoat for the shortcomings of others, notably a long line of Liberal ministers whose only contribution in recent years has been to manipulate the Canadian Wheat Board for purely political advantage.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The real culprit in bringing Canadian agriculture, and western grain producing agriculture in particular, to its present critical state is the Liberal Party that turned its back on this country's agricultural community deliberately and which has kept it turned for the past five years or more. The sorry mess in which we find ourselves today is as much due to the inadequacies of the present Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) as to any faults in our system of marketing grain.

[Mr. Stewart (Marquette).]

Instead of spending his time trying to sell the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the cabinet to the west and trying to engineer the merger of the provincial wing of his new party with his old party, he should have been selling the west to this administration, which in so far as action or interest is concerned appears to be completely ignorant that the west exists within confederation. It is apparent from the attitude of this government to the west, and people and things western, that the Prime Minister's Canada ends at the Lakehead.

As long as we have a federal system of buying, handling and selling our wheat, as long as the whole apparatus is dependent upon the government of the day, it will continue to be effective or ineffective in direct proportion to the amount of importance and support accorded it by Ottawa. We could have the best and most up-to-date grain marketing set-up in the world, but it would still be unsatisfactory as long as the federal government continued to callously disregard the needs of the agricultural industry and gave it no priority among the items of national business. I suggest, therefore, the first and most necessary thing Parliament must do is generate a real and informed concern within this government for agriculture. Then, and then only, will we be able to get anywhere in completely overhauling and modernizing our system of marketing Canadian grains.

In respect of the grain industry, the fact is that while the primary producers, the farmers, have taken giant strides forward in adapting modern technology and methods to their end of the business, the rest of it has remained in the horse and buggy era of the 1920's and 1930's. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Ritchie), farmers have increased their per capita productivity at a tremendous rate which surpasses that of any other industrial classification in Canada. Yet the system of marketing their output—and in the area of grain-handling the government has denied the farmers any responsibility—remains archaic. This system of marketing is not only cumbersome and ineffective but is petrified in a mould that could operate at all only in the best of all seller's markets. It is useless in the world market place of today and in a market that has become, and is likely to remain in the foreseeable future, a buyer's market.

This is clearly demonstrated by considering the process by which Canadian grain is

shipped and exported, which demonstrates that Canada's marketing facility consists of four large foreign firms, two controlled by French capital and two controlled by United States capital. Let me illustrate this simply by quoting a few paragraphs from an article by John Schmidt, agricultural editor of the Calgary *Herald*. In it he expresses some interesting facts about Canada's international wheat sales:

> Is it really a serious matter that Canada has no major exporting firm selling any volume of Canadian grain?
>
> The answer is yes.
>
> And the reason is that if any large import order by a major wheat user was put up for tender tomorrow Canada would probably get last chance at supplying the order.
>
> This is because four major international trading companies perform most of the shipping and exporting arrangements for the Canadian Wheat Board. They are Dreyfus and Bunge (controlled by French capital) and Cargill and Continental Grain Company (controlled by American capital).
>
> It was Dreyfus and Company which got wind of the Russian wheat shortage in 1961. This company's representatives undertook to dig up wheat supplies for Russia.
>
> The first move was to buy all the surplus French wheat.
>
> That wasn't enough so Dreyfus sold the Russians all they could buy of the remainder of a short Argentine crop.
>
> Then the company picked up a significant portion of the Australian crop.
>
> Fourthly, it came to Canada for what was left of the Ontario winter wheat crop.
>
> And finally—after all other supplies were exhausted—they came to Western Canada because Dreyfus knew the Canadian Wheat Board would give it the smallest working margin for shipping insurance, credit arrangements and delivery dates for acting on its behalf. The only point at which the wheat board entered the negotiations was in setting the price at which it would sell Canadian wheat.
>
> Most commercial sales of Canadian grain are made by these shipping and exporting companies—or rather it would be true to say that they go around and dig up the orders.
>
> Even when the wheat board signs a sales contract with a government importing agency of a buying country (in the case of countries where free enterprise has been eradicated) the final arrangements are left to either Bunge, Dreyfus, Continental or Cargill.
>
> Naturally the Canadian Wheat Board would give the business to a Canadian company if there was a Canadian company now in this business. Canada has no merchant princes who want to work at the small margins the wheat board offers.
>
> This may explain why France, for instance, is cutting into Canada's barley market in Japan.

With all our know-how and ingenuity Canadians could surely set up such a selling agency of their own. Mr. Schmidt has suggested a consortium of all the private and co-operative handling companies together with the banks. Whatever form it might take, it would be a great improvement on our present system of subletting our sales prerogative to disinterested, profit-conscious foreign firms. Another thing that is desperately needed in my estimation is establishment of a close liaison between the market-wise scouts and salesmen of Canadian grain and the primary producer, the farmer.

It seems to me it is vital to have a swift and direct channel of market information by means of which the Canadian producer can be made aware of what types of crops and what quantities are in demand around the world. The weekly Richardson letter on the grain trade for January 15 states that we have lost and are continuing to lose sale after sale of crops such as barley, flax and rapeseed because the physical crop was not available at the ports for shipping.

This market demand must have been foreseen months ago, yet lack of liaison and dissemination of pertinent information prevented adequate supplies being moved to suitable sites in time for sales. This letter, incidentally, mentioned the loss of any possible share of this month's Japanese tender for 180,000 tons of wheat because the Wheat Board raised the price ¾ of a cent only a day before the tender. According to the Richardson letter, the Japanese buyers were more offended by the act than by the price increase. The result was that Canada lost every bushel of that large sale of about 9 million bushels to Australia and the United States.

Mr. Speaker, through you may I ask the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) how we can explain this scandalous blunder to those farmers who are being forced to sell their wheat at the present time for 60 cents or 50 cents a bushel?

I would adopt the suggestion made by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Stewart) in respect of overseas storage. Then we would not be restricted to the sale of grain in boatload quantities. This would enable the operation to be more flexible.

I believe a very good place at which to start a general overhaul of our system would be cleaning up the confusion that exists within the government concerning which minister is responsible for what particular phase of agriculture. There is no sense subdividing responsibility and having the Minister

without Portfolio responsible for the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board and the Minister of Agriculture responsible for other aspects of the industry. Neither one, in my view, is capable of the action required to bring the system up to modern standards. One is beguiled by the idea of an efficient handling and storage system, and the other by the idea of trying to convince his party colleagues that he is really a Liberal. While the former, apparently, is at least trying to do something constructive, albeit in a very cold-blooded manner, neither appears to be at all concerned with solving the basic problem, which is selling wheat.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Speaking of efficiency, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister without Portfolio whether he considers it efficient to have hundreds of thousands, if not millions of bushels of grain lying exposed to the elements and deteriorating while millions of bushels of storage space is lying idle at the Lakehead.

The stubborn refusal of the government to recognize the just claims which the agricultural community has upon the rest of the country is baffling. It is well established today that the west feels it has been disinherited by the government. This feeling is even more pronounced among western farmers who have waited in vain for a few crumbs from the government's table which has been laden with good things for Quebec and Ontario. As an example, one might point to the recent $125 million write-off, in one day, in respect to the Expo Corporation which, by the way, equals three annual acreage payments made by the former Conservative administration to western farmers.

Canada's agricultural community has begun to realize it has been declared expendable by the government. Members of that community are becoming suspicious that they are being used cynically and callously by the government to carry the main burden of the fight against inflation. Many farmers now believe that the government is deliberately withholding action to stimulate the sale of grain, in order to cool-off the economy of the west and, eventually, the economy of the country as a whole. It is hard to find a more logical explanation. If there is one, I am sure the people of western Canada would like to be let in on the secret.

Much more could be said on this question, Mr. Speaker, but if the government's ears are wilfully closed to all advice and exhortation, it will profit us little to belabour the point. I would simply say in closing that the need for immediate and drastic action in regard to our whole process of handling and selling grain is clearly apparent. Suggestions have been made over and over again by many people knowledgeable in the field, and these are readily available. All that is required is government backing and leadership. The government has a clear responsibility to act, and a duty to act quickly and effectively to preserve an historic, valuable and necessary segment of Canada's social and economic life.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I thank all hon. members who have kindly helped the member from Bellechasse get an apportunity to say at least a few words.

The matter we are now examining is so important, in my opinion, that it should be approached in an unbiased way. When we were dealing with the problems of Canadian farmers, whether in western or in eastern Canada, I always felt that they should be given serious consideration in order that we could recommend solutions to the government.

Last spring, the Committee on Agriculture travelled throughout Canada primarily for the purpose of examining the important problems of western farmers and in order to determine whether the representations of the members for those regions were really justified. I deeply regret that the report of the committee has not yet been put before the House for lack of some highly important briefs as yet not submitted, although the solutions they offer are likely to correct the situation to a certain extent.

I am not a feed grain producer, but I must say that in my constituency large quantities of western grain are used. Co-operative milling plants import more than two million bushels of feed grain a year.

Were the movement of grain from western to eastern Canada made by ship—in accordance with the proposals of certain studies which have been made—thousands of dollars could be saved.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that it is 9.45. I would not wish to delay the question unduly. Perhaps we will have another opportunity to

express the views of Quebec farmers on the problem of western feed grain. I do hope I shall then be able to inform you of the suggestions made by eastern flour mills and the Federated Co-operative, and explain the advantages stemming from co-operation, because the consumption of feed grain is highest in the province of Quebec.

In fact, we are interesting customers for western farmers and they can be sure of our full co-operation.

Mr. Speaker: It being 9:45 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings pursuant to section 9 of Standing Order 58 and put every question necessary to dispose of the business now before the House.

[*English*]

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Gleave) which was negatived on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Broadbent
Burton
Carter
Coates
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gleave
Godin
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Latulippe
Lewis
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Matte
Mazankowski
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nystrom
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rose
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Valade
Winch
Yewchuk—78.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Comtois
Corbin
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Duquet
Émard
Forest
Forget
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gillespie
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Jamieson
Kaplan
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
McBride
McNulty
Major
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Roy (Timmins)
Serré
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—107.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. The question is on the main motion.

Division

Some hon. Members: Dispense.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of hon. members that we proceed with the vote without ringing the bells?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

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

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Broadbent
Burton
Carter
Coates
Code
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Fairweather
Flemming
Forrestall
Fortin
Gleave
Godin
Gundlock
Hales
Harding
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Latulippe
Lewis
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Matte
Mazankowski
Moore
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Muir (Lisgar)
Nesbitt
Nystrom
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rose
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Simpson
Skoberg
Skoreyko
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Valade
Winch
Yewchuk—78.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Comtois
Corbin
Crossman
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Duquet
Émard
Forest
Forget
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gillespie
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Hogarth
Hopkins
Hymmen
Jamieson
Kaplan
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
McBride
McNulty
Major
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mongrain
Morison
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Roy (Timmins)
Serré
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stanbury
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting—107.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, January 21, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. DINSDALE—LETTER RESPECTING NATIONAL PARKS TABLED BY MINISTER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. Yesterday afternoon the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development tabled a letter bearing my signature. I was out of the House attending a meeting with the chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission, the Hon. Jack Pickersgill, in the company of the Premier of Manitoba, the Manitoba Minister of Industry and Commerce and the mayor of Brandon.

An hon. Member: What a group!

Mr. Dinsdale: The meeting was convened to discuss ways and means for continuing the present class one air service into western Manitoba which has been threatened by Transair's application to suspend the service. Because of the implications of the proposed change in regional air policy for continuing economic progress in western Manitoba, I think you will agree that the meeting had top priority. This, then, is the first opportunity I have had to deal with the minister's action.

The issue raised in the House yesterday brings into focus the whole question of leaseholds in western national parks. It is also closely tied in to the feeling of isolation and alienation that is growing to an alarming degree in western and northwestern Canada, as has been pointed out recently in press articles. The government has demonstrated a congenital incapacity to deal with the serious special problems in these important areas of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. gentleman immediately to remind him that he has the floor now under very special rules and the requirement at this time is that he should indicate how his privileges as a member of this House have been violated by the tabling of the letter to which he alludes in the notice he has given me. If he will indicate in what way he thinks there has been a breach of privilege, then further action might be contemplated. Certainly this is not the time to discuss the general policy which is perhaps the background of the tabling of the letter yesterday by the minister.

Mr. Dinsdale: I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker. I merely made that reference because the problem is peculiar to the west inasmuch as there are no national parks in Quebec and only minor ones in Ontario. In tabling the letter the minister implied that it endorsed a policy that the Liberal government has been pursuing in respect of western national parks since 1963.

My question of privilege revolves around two fundamental matters: first, the right of the minister to table a letter signed by another Privy Councillor without first seeking the customary permission from the author and, second, the ethics of using this kind of cheap politics to stir up further trouble in the west.

The letter, of course, in no way endorses what the minister is attempting to do in the western parks today. It merely outlines the orderly plan that was adopted in 1962 for the development of national parks in western Canada based on the principles of wise management and multi-use that emerged out of the Resources for Tomorrow Conference in 1961. It carefully preserves the right of perpetuity in the original leases.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the letter was tabled. It is now the property of the House. It was tabled without my permission, and I do not think hon. members will have the opportunity of perusing it unless they make special efforts to do so.

The implication was left by the minister that it endorses his policy. I shall be as brief as I can on this fundamental point. It does not endorse that policy because the minister has arbitrarily cancelled perpetuity in original leases. The issue was taken to the Exchequer Court by the residents of the western parks and their position was upheld by that court. The minister has now referred the matter to

the Supreme Court, hoping to get that decision reversed. It is because of these situations that there is a growing feeling of alienation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the same situation is involved in the question asked by the hon. member for Oxford with reference to the rental reassessments that are now taking place in the national parks. This, again, was a policy agreed to only after long consultation with the advisory councils and the people in the parks, and it has nothing to do with the current increases of up to 4,000 per cent.

On the strength of the points I have made, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that I be allowed to table some documents, with the consent of the House, which put the record straight. I am sure all hon. members would want this to be done in light of the distortions arising from the discussion yesterday.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As I indicated a moment ago, the hon. member got the floor on a question of privilege of which he had given the Chair due notice according to the Standing Orders. The observations of the hon. member were not followed by a motion so that in the ordinary way we cannot pursue the matter further. In any event, I have serious doubts whether there is an actual question of privilege.

The minister tabled the letter or document yesterday under the provisions of Standing Order 41(2) which gives a minister the right at any time to table a document or a paper. The hon. member suggested that the minister should perhaps have obtained his prior consent or permission. This is certainly not a requirement under the Standing Order and the Chair has to be guided by the Standing Orders.

I respectfully suggest to the hon. member that it would have been competent for any hon. member, under a motion for production of papers, to request the tabling of this and any other paper in the possession of the minister, under the terms of the Standing Orders. This is perhaps all *obiter dicta* because the hon. member has made his point. He has not followed his point by a formal motion which the Chair would have to put to the House. That would conclude my ruling on the question of privilege raised by the hon. member.

As a sequel to his observations he has suggested that additional papers might be tabled. The House is responsible for its own procedures. The House can accept the tabling of any documents whether it be by a minister or by a private member on one side or other of the House. If that were the wish of the House I am sure that so far as the Chair is concerned there is no objection to the tabling of the documents to which the hon. member for Brandon-Souris has alluded. But that would not be in accordance with any of the Standing Orders of the House. Standing Order 41 to which I have referred, under which the minister has tabled the letter in question, provides as follows:

> A Minister of the Crown, or a Parliamentary Secretary acting on behalf of a Minister, may, in his place in the House, state that he proposes to lay upon the Table of the House, any report or other paper dealing with a matter coming within the administrative responsibilities of the government—

That Standing Order does not appear to extend to a private member. If there is unanimous consent the papers can be received at the table. If there is not unanimous consent perhaps the hon. member would wish to seek another way of bringing them to the attention of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No.

An hon. Member: You wouldn't, Macdonald.

Mr. Dinsdale: For my own information, Mr. Speaker, do I take it from your decision that ministers have the right to table partial documentation that distorts the situation and misleads the House?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: We should not get into debate on this matter. I do not make the rules. I took the trouble of reading all of the Standing Order and it gives the minister the right to table the document. If there is agreement by all hon. members that additional documents be tabled the Chair, as I said, has no objection, but my ruling is simply a reading of the Standing Order. I did not write it. The Standing Order is a rule of the House, and I can only bring it to the attention of hon. members. It is unfortunate if the Standing Order has the effect that the hon. member suggests and difficulties result, but I would not think I am in a position to rectify the situation as a procedural matter.

Mr. Nesbitt: I rise on a question of privilege, Your Honour. This matter arose as a result of a question I directed to the minister yesterday. The minister requested permission to

table the document in question to clarify his answer and of course all members of the House, including myself, gave the minister permission. I should like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is shocking that the President of the Privy Council has taken this attitude. It is very unfair.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Third report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, in French and in English—Mr. Lessard (La Salle).

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NEWSTART PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent of the House to make the following motion under Standing Order 43:

That the abandonment by the government of the Canada Newstart Program be referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development for consideration and report, and

That the Standing Committee on Regional Development be convened for purposes of organization.

By way of brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the Standing Committee has not yet been organized although there have been several requests from hon. members interested in the many questions of regional development which urgently need examination. One of the most urgent problems to be considered is the apparent abandonment of the hopeful Newstart program, which is causing great consternation amongst the native and other people in all areas where the program has been in operation and in particular in the Lac-la-Biche area in Alberta. The Lac-la-Biche centre has been occupied by Métis and Indian people since last Saturday and some immediate response from the government and Parliament is necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion of the hon. member for Athabasca. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

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

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

STUDIES OF PHARMACEUTICAL FIRMS' DRUG TESTS

Question No. 55—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Is the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare undertaking special studies to evaluate whether drug tests submitted to the Directorate by pharmaceutical firms are ineptly designed and deficient, as disclosed in some tests reported in the United States.

2. Is the government considering legislation which would take away the major responsibility for evaluating new drugs from the pharmaceutical manufacturers and give it to the federal government?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. The Food and Drug Regulations require pharmaceutical manufacturers to submit details of all animal and clinical studies to the Food and Drug Directorate of the Department of National Health and Welfare before a new drug is marketed. This research data is carefully assessed and evaluated by officers in the Directorate. If the safety and effectiveness of the drug has not been clearly demonstrated, either by reason of deficient or poorly designed studies, the Notice of Compliance is withheld until properly designed studies have been conducted. In addition, officers of the Directorate frequently discuss proposed plans for both animal and clinical studies with manufacturers and with individual investigators.

2. The majority of new drugs that reach the market are the result of the research and development activities of the pharmaceutical industry. Existing legislation under the Food and Drugs Act ensures that a proper evaluation of the safety and efficacy of all new drugs is made before they reach the Canadian market.

IMMIGRATION APPLICATION, DR. A. A. SOLOOJEE

Question No. 58—**Mr. Nystrom:**

Did a Dr. A. A. Soloojee, a citizen of South Africa apply for immigration to Canada and, if so,

were any conditions laid down by the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding Dr. Soloojee's application?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Dr. Saloojee's application for admission to Canada as an immigrant was assessed and approved under the same standards used for all immigrants. No special conditions were laid down in his case. Because he was engaged to be married to a person whose application had been refused, both Dr. Saloojee and his fiancee were informed that should he proceed with his plans to migrate, this would result in separation from his fiancee. In addition, he was asked to sign a document which in effect indicated that he had been given this advice and understood its significance.

ADMISSION TO CANADA OF MISS EDNA WILCOX

Question No. 59—**Mr. Nystrom:**

Is Miss Edna Wilcox, of South Africa, being denied admission to Canada and if so, what is meant by the statements of officials of the Department that her admission would not be in the national interest?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, because she is prohibited for admission to Canada under subsection (1) of section 5 of the Immigration Act.

SUBSIDY TO DAY AND ROSS, TRUCKERS

Question No. 136—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What is the present subsidy being paid to the trucking firm Day and Ross, Hartland, N.B., under the Atlantic Region Freight Rate Assistance Act?

2. What are the specific reductions in both its class and commodity rates of the above trucking firm as mentioned in the Department of Transport's news release of October 3, 1969?

3. Have all other trucking firms operating between the Atlantic Region and Central Canada instigated similar rate reductions and, if so, what are the names of these trucking firms and for each, what have been the specific rate reductions?

4 Which trucking companies have not reduced their freight rates?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Department of Transport advise as follows: 1. To be answered by the Canadian Transport Commission.

2. The rate reductions are on file with the highway transport boards of Quebec and Ontario and can be obtained from that source.

3 and 4. To be answered by the Canadian Transport Commission.

[Mr. Nystrom.]

The Canadian Transport Commission advise as follows: 1. The present subsidy being paid is that provided for by sub section (2) of Section 3 of the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act. As of October 23rd, 1969, $56,125.43 had been authorized for payment to Day and Ross, Hartland, N.B.

2. To be answered by the Department of Transport.

3. No.

4. Information not available.

NEW JERSEY GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME PLAN

Question No. 160—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. Has the Department of National Health and Welfare sent any officials or outside consultants to investigate the guaranteed annual income plan introduced in New Jersey in the United States?

2. If so, who are the officials, and what was the specific purpose of their investigation?

3. For what time period were these officials in New Jersey?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1 and 2. The Department has obtained information about the guaranteed annual income plan introduced in New Jersey in the United States. Information about United States developments in social security and other anti-poverty measures is obtained by the Department of National Health and Welfare from government agencies in the United States directly and through the Canadian Embassy in Washington.

Discussions concerning social security and other anti-poverty measures which included the New Jersey pilot project, have taken place between departmental officials and U.S. officials in Washington.

These officials include the following: Dr. R. B. Splane and Mr. L. Shifrin, in December, 1968.

3. Discussions were with officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Health Education and Welfare in Washington. Officials were not in New Jersey.

SOUTH AFRICA—WITHDRAWAL FROM COMMONWEALTH

Question No. 296—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. On what date did South Africa withdraw from the Commonwealth?

2. On what date did Canada cancel Commonwealth trade preferences with South Africa?

3. If preferences are still granted to South Africa, is it the government's intention to cancel them?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. May 31, 1961.

2. Canada continues to exchange preferential tariff treatment with the Republic of South Africa under the provisions of the Canada-South Africa Trade Agreement, 1932.

3. No.

*MOTOR VEHICLE STANDARDS COMPLIANCE TESTS

Question No. 428—**Mr. Mather:**

Will motor vehicle standards compliance tests be conducted by the federal motor vehicle safety authority and, if so, will the results of such tests be published?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-137 (Motor Vehicle Safety Act) envisages the use of a national safety mark for motor vehicles, and in connection with these marks there will be required a statement by the manufacturer indicating that such vehicles and their components comply with all applicable safety standards. The manufacturer will support his statement with tests which may be subject to scrutiny by federal inspectors. Consideration is presently being given to the need for additional independent tests by the federal government to verify compliance as certified. The benefit that might accrue to the Canadian public from the publication of test results is also being studied.

[*English*]

BREATH ANALYSIS OF DRIVERS

Question No. 493—**Mr. Robinson:**

Is the federal government giving consideration to a change in the present breath analysis legislation to reflect the widely held view that 0.10% blood alcohol concentration level is the point at which all human beings, regardless of their drinking habits, are considered impaired in respect to safe performance of the driving task?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: No. Our information indicates that there is more support for .08 including support from such sources as the Canadian Bar Association, the British Medical Association (the Canadian Medical Association recommended .05), the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs and by resolution of the Manitoba Legislature adopted on May 22, 1968. In fact, it was considerations related to this greater support that led the Government to change the figure from .10 in Bill C-195 to .08 in Bill C-150.

CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOOLS, PORTNEUF

Question No. 547—**Mr. Godin:**

1. Since 1966, has the federal government undertaken to contribute financially to the construction of schools in the Constituency of Portneuf and, if so, for what types of schools were such grants given?

2. How many such schools have been built to date and where are they situated?

3. How many projects have been approved to date or are being considered at the present time?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Manpower and Immigration and Indian Affairs and Northern Development as follows: 1. Yes. For schools which provide occupational training facilities.

2. Eight: Ancienne Lorette, Donnacona (2), Neufchatel, St. Emile, St. Raymond, Charlesbourg, Loretteville (1961 to 1969).

3. Ten. Including those in 2 above.

*MOTORCYCLE ACCIDENT DEATHS

Question No. 550—**Mr. Southam:**

1. What action if any, is the government taking in relation to the heavy increase in motorcycle deaths and related high injury rate on our Canadian highways?

2. What scientific research, if any, is presently underway in Canada with a view of curtailing this heavy death toll due to motorcycle accidents?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the answer to question No. 550 is somewhat detailed and lengthy and that I would probably not be allowed to read it in full, I beg leave of the House for the reply to that question to be taken as read and reported in *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Loiselle: 1. Of the 29 motor vehicle safety standards that are already available as a basis for issuing regulations after passage of the proposed Motor Vehicle Safety Act (Bill C-137) there are 9 that will include requirements applicable to motorcycles. An additional group of 5 safety standards are also under consideration.

Questions

The Road and Motor Vehicle Traffic Safety office has also undertaken to correlate research being done in Canada that will deal with motorcycles as well as other motor vehicles. The office is also participating in international efforts aimed at greater uniformity in traffic signs and rules of the road that should make driving safer for all types of vehicles.

In addition, the government is financially supporting the work of the Canada Safety Council and the Traffic Injury Research Foundation of Canada, organizations that promote safety research and driver training programs that contribute to the safety of motorcycle drivers. It also is anticipated that implementation of the recent amendments to the Criminal Code with respect to the blood alcohol content of persons in charge of motor vehicles will also tend to decrease accidents involving motorcycles and their drivers.

2. The Ontario Department of Transport has studies underway to determine the effectiveness of protective devices, in particular headgear, in reducing motorcycle fatalities and injuries.

[*English*]

CANADA MANPOWER CENTRE, VICTORIAVILLE

Question No. 552—**Mr. Fortin:**

How much has the Canadian Government spent annually on the premises reserved for the Canada Manpower Centre in Victoriaville since its opening (a) on administration (b) on rental (c) on maintenance (d) on repair (e) for other purposes?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of Manpower and Immigration and Public Works as follows:

	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
(a) Administration:							
Salaries						106,000.	109,000.
Operations						6,000.	6,400.

The Department of Manpower and Immigration records for Victoriaville cover the above mentioned periods only.

(b) Rental	5,225.	11,280.	11,208.	11,280.	11,280.	11,280.	11,280.
(c) Maintenance		140.	225.	205.	256.		
(d) Repair	656.					637.	174.
(e) Other Purposes:							
Electricity	446.	1,106.	1,028.	974.	950.	905.	831.
Moving	227.					370.	
Freight		2.	8.	24.			

Note: Canada Manpower Centre opened in Victoriaville on September 14, 1962.

INDIAN AND MÉTIS UNEMPLOYMENT, ALBERTA

Question No. 569—**Mr. Yewchuk:**

1. How many Indian or Metis people are presently unemployed in the Province of Alberta?

2. How many of these would be suitable for work, if trained, in Alberta's coal mining industry?

3. How many miners are required for work at Grande Cache, Alberta at the present time and in the foreseeable future?

4. How many miners have been brought to work in Grande Cache (a) from other parts of Canada (b) from countries other than Canada (c) how many from each of the countries, other than Canada?

5. What financial assistance has been made available to each of these miners and their families (a) for moving them to Grande Cache from other areas of Canada (b) for moving them to Grande Cache from countries other than Canada?

[Mr. Loiselle.]

6. Does the Department of Manpower and Immigration have plans to train Canadian Indians or Metis for employment at Grande Cache and, if so, how many trainees will be trained and when will training begin?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by several Departments as follows:
1. and 2. Information not available.

3. The Company at Grande Cache has a staff of about 216 persons. The Company is not hiring additional workers at this time because of the need to consolidate their existing staff into an effective working group. Eventual requirements are not known precisely but the best estimate possible at this time is 400 to 600 employees when the full work force is developed.

4. (a) About 100 workers are from outside Alberta. (b) About 65 workers are immigrants. (c) Nearly all immigrant workers have come from the United Kingdom.

5. (a) Seven workers and their families were assisted under the Manpower Mobility Program to move from other parts of Canada to Grande Cache at an average cost of $671. The Company made private arrangements with other workers. (b) Immigrants proceeding to Grande Cache from other countries receive from this Department all ordinary assistance available to immigrants which could include Assisted Passage Loans if required.

6. There is a nucleus of 150 experienced miners at Grande Cache and in addition approximately 50 inexperienced workers have been recruited by the Company and are reported to be in training now. More unskilled workers will be phased in during the next two or three years through training on-the-job. Manpower officials will continue to press the Company to hire as many local workers as possible, including Indians and Metis. If Indian and Metis workers require any special training in order to qualify for the Company training on-the-job program then the Department of Manpower and Immigration is prepared to consider the provision of the necessary training under the Occupational Training for Adults Program.

OIL AND GAS EXPLORATION PERMITS, WEST COAST

Question No. 595—**Mr. Harding:**

1. How many oil and gas exploration permits were issued by the federal government for the west coast area of Canada for each of the years 1967/68, 1968/69 and 1969/70 to date, and (a) to whom were these permits issued and what was the acreage involved in each case (b) what was the total revenue from these leases for each of the above fiscal years (c) how many of the leases are still valid (d) did any of the leases cover any part of the Strait of Georgia and, if so, which leases included this area, when were they issued and what was the acreage involved?

2. Have any permits for seismic testing for oil in the Strait of Georgia, apart from the above, been let by the provincial government and, if so, was approval sought and obtained from the federal government prior to the issuing of the permits?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1. (a) and (b) No oil and gas leases have been issued to date off the West Coast. Oil and gas exploratory permits issued off the West Coast for the periods designated are as follows:

Fiscal Year	Permits issued	Acres issued		Revenue (Permit fees)
1967-68	1	42,238	Ranger Oil (Canada) Ltd.	$ 250.00
	11	478,930	Offshore Oil & Gas Corpn.	2,750.00
	6	294,698	Chermarc Developments Ltd.	1,500.00
	18	815,866		$ 4,500.00
1968-69	8	247,828	Offshore Oil & Gas Corpn.	2,000.00
	5	192,806	Shell Canada Ltd.	1,250.00
	5	197,030	Ranger Oil (Canada) Ltd.	1,250.00
	5	327,312	Citizens Pipeline Ltd.	1,250.00
	23	964,976		$ 5,750.00
1969-70	Nil	Nil		Nil
Totals	41	1,780,842		$10,250.00

(c) All permits issued since 1967 are still in force.

(d) No permits or leases were issued in the Strait of Georgia during the above designated periods.

2. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has no record of approvals that may be issued by the British Columbia Government for marine seismic programs. The federal government has approved, prior to their commencement, four seismic programs in the Strait of Georgia since 1967, all of which were carried out with air-gun type seismic equipment which is harmless to fish. The duration of these programs ranged from two days to ten days.

Questions

ABM SAFEGUARD SYSTEM—BIDS BY CANADIAN FIRMS

Question No. 643—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Are Canadian firms presently, under the Canada-U.S. Defence Production Sharing Agreement, attempting to bid for components, materials, etc., to be used in the construction of the U.S. ABM Safeguard System and, if so, what firms and specific materials are involved?

2. Is the International Programs Branch of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce presently attempting to pursue contracts for Canadian firms regarding the construction of the American ABM Safeguard System?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The Department is not aware of any Canadian firms bidding for contracts relating to the U.S. ABM Safeguard System although, under the Canada-U.S. Production Sharing Program Canadian companies would be eligible to compete.

2. The International Programs Branch of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is not actively seeking contracts for Canadian firms regarding the construction of the U.S. ABM Safeguard System.

*EXPORTS TO U.S. BY ALCAN

Question No. 644—**Mr. Broadbent:**

For the years 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 to date, what products, and in what financial magnitude, have been exported to the United States from the Canadian firm ALCAN, under the Canada-U.S. Production Sharing Agreement?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the information requested is not releasable since it is provided to the Canadian government for statistical purposes only and on the understanding that it is to be treated as commercially confidential affecting the competitive position of the company involved.

EMIGRATION OF McGILL GRADUATES TO UNITED STATES

Question No. 651—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. During the past ten years, how many students from McGill University have emigrated to the United States upon completion of their studies?

2. What percentage is this of the total number of students graduating from that institution?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I and 2. Information not available.

REFORM OF EXCHEQUER COURT

Question No. 658—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What stage has been reached in the studies relating to reform of the Exchequer Court?

[Mr. Orange.]

2. Is the government studying means of improving judicial control of government decisions so that citizens may be better protected?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: The government is studying ways and means of improving judicial control of administrative decisions and it is anticipated that legislation will be introduced during the present session dealing with the Exchequer Court and judicial control of administrative decisions.

PAYMENTS UNDER HOSPITAL INSURANCE AND DIAGNOSTIC SERVICES ACT

Question No. 673—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

What was the total amount paid by the federal government under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act to each of the provinces for 1968?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Newfoundland, $18,042,-070; Prince Edward Island, $3,451,496; Nova Scotia, $26,338,314; New Brunswick, $21,056,-614; Quebec, NIL; Ontario, $264,800,153; Manitoba, $32,943,818; Saskatchewan, $33,800,232; Alberta, $55,281,166; British Columbia, $65,-772,481; Yukon, $459,634; Northwest Territories, $1,028,417; Total: $522,974,395.

The above payments are advance payments and amount to approximately 97 per cent of the estimated contributions by Canada. Final settlements for 1968 will be made when all the audited cost returns have been submitted by the provinces.

Payments are not made to the Province of Quebec under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, but equivalent contributions are allowed to that province under an agreement made under the provisions of the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act. Had advance payments been made to Quebec for 1968 under the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, these advances would have totalled $223,398,983 for the year.

DEMURRAGE CHARGES, SHIPS WAITING FOR GRAIN

Question No. 699—**Mr. Korchinski:**

What amount of demurrage charges were paid for ships waiting for grain in the last two years and at what ports were the delays?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): As indicated in the Annual Report of The Canadian Wheat Board for the 1967-68

crop year, $86,187 was paid in respect of demurrage charges in that crop year. Of this amount $80,601 was applicable to vessels loading at the port of Vancouver and the balance of $5,585 to vessels loading at the port of Montreal. Particulars of demurrage for the following crop year, that is 1968-69, will appear in the Annual Report of The Canadian Wheat Board for that crop year when it is tabled in Parliament.

AEROMAGNETIC PROSPECTING, ABITIBI

Question No. 704—**Mr. Laprise:**

Has the federal government ceased aeromagnetic prospecting in Abitibi and, if so, when and for what reason?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The aeromagnetic survey of Abitibi County was completed in 1962 mainly by the federal government. However the aeromagnetic survey for the whole of Abitibi electoral district is presently going on under a federal-provincial program. It is complete as far north as 52° north latitude and work is now being carried out between 52° and 55° north latitude.

*REGIONAL AND ECONOMIC EXPANSION—NUMBER OF PROJECTS APPROVED

Question No. 705—**Mr. McKinley:**

1. What projects have been approved in Canada under the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion within the conditions contained in Bill C-202, passed in the First Session of the 28th Parliament?

2. How many projects have been approved under this Act in each province of Canada?

3. What amount of money has been approved under this Act in each province of Canada?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the answer to this question is that the numbers of offers made and accepted are available in the report tabled each month in parliament, and details are given in that report of all projects under way.

RURAL POST OFFICE CLOSURES, HALIFAX COUNTY

Question No. 745—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Since 1965, how many post offices servicing rural areas in Halifax County have been closed?

2. Where were such offices located and how many jobs were eliminated through the closing policy?

3. What alternate service is being provided with respect to money orders and other services?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. This information is not available by county. However, two post offices have been closed since 1965 in Dartmouth-Halifax East Electoral District.

2. (a) Post Offices: Gaetz Brook and Oakfield. (b) Two positions were eliminated.

3. Alternate Service: Head of Chezzetcook R.R. No. 1 and Enfield R.R. No. 1.

WATER POLLUTION—CHARGES LAID UNDER NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION ACT

Question No. 759—**Mr. Harding:**

1. For the years 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 to date, how many charges were laid against individuals or companies by persons in the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources responsible for the enforcement of the Navigable Waters Protection Act and Regulations regarding violations of the Act and Regulations dealing with pollution of waters?

2. How many of the above charges resulted in (a) convictions (b) dismissal of the charges (c) withdrawal of the charges?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): 1. None. The Navigable Waters Protection Act and Regulations are administered by the Department of Transport and not by this department.

2. Not applicable.

WATER POLLUTION—CHARGES LAID UNDER FISHERIES ACT

Question No. 760—**Mr. Harding:**

1. For the years 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 to date, how many charges were laid against individuals or companies by persons in the department responsible for the enforcement of the Fisheries Act and Regulations regarding violations of the Act and Regulations dealing with pollution of waters?

2. How many of the above charges resulted in (a) convictions (b) dismissal of the charges (c) withdrawal of the charges?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): 1. and 2.

	Charges	(a)	(b)	(c)
1963-64	11	9	1	1
1964-65	5	4	1	—
1965-66	12	11	1	—
1966-67	7	7	—	—
1967-68	5	5	—	—
1968-69	13	9	2	2
1969-70	12	11	1	—
	65	56	6	3

Motions for Papers

COST OF FREE DELIVERY OF FEDERAL MAIL

Question No. 801—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, is the annual cost to the Post Office Department of the free delivery of federal mail?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1968-69—$8,386,700.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

VALUE OF COMPUTER PURCHASES

Question No. 44—**Mr. Benjamin:**

What is the total value of Canadian government purchases of computers and auxiliary equipment, by manufacturer, that were purchased in the last fiscal year?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 211 and 315 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that notices of motions No. 211 and 315 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

TRAINING MATERIALS FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Motion No. 211—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Strathmere Associates on the planning and production of training materials for community development for use by the Company of Young Canadians in the fiscal year 1966-67, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN ELECTRONIC MAIL IN-FARM MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

Motion No. 315—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report on the Canadian Electronic Mail In-Farm Management Information System, undertaken for the Department of Agriculture by the firm Kates, Peat, Marwick and Company, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 2,452 of the past Session.

Motion agreed to.

[Mr. Whelan.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 260 and 268 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 conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notices of Motions No. 260 and 268 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CBC TELEVISION ADVERTISING REGULATIONS

Motion No. 260—**Mr. Mather:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the CBC regulations regarding TV commercial advertising as mentioned in answer to Question Number 153 reported in Hansard on page 864, November 17, 1969.

Motion agreed to.

RESOURCES RESEARCH CENTRE STUDIES

Motion No. 268—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all research studies undertaken by the Resource Research Centre of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources mentioned in answer to Question Number 86 as reported in *Hansard* on pages 1137-38, November 24, 1969.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call the following notices of motions: Nos. 21, 125, 156, 200, 209, 221, 247, 261, 262, 301, 304, 310 and 325?

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

[*English*]

NATO COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH PROGRAM

Motion No. 21—**Mr. Lewis:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the memorandum of agreement among eight participating NATO countries, including Canada, regarding the second phase of the NATO communications research program established in 1967.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the document referred to in this motion is a memorandum of under-

standing between the governments concerned, and is classified. Such confidential documents are considered to be privileged and I wonder if the hon. member from York South is prepared to withdraw this motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, since the minister was kind enough to let me have a detailed press release on this subject which he issued—

[*Translation*]

I am pleased to withdraw my motion.

Mr. Speaker: Motion withdrawn.

[*English*]

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CANADA—U.S.S.R. WHEAT CONTRACT

Motion No. 125—**Mr. Gleave:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the wheat contract between the Government of Canada and the Government of the USSR signed on June 20, 1966, on the sale of 336 million bushels of Canadian wheat to the USSR.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council: Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) wishes to inform the hon. member that it is not the practice of the government or the Canadian Wheat Board to make public wheat sales contracts as such information might be prejudicial to the board's marketing operations. In view of this, the minister would ask the member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Gleave: Stand for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

METRIC MEASUREMENT

Motion No. 156—**Mr. Peters:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the interdepartmental committee report on the applicability of metric measurement in Canada as mentioned in answer to Question Number 2,706 as reported in *Hansard* on October 22, 1969, page 11,702.

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 report of the interdepartmental committee is a report to ministers which includes recommendations and is, in consequence, an internal memorandum and thereby privileged. The white paper on metric conversion, tabled last week, sets forth the conclusions of the government. In view of this, the minister would ask the member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Peters: Because of the importance of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it should be privileged and I therefore ask Your Honour to put the question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

SUMMER JOBS FOR STUDENTS

Motion No. 200—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the plan of the Special Task Force to study the question of summer jobs for students as stated by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his address to the Canadian Vocational Association on May 23, 1969.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the documents requested in the present motion are working papers for internal use, for the officials of the department and, as such, traditionally privileged.

I therefore request the hon. member to kindly withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I think this document is precisely the kind of document that should be readily available to every Canadian; therefore I request that the question be put.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, AIR TRANSPORT COMMAND

Motion No. 209—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Simpson, Riddell, Stead and Partners on the financial management in Air Transport Command undertaken in 1966 for the Department of National Defence, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the report referred to in this motion was classified by the consultants undertaking the study and was for internal use in my department. Under the

circumstances I wonder if the hon. member for Moose Jaw is prepared to withdraw his motion?

Mr. Skoberg: I see no real national security involved and I call for a vote.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN FURNITURE INDUSTRY

Motion No. 221—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Woods, Gordon and Company on research and development in the Canadian furniture industry undertaken for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal year 1967-68, as mentioned in Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this particular consultant report was already tabled in the House in response to a motion for production of papers in the last session, No. 119, which was dealt with in the House on July 2, 1969. The member may wish to consult sessional paper No. 289G. I would be pleased to send the member a copy of this study. In view of this, the member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

INTERNATIONAL MARKET FOR SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS

Motion No. 247—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Acres Intertel Limited on international market for satellite communications systems undertaken for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal year 1968-69, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this particular consultant report was already tabled in the House in response to a motion for production of papers in the last session, No. 119, which was dealt with in the House on July 2, 1969. The member may wish to consult sessional paper No. 289G. I would be pleased to send the member a copy of this study. In view of this, the member may wish to withdraw his motion.

[Mr. Cadieux (Labelle).]

Mr. Skoberg: Agreed, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

"PROJECT PHOENIX" CORRESPONDENCE

Motion No. 261—**Mr. Nystrom:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence, agreements, etc., between the Government of Canada and the provincial governments regarding "Project Phoenix".

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I had some correspondence with the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville regarding this motion and it is my understanding that he is prepared to withdraw it.

Mr. Nystrom: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

"PROJECT PHOENIX" PROGRAM

Motion No. 262—**Mr. Nystrom:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Department of National Defence's Program "Project Phoenix"—a five year plan aimed at organizing the recovery of Canada after an all-out nuclear attack on North America.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have had some correspondence with the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville regarding this motion and he has been provided with a copy of the Project Phoenix Report. Under the circumstances I wonder if he is prepared to withdraw this motion?

Mr. Nystrom: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE REPORT ON WATER

Motion No. 301—**Mr. Harding:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the interdepartmental committee report on water, referred to by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, as reported in *Hansard,* November 4, 1969, on page 468.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not think any such report as requested by the hon. member is available.

The interdepartmental committee on water has not yet completed its study of this matter of water pollution through the input of phosphates. As the minister stated in the House of Commons on November 4, he is to receive the ICW recommendations as to appropriate federal government action in this regard and refer them to his colleagues for consideration.

The minister expects to be in a position to take this action in the latter part of January or in February following completion of the ICW study of and report on this very complex subject. I would therefore request withdrawal of this motion.

Mr. Harding: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Motion withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN WHEAT BOARD AND V/O EXPORTKHLEB

Motion No. 304—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the agreement entered into in June 1966 between the Canadian Wheat Board and V/O Exportkhleb for the sale of Canadian wheat and flour to Russia and a copy of any agreement, letter of understanding or other documents pertaining to the extension of this agreement beyond its expiry date.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang) wishes to inform the hon. member that it is not the practice of the government to make public details of Canadian Wheat Board sales agreements as such information might be prejudicial to the board's marketing operations. In view of this, the minister would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Burton: I cannot agree to withdraw this motion, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that the question be put to a vote.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is transferred for debate.

CANADA-QUEBEC AGREEMENT ON LANGUAGE AND CITIZENSHIP COURSES

Motion No. 310—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of all documents covering the agreement between the Government of Canada and the Province of Quebec under which 50% of the cost of language and citizenship courses available to Quebec immigrants will be paid for by the federal government.

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): There is an agreement between the government of Canada and the province of Quebec covering the sharing of costs of language and citizenship courses. If that is the document required by the hon. member, the motion is accepted subject to the consent of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Orlikow: That is agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservation expressed by the minister, does the motion carry?

Some hon. Members: Carried.

Motion agreed to.

RECONNAISSANCE REPORT ON NORTHERN MILITARY EXERCISES

Motion No. 325—**Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the reconnaissance report undertaken by General Gilles Turcot, Commander of the DND Mobile Command, regarding military exercises in the Canadian North.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): As this report is an internal military document which was prepared by a group of officers for the Commander, Mobile Command, and Canadian Forces Headquarters, it is considered to be privileged. Under the circumstances I wonder whether the hon. member would be prepared to drop his motion?

Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, had the minister communicated with me as he did with the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville, I might have agreed. As it is, I should like the motion transferred for debate.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an inquiry about motion No. 256 which has been on the Order Paper since November 20. I wonder when the government might be prepared to call this motion.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I shall inquire of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and try to reply to the question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—USE OF SANCTIONS IN DEPARTURES FROM PRICING CRITERIA

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I am happy to see the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs in the House today, Mr. Speaker, because I tried to get some information from the Minister of Finance yesterday and he did not seem to know too much about the subject. I should like to ask the minister this question. In the event of an agreement being reached at the forthcoming conference with regard to pricing criteria to be followed by Canadian firms during 1970, is it the intention of the government to use sanctions in cases where the Prices and Incomes Commission reports a departure from those criteria by a Canadian firm?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): As the Minister of Finance said yesterday, we are working in very close harmony with the Prices and Incomes Commission. I think the Minister of Finance answered that question yesterday.

Mr. Benson: You just did not understand the answer.

Mr. Stanfield: I understand a snow job when I see it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Am I to understand from the answer of the minister that the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission did not have the approval of the government when he said that in the case of departures from the criteria established, should an accord be reached, it was the intention of the commission to ask the government for sanctions?

Mr. Basford: I think the Leader of the Opposition is misrepresenting the statement made by the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission. It is his hope, and it is our hope, that the program of restraint he is endeavouring to work out will be as effective as possible, and it is our intention as a government to make it as effective as possible. In this I hope we shall have the co-operation of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Stanfield: Just one other question, Mr. Speaker. Would it be correct to assume that the program of the government as far as this announcement is concerned is still one of purely voluntary restraint and that there is no question of government sanctions being involved? Is that correct?

Mr. Basford: The Chairman announced yesterday that a meeting will be held to word out procedures by which a program of price restraint can prevail across the country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): A supplementary question to the Minister of Finance in connection with this matter of restraint or lack of restraint. Bearing in mind the recently disclosed information that the Minister of Finance led all cabinet ministers in travel expenses at $10,000 a year, can the hon. gentleman say if that is where he gets his ideas about living on $30 a week?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The Public Accounts Committee will have full opportunity to question the legitimacy of departmental expenditures, including travelling expenses. I believe the people of Canada wish to be informed concerning matters of interest to them. Indeed, it should be the duty of ministers to visit various parts of Canada to keep them so informed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have doubts about whether the original question was in order. The minister was allowed to reply to it in any event, but I do not think supplementary questions on that subject should be allowed.

INCREASE IN AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE RATES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs regarding the announcement by the insurance companies that they intend to raise automobile insurance rates by approximately 13 per cent with effect from February 1 in most areas? Since the minister is the custodian of the rights of consumers I should like to ask him whether he has looked into the question of possible collusion in view of the fact that all the companies seem to be applying an increase of approximately the same amount at the same time. Has the minister looked into this matter and can he indicate what action he proposes to take?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): The situation relative

to the law and to jurisdiction is an extremely complicated one, but since the announcements were made the matter has been receiving urgent examination.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Bearing in mind that the only areas in which these increases will not come into effect are those in which government car insurance is in operation, or where the possibility of introducing government car insurance is under study, has the minister given any thought to the possibility of promoting a government car insurance scheme across the country in order that automobile drivers may receive protection at cost?

Mr. Basford: I think the hon. member well knows that the provision of automobile insurance, the kind of insurance he is talking about, is a provincial matter.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ASSUMPTION OF OBLIGATIONS OF CANAIRELIEF

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

It is known that the Canadian government has made some moneys available to Canairelief for assistance to Biafran refugees. In view of the recent decision to wind up shortly the agency's operations, does the government intend to give that relief organization the assurance that all their justified debts will be settled?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this matter is not under consideration for the time being.

[*English*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INABILITY OF ONTARIO FEDERATION OF AGRICULTURE TO PURCHASE ENGLISH TRACTORS

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Mr. Speaker, and I hope he will co-operate with the farmers of Canada. In view of the apparent difference between the prices charged to English farmers and those charged to Canadian farmers by machinery companies, as indicated by the Barber commission report on the prices of farm tractors in Canada, has the minister been in touch with the restrictive practices tribunal in England to ascertain why the Ontario Federation of Agriculture cannot purchase English tractors directly from English dealers or directly from the manufacturers of tractors in England at the lower prices prevailing there? I ask this question in view of the evidence in the Barber commission report to the effect that machinery dealers in England have been threatened with loss of their franchises if they sell tractors to Canadian farmers.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): As the Minister of Agriculture made clear on Friday, discussions have already been held in Washington and London by officials of the government. Those officials included officials of my department together with anti-trust people in both London and Washington.

REQUESTED REFERENCE OF TRACTOR AND COMBINE PRICE INCREASES TO COMMISSION

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the obvious evidence of price exploitation in respect of farm machinery would the minister refer the question of the price increases announced last fall to the Commission on Prices and Incomes for its careful review?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a more desirable course to follow the course the government is following. We are examining the Barber report recommendations. We have an interdepartmental committee of government examining all the recommendations and what possible course of action the government could follow.

[*Translation*]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

ACTION RESPECTING WILLIAM ROY ROSIK—GENERAL POLICY

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

In Windsor, a certain William Roy Rosik has been sentenced to death for murdering a policeman. I would like to know whether the minister intends to submit his case to the cabinet so as to have the death penalty commuted into life imprisonment, as the cabinet has always done in such cases for several years, or whether the minister will allow justice to take its course.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubt concerning the hon. member's question. He is alluding to the royal prerogative and I have some doubt, because of precedents, whether the question can be asked in that form. The hon. member might like to give the Chair a moment to reflect on the matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, as my previous question was unacceptable, I shall reword it.

Given the considerable increase in the crime rate, both in Quebec and throughout the rest of Canada, does the minister intend to introduce soon in the House a bill to put back in force the death penalty for anyone found guilty of qualified murder, a measure which I think is imperative at the present time?

[*English*]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we are of course reviewing the statistics constantly. I do not feel that at the moment those statistics lead to either one conclusion or the other.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED U.S. NUCLEAR TEST

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Having in mind the announced intention of the United States to conduct an underground nuclear test in the north Pacific approximately six times more powerful than the one they conducted last year, can the minister say what Canada's position is in respect of this potentially dangerous situation?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I answered a similar question some weeks ago. Briefly, the position is that the United States is now looking at the results of the test that was conducted. If there is to be another test it will not be before another couple of years. If at that time we feel it would be desirable to ask them to reconsider, we would do so.

[*Translation*]

COMPENSATION FOR FORMER CANADIAN MILITARY BASES IN FRANCE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Could he tell the House whether he has received an answer from the French government about the Canadian government's claim for $10 million subsequent to the withdrawal of the NATO forces stationed in France?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker; Canada has put in a claim to France, as have other countries, which is separate of course from the claims of the NATO organization as a whole, since we had some investments in France which we lost as a result of moving to Germany.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Does the government intend to forget about this debt or rather to remind the French government of it?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: I do not think it is necessary to remind the French government. It has notice of our claim and I am sure will deal with it fairly.

AIR TRANSPORT

TRENTON, N.S.—DISCONTINUANCE OF SERVICE BY EASTERN PROVINCIAL AIRWAYS

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the importance of air service to the area would the minister advise whether he has received a communication from the government of Nova Scotia asking that the appeal against Eastern Provincial Airways application to discontinue its service at Trenton, Nova Scotia, be heard by the Governor in Council.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, I have had such a notification from the government of Nova Scotia. I find that a discontinuance of this kind is not the kind of case which is subject to appeal either to the minister or to the Governor in Council. However, in an attempt to resolve the problem I have held meetings in adjacent Antigonish and the area to discuss the possibility of possible alternative sites. This is the course we are following now.

Mr. MacEwan: In looking into these possibilities would the minister consider continuing government assistance to the Trenton airport?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

HARBOURS

COME-BY-CHANCE—PROVISION OF DOCKING FACILITIES FOR OIL REFINERY OPERATIONS

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. Has the minister received representations from the Newfoundland government in respect of the provision of docking facilities at Come-By-Chance in order to facilitate the operations of an oil refinery in the community, and when may we expect a decision in this regard?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is a question which might well be placed on the order paper.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

REDUCTION OF SECTION HANDS—EFFECT ON JOB SECURITY AND SAFETY

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether he would inquire of the management of Canadian National Railways whether full consideration has been given to the job security of sectionmen and section foremen, the safety of operating crews and the safety of the travelling public when reductions in the number of such section hands are ordered such as the latest which was to have taken effect on January 15?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I shall be glad to make such an inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Monteith: I wonder if this subject could be dealt with when the CNR management is appearing before the House committee on transport?

Mr. Jamieson: I would suspect, Mr. Speaker, that various members will find ways and means to get such questions in.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in view of the death yesterday of one of the passengers because of the derailment of a CNR train, I wonder whether the Minister of Transport could now answer the question which he took as notice on January 12 in respect of adequate track inspection?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of the unfortunate accident, the railway committee of the Canadian Transport Commission is now carrying out a thorough investigation. I have asked for a complete report as quickly as possible. This will only have a bearing on the broader question asked by the hon. member.

Mr. Skoberg: In order to ensure that trains may operate over the Weston subdivision safely, would the minister give immediate consideration to the installation of automatic signals in this area?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a representation which he can assume has been noted. The hon. member for Sarnia.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPARATION FOR DAMAGE CAUSED BY U.S. ICEBREAKER

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, et mes amis. I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs or the Minister of Transport. I do not care which minister answers because they are both capable men. In view of the fact that an American icebreaker operating in the St. Clair River after the shipping season closed has caused widespread property damage to Canadian property owners, will the minister demand or negotiate reparation payments from the United States government and/or the owner of the icebreaker?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): This is the first time the matter has been brought to my attention. I thank the hon. member and will make inquiries immediately.

TAXATION

MODIFICATION OF WHITE PAPER

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance a question on which there would appear to be some misunderstanding. On Monday the Prime Minister indicated there had been no changes in government policy regarding tax reform. What is the correct situation? Does the white paper represent government policy on tax reform or has this policy been changed in some manner undisclosed but which may be revealed in a subsequent document?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend would contact his members who were at the committee he would find out exactly what I said with regard to what he has referred to on Monday.

I said before the committee that certain problem areas had arisen regarding the proposals which were put forward by the government. My friend is confusing proposals with government policy. These are proposals put to the Canadian people for discussion. I said that my department would present a paper to the committee indicating what difficulties had been pointed out by people in respect of a particular area of tax reform.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Prime Minister is not the only one who is confused; I am in the same position he is. May I ask the Minister of Finance whether, in view of his statement that the proposals put forward by the government are to be changed, he considers it proper that interested and affected Canadians should be asked to prepare and submit briefs in respect of government proposals which have been changed in an undisclosed manner?

Mr. Benson: Oh, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: That is a good question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The suggestion has been made that this is a good question. I have to consider the question from a procedural standpoint. The Leader of the Opposition is asking whether the minister considers it proper that some action ought not to be taken. Certainly a question in those terms is not in order. The hon. member is asking the minister to express an opinion.

Mr. Stanfield: Perhaps I could put it in a different way that might be more acceptable to you and the Minister of Finance, whom I am always desirous of pleasing, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister do all he can to assure that those Canadians who are interested in submitting their views on these proposals will have a full opportunity to consider their positions after the supplementary changes are made? Will the minister do all he can to assure that adequate procedures are followed by the committee and himself so there will be plenty of time for this?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the proposals for tax reform, one can assume, would not represent the exact form of the legislation or one would not put them forward as proposals. We are looking for people's opinions in this regard. The white paper is now in the hands of the committee and it is my intention and that of the officials of my department to supply the committee with information that comes to us from various sources in order that the committee may have that along with the information submitted to it so that it may come up with recommendations in respect of the proposals that have been placed before it.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to be persistent about this matter but it is giving a great many Canadians much concern. Will the minister use his good offices to ensure not only that he and his officials supply all the information necessary to the committee but also that Canadian citizens who are interested in this matter will be given a full opportunity to make their submissions after having full knowledge of what the government's proposals are?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I trust that interested Canadians will follow the proceedings of the committee and make their submissions in light of what takes place there. I am sure they will do this after carefully reading the white paper, something which I sometimes wonder whether the Leader of the Opposition has done.

Mr. Stanfield: You don't understand things too well.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INCREASE IN BANK DIRECTORS' FEES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the government's desire for restraints in order to deal with inflation I should like to ask whether the Minister of Finance will consider discussing with officials of the Toronto-Dominion Bank their recent decision to increase fees paid to directors of the bank from $6,000 per annum to $8,100, since this 33 per cent increase in one jump can hardly be considered moderate or in keeping with the government's austerity program?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear that my hon. friend is also supporting moderation in wage demands.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ALLEGED MISLEADING ADVERTISING BY IMPERIAL TOBACCO COMPANY

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, like other hon. members I want to welcome back the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with a question.

In view of the fact his department has asked the Department of Justice for an opinion on alleged fraudulent advertising of Casino cigarettes by the Imperial Tobacco Company, can the minister say whether this opinion has yet been received by his department and, if so, has a decision been made to lay charges?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the hon. member has a letter from the department regarding the matter referred to in the question. I do not think I can go beyond what is said in the letter she has received.

Mrs. MacInnis: No, Mr. Speaker, the letter did not cover the point at all. If I may say so, the letter merely covered the fact that an opinion had been sought from the Department of Justice. I am asking whether the opinion has been received from the department and, if so, has a decision been made to lay charges?

Mr. Basford: I am not able to add to the letter the hon. member has, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the question asked by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. Will the Minister of Justice inform the House whether his department is or has looked into the alleged fraudulent advertising in connection with Casino cigarettes, whether his law officers have arrived at any conclusion about the matter and, if so, whether any action is contemplated?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is aware of the practice of the office of the Attorney General not to reveal whether it is conducting an investigation of any person or company. If charges are laid, charges are laid; if charges are not laid, the matter rests there. But in order to protect the reputation of private individuals and corporations it has been the tradition, which I think is quite proper, for the Attorney General not to describe in particular terms the existence of an investigation.

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry but it has already been made public by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or one of his officials that the Department of Justice has been asked to look into the matter. In view of that, I rephrase my question and ask the minister whether officers of his department are in fact investigating and looking into the allegations made, whether any conclusions have been reached and whether any report has been made to him and/or to the Department of Consumer Affairs?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am not going to expand on my answer, Mr. Speaker. The letter to which the hon. gentleman refers will have to speak for itself.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will he be in the House tomorrow night at ten o'clock so that we may debate this matter?

Mr. Basford: If the matter is on the agenda, yes.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps that question might be considered at ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REPRESENTATION AT QUEBEC LIBERAL PARTY CONVENTION

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

Can he tell us whether it is true that the CBC sent 195 employees to the Quebec Liberal party convention last weekend?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to say whether it is true that the CBC sent 195 employees to the convention. I can however, forward the question to the Corporation itself which will send the hon. member its answer.

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

BANFF AND JASPER—NEGOTIATIONS FOLLOWING RESIDENTS' REQUEST TO COME UNDER PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development arising out of his answer yesterday in my absence. It has reference to the fact that the citizens of Banff and Jasper, through a plebiscite have asked that they be placed under provincial jurisdiction. Is the minister now in a position to advise that he will negotiate with the premier of Alberta in this regard?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Woolliams: Is it the minister's intention to contact the premier with the idea of negotiating in regard to the request of these citizens that they be placed under provincial jurisdiction?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, this is an hypothetical question which is irrelevant at the present time.

[*English*]

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS IN TWELFTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice to indicate whether any action has been taken by his department following examination of the evidence by the law officers of the Crown, in accordance with the recommendations contained in the twelfth report of the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, when I received the recommendation of the committee, as I said in an earlier answer, I asked the officers of the department and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to investigate the facts or allegations contained in the report. I understand they have not completed their investigation, but when they have I will be glad to report to the hon. member.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO CANADIAN CITIZENS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, last Thursday I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs about instructions under which officers of the Canadian consular service were alleged to have refused to assist Canadian citizens who happened to be in the United States and in trouble with United States draft laws.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Canadian consular officials in the United States regularly provide Canadian citizens who approach them on such matters with advice as to the course they may follow in dealing with problems which may arise in connection with liability for military service. The report to which he refers, and which I have already had drawn to my attention, is quite false.

AIR TRANSPORT

ACTION TO END POLLUTION BY JET PLANES

Mr. G. W. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport, similar to one asked in his absence by the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe. Is the government preparing regulations to require jet aircraft using Canadian airports to convert to clean burning engines, in accordance with instructions being issued in other countries?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I was in Washington yesterday for conversations with Secretary Volpe on this matter. We have determined what it is that the American authorities are doing because there is a necessity for consistency on both sides of the border. We will be moving to impose the same kind of regulations, although I may say in the first instance I do not know if imposition and voluntary restraint are exactly compatible, but we will be talking to the airlines about what they are doing in the United States. This does not relate to fuel but to adapters which are placed on jet engines and which accomplish the same end results.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—USE OF CANADIAN DOCTORS AND NURSES

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Would the hon. gentleman say whether the government has had an opportunity to consider the suggestion I made last week as to whether the Nigerian government needs and would welcome volunteer Canadian doctors and nurses?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is one of the needs in Nigeria. The Canadian Red Cross will be reporting to us on this question, when General Wrinch returns, but it is also my understanding that there is an opportunity for volunteers to get permission to go into Nigeria. Many of them are there now and I imagine they would be used in the present emergency.

SPORTS

PAN-AMERICAN GAMES—INQUIRY AS TO FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO WINNIPEG

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. On December 16, 1969, when I asked him about a certain letter regarding Winnipeg's request for assistance in connection with the deficit in respect of the Pan-American Games he told me he would try to get the letter to me that afternoon or the next day. When it did not arrive I thought he must have put it in the mail—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): —but he told me two or three days later that he was redrafting the letter—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member because the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate wishes to raise a point of order.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the question period can we have the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre phrase his questions like other members of the House, succinctly and clearly?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If the hon. member would like me to start over again, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. Trudeau: Learn the rules.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Since the Minister of Finance told me he was redrafting this letter, I wonder if he is now in a position to send it to me or tell me in the House what is going to be in it?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am still not happy with the answer I have drafted at the moment and the matter is still under consideration. As I have explained to the hon. member, it is a long outstanding matter. I hope he will have patience and give me a little time to have it settled before I send him a letter I would not like to send him.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May we expect an answer this year?

Mr. Benson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have hopes—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PURCHASE OF SUPER-TANKS

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of National Defence.

His department announced yesterday that it had authorized the mass production of MBT-70 super tanks, each of which will cost about $600,000. Would the minister tell the House how Canada will use those tanks?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question could be put on the order paper.

[*English*]

HIGHWAY SAFETY

EFFECTIVENESS OF HEADRESTS IN AUTOMOBILES

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In light of the recent announcement by the Winnipeg Chief of Police regarding the removal of headrests from all city police vehicles because of visibility obstruction and inconvenience, can the minister indicate to the House whether his department is reassessing the effectiveness of this safety device for the average Canadian motorist?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubts whether the question can be asked at this time, but perhaps the minister might be allowed to answer.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we are constantly reassessing the various safety devices but we are rather limited in what we can do until the legislation now before the House is in fact law, which I hope will be in a matter of a few weeks.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

NEWFOUNDLAND—SIGNING OF AGREEMENT ON FIRST PHASE OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion I should like to direct my question to his Parliamentary Secretary. In view of the serious economic difficulties being experienced in the province of Newfoundland would the minister confirm that the agreement on the first phase of a five-year regional development plan for

that province will be signed in April, and would he table its contents so that Newfoundlanders can be made aware of the benefits to be derived under such plan?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I will draw that question to the minister's attention.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

HAZARD TO CHILDREN FROM TOYS CONTAMINATED BY DDT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister examined the question of plastic toys coming into Canada from abroad contaminated by dangerous proportions of DDT, and does he not consider this to be a hazard to the health of Canadian children?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my officials have been in touch with Dr. Mastermattio, Director of the Environmental Health Services Branch of the government of Ontario, and we have arranged for joint testing of a large number and variety of plastic toys to determine if there is any great degree of hazard.

FISHERIES

EXTENT OF JURISDICTION OVER RESOURCES

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It arises from the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries in the House before Christmas to the effect that Canada should assume management and jurisdiction of its fishing resources as far out as the continental shelf. I wish to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if the government supports Bill C-91, to amend the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act, or whether it has some other methods in mind to achieve the ends announced by the Minister of Fisheries?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would not think the question as asked is in order.

NATURAL RESOURCES

DEVELOPMENT OF CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Has agreement been reached between the federal government and the provinces on the resource development of our continental shelf? I have another short question, Mr. Speaker. Which level of government is currently responsible for the drafting and the enforcement of pollution regulations in these areas?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that the second question might be placed on the Order Paper. If the Prime Minister wishes to respond to the first question I see no difficulty.

[*Translation*]

COMBINES

INVESTIGATION OF QUEBEC AND NEW BRUNSWICK NEWS MEDIA MONOPOLY

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): I direct my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Does he intend to hold an inquiry in Quebec and New Brunswick in order to ascertain whether the ownership concentration of news media might deprive Canadians of the objective news reports they are entitled to?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member may know, there is an inquiry going on at the present time in the province of New Brunswick which became public because those being inquired into made it public. The hon. member will also know that it is not usual policy to reveal those instances in which there is an investigation under way.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

OBJECTIVE OF NEWSCASTS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State who reports to the House on behalf of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Would he make inquiry of the President of the CBC in order to find out whether or not CBC newscasts are designed for Canadians or for citizens of the United States? I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, in view of last evening's news broadcast when almost one-third of the time was spent on communist propaganda from North Viet Nam, obviously directed toward the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker: The question as asked is argumentative.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY MINISTER

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): I should like to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the deep concern felt in many quarters that the Department of National Health and Welfare is operating without the services of a deputy minister since the resignation of Dr. Crawford last August, and in view of the many urgent problems in this field, would the Prime Minister say whether there has been any recommendation made to him by the minister to fill this post?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member recognizes that since the days of Sir Charles Tupper the nomination of deputy ministers has been the prerogative of the Prime Minister. Everyone does not seem to know this. I have been discussing with the minister this particular appointment and possible appointees, and I think we will shortly be in a position to state the name of the person who will occupy the post.

HARBOURS

COME-BY-CHANCE—PROVISION OF DOCKING FACILITIES FOR OIL REFINERY OPERATIONS

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, earlier in the question period I asked a question of the Minister of Public Works concerning the provision of docking facilities at Come-By-Chance. In Your Honour's wisdom the question was not allowed but I wonder, in view of the fact that statements have been made by the Premier of Newfoundland to the effect that these facilities are essential and that the establishment of the plant hinges on them, whether Your Honour would allow the minister to answer the question?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure whether we can accept the hon. member's suggestion that the Premier of Newfoundland has procedural authority in this House, but perhaps the minister might want to reply to the question the hon. member asked earlier.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, we have had less representations seeking federal government investment in that area from the government of Newfoundland than from the private investors who plan to make the investment there. The representations have been supported by the government of Newfoundland.

Mr. Carter: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the urgency of this matter, can the minister say if early consideration will be given to the application by the private company concerned or the Newfoundland government for the provision of these facilities?

Mr. Laing: Mr. Speaker, consideration has been given to the representations for some time and we have requested a continuing amount of information which will be of a nature that could justify and indeed command the federal government to participate. So far that has not been forthcoming.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

LAC-LA-BICHE NEWSTART PROGRAM—REQUEST FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion but in his absence I shall direct it to the right hon. Prime Minister. Is the government reconsidering its decision not to provide the funds necessary for the continuation of the Newstart program at Lac-la-Biche, Alberta?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Perhaps I should answer that question, Mr. Speaker. This situation is being given very close examination by the department in order to seek a solution. I wish to give the hon. member the firm statement that the budget for this program has not been cut.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the President of the Privy Council. Will the Newstart program and the regional development program be referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development to examine their effectiveness in dealing with problems of regional disparities and poverty?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I think the time to discuss this would be when the estimates of this department are before the committee, which should be in several weeks' time.

• (3:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

WATER RESOURCES

PROVISION FOR MANAGEMENT INCLUDING RESEARCH AND PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROGRAMS

The House resumed from Monday, January 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-144, 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, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate today, I should like to commence my remarks by stating how extremely gratifying it is to many of us as elected representatives to observe the very great interest Canadians are taking in the subject of pollution. More and more people are becoming deeply interested in the implementation of methods to control or eliminate, to the greatest possible extent, the pollution of our environment. Until about ten years ago, water pollution did not seem to attract much attention. When I first came to this House some years ago many statements were made by my colleagues and myself to the effect that water would probably become one of Canada's greatest natural resources, but at that time there was not the interest in the subject that there is today.

Mind you, some Canadians do not seem to realize that this House is debating the matter. I have contacted many of my constituents and some have stated how pleased they are to see the government taking some action, whilst others do not seem to know that the debate is taking place. However, even those who mentioned their interest in the government's action did not seem to have had an opportunity of perusing Bill C-144. If they had read it I am sure they would have realized, as we do, that this bill is an inadequate measure to control pollution. As I mentioned before, the Canadian people have been demanding an end to the continual corruption of the environment. We in the Progressive Conservative Party have continually recommended action against pollution and the government has responded with the Canada water act. This, I feel, is a pitifully weak bill, one which

betrays the hopes and expectations of concerned Canadians. It simply does not provide any basis for effective action.

Members of our party are concerned and disturbed at the absence of comment in depth outside Parliament. Despite the profuse writings on the dangers of pollution, the dire warnings on the future of mankind and the constant call for action, there seems to have been very little study of the real content of the bill. The advance publicity last summer, and the flowery words of the minister as to his hopes and aspirations when introducing the bill, seem to have had the desired effect of lulling the country into a feeling of satisfaction. It is easy enough to understand the silence of industrial concerns and interests against whom the real control program would be directed, because they can see immediately the inadequacies of it and find no danger to themselves in it. The bill made its appearance well before Christmas and debate began on it almost immediately but many concerned Canadian writers have not had the opportunity to fully examine it.

We of the Progressive Conservative Party, the official opposition, are appealing for public support in our fight against a largely useless piece of legislation. We ask all those people concerned about pollution control to study this bill and to give opinions on it, because only an outraged public can force the government to strengthen its proposals and put teeth into this bill; and teeth are very, very necessary. I think that this points out very clearly one of the great values of Parliament. The government seems to play down the role of government and feels that it does not have a great role to play in our democratic society. However, I think this is one matter which is of great concern to all Canadians, and once again it demonstrates the value of Parliament and the value of debate.

As I said before, and I wish to underline this, I think it is very, very important for all Canadians interested in controlling and eliminating pollution as far as possible to read Bill C-144 and find out for themselves just what we of the opposition are trying to bring to the government's attention. We want to emphasize the idea that it is necessary to have amendments to this bill.

The success of the Canada water act is based on the fond hope that the federal government can persuade the provinces and municipalities to set up dozens of new water management boards without federal money, without national standards and without

proper research. Then, they will have to persuade the boards to collect their own money, organize their own projects and do battle with water pollution, with nothing from the federal government but advice and the inevitable necessity of having everything approved at provincial and federal levels. The result will be a new form of pollution, namely, large bundles of red tape.

Our party has clearly set out its alternative proposals on many occasions, dating back in their present form for two years. We would have the federal parliament pass a law applying to federal jurisdiction and proceed alone, where possible, or by agreement when working in a divided jurisdiction. Yet, we would go along with the government's plan if it had any real strength or hope of success. In its present form we see neither. It must be substantially re-written.

Recently we experienced a situation with respect to the Saskatchewan River in which serious contamination occurred as a result of mercury pollution. This has resulted in almost all of the species of fish in the lakes which are formed by this river downstream from the source of pollution being declared unfit for human consumption. I might add that this has taken place in a lucrative fishing area. I hope it will once again become lucrative for fishermen.

A considerable number of people residing downstream from the source of this contamination derive a good portion of their livelihood from commercial fishing, including a number of our Indian citizens, and their catches during the last month of yellows or pickerel, jacks and sauger have been ordered destroyed. The white fish on the other hand have been given a clean bill of health, apparently because they are not predator fish. I hasten to add at this time that the recently established freshwater fish marketing board has continued to purchase the contaminated fish from the commercial fishermen; but there will be an additional cost for destroying them.

In answer to questions in the House last week, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) said that the fisheries task force on the prairies had visited the plant of interprovincial co-operative downstream from Saskatoon and were of the opinion that this Chlor-Alkali plant is the principal if not the only source of mercury pollution on the prairies.

Answering a question of mine in the House yesterday, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry said, as reported on page 2583 of *Hansard*:

> The necessary steps have been taken to make sure the effluent stream containing mercury is kept within the plant itself. Mercury is meanwhile being removed by treating the effluent.

Naturally, we were very, very pleased to hear this statement and I am sure it will be well received by the fishermen concerned on the lakes downstream from the polluted area. But we are left with this further thought. For instance, it would be very interesting to know whether this was a voluntary move on the part of the industry concerned or whether the government had authority to order that this be done. I hope the minister will make a statement in the House and tell us just how this solution was arrived at in this particular instance.

Answering a supplementary question, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry said that it will take a spring freshet to flush out the river completely. That also brings up interesting problems because the river, as the minister no doubt knows, empties into Lake Winnipeg. I am wondering, as are many other people, just what will happen to this mercury pollution when it is flushed out of the river and into Lake Winnipeg. Of course, it will go into the Nelson River and, eventually, into Hudson Bay. I can recall years ago, when asking questions in the House about the quality of water in northern Manitoba rivers such as the Nelson, being assured by the minister of the day that inspections were taking place from time to time and that there was no occasion for any of us to be concerned about the purity of the water in the Nelson river. Well, this is not the first time that we have seen pollution coming from the Saskatchewan River which empties into Lake Winnipeg. The water then flows from Lake Winnipeg out through the Nelson River.

Undoubtedly pollution is a very, very important subject for our consideration and I, personally, think it is one of the most important matters confronting Canada today. I could mention many other important subjects, such as inflation, national unity, unrest among our youth, the population explosion, poverty and aggression by force. All these are very, very pressing problems. However, I think that the question of pollution and pollution control ought to have a priority at least equal to that of many of the most important problems confronting us and should have greater priority than some.

I am quite sure that a reasonable person will realize that this bill dealing with pollution ought to be in the same category as any bill dealing with inflation, national unity, unrest among our youth and so on. But he could well expect to be charged with being an alarmist. Without doubt, at least one minister on the government's treasury benches feels that the people who talk this way are alarmists. I am sorry that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is not here today, because I should like to read to him some statements he has made on this very matter. Of course, in doing so I shall be trying to demonstrate that the government is not too concerned about the matter, as evidenced by the contents of Bill C-144.

Speaking to the Vancouver Chamber of Commerce last Thursday, the minister said that he does not subscribe to alarmist thought about pollution. I quote from what the minister said:

• (3:30 p.m.)

"I don't believe all that I read about dying lakes and sickening seas. Most of it is poppycock—written by novices who are reaching for headlines—"

I have already mentioned that I feel pollution deserves top priority, along with the other subjects I mentioned of inflation, national unity, unrest among our youth, population explosion and aggression by forces. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry said people who talk like this are alarmists, that most of it is poppycock and they are novices reaching for headlines.

I have a document which was introduced in this House earlier this session. I quote from it as follows:

The evidence of past failure to rehabilitate our water resources is there for all to see—befouled water, despoiled beaches, rotting marine vegetation, and diminished fishing.

The document I am quoting from is the Speech from the Throne introduced in this House by the government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simpson: Here we have the Minister of Fisheries saying that people who talk in an alarmist fashion are nothing but novices reaching for headlines. I think this is a clear example of one of the ministers of the treasury benches strongly disagreeing with those who support the tidying up mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

The minister went further when he said, "the ecological situation is still basically under control". I do not know where the minister finds any basis for saying this when all the reports, and the Speech from the Throne, admit that we have diminished fishing. That in itself upsets the ecological balance.

I have some interesting information before me, Mr. Speaker. It is contained in a letter written to Mr. R. C. Passmore, the Executive Director of the Canadian Wildlife Federation. This letter is signed by the President of the Flin Flon Wildlife Association. It is further evidence of the interest that wildlife and conservation groups are showing in this very important subject. The letter advises that a conservation seminar was sponsored by the Flin Flon Wildlife Association on January 10. The seminar was entitled "The Value of Water as a Natural Resource".

There were two papers presented, and I quote from a report:

The morning paper, "Water and Man" was given by Nes Mudry, Chief of the Planning Division, Water Control and Conservation Branch, Dept. of Mines and Natural Resources, Manitoba. The other paper was given by Jack Howard who is a biologist with the Manitoba Renewable Resources Branch.

The House may be interested in some of the findings:

At the morning session an attempt was made to define clean water and to identify some of the problems and pressures affecting our water resource. They decided that water was clean when it could be taken directly from a lake or stream and used for human consumption.

Over the years, this idea has been in the minds of the people living in our northern areas. Up until now they have had the advantage of an abundance of fresh water in lakes, water which could be taken directly out of the lakes and used for human consumption. These people are very concerned about the fact that pollution can and is taking place slowly but surely and will continue to increase unless strong measures are taken to control it.

I continue quoting:

Pollution was high on the list of problems—not only industrial pollution but people pollution too. Further, all the groups agreed that Canada should not export water, that if industry needs water, then it should be required to move to the water and not vice versa.

—the participants were asked to make recommendations that would correct some of the problems. And here, I think, a rather amazing thing happened. When the groups reported back to the plenary session their recommendations were almost identical.

All were agreed that Canada must have uniform pollution levels and that these must be rigidly maintained. There was also unanimous agreement that the federal government should establish these standards, with the provinces being given the responsibility of administering them, providing Ottawa retains the authority to police the provinces.

This is one thing which is certainly not included in Bill C-144.

It was also agreed that educators have a bigger role to play in teaching Canadians the importance of a clean environment.

I am sure these conservationists feel that there is a place in the curriculum of our educational institutions for the teaching of the benefits of a clean environment and of the dangers of pollution. I continue:

Two of the groups looked into the future and decided that Canada will, some day, be short of water if she continues to ditch, drain and generally waste water at the present rate. They looked at the drainage authority in Manitoba where the municipality makes the decision to drain and it was agreed that authority should come from a less biased body. There was even discussion on the feasibility of underground storage for water.

It was decided that, if we can in fact foresee a time when Canada will be short of water, we should be making plans today and determine what can be done about it rather than waiting until there is an actual shortage. It was suggested, for instance, that if all marginal land were taken out of agricultural production today, much of it would return to marshland and this alone would provide extensive water storage.

It was suggested to me that the House should be made aware of the findings of this seminar. It is gratifying to know that groups such as wildlife associations are taking a keen interest in this very important problem. This group feels that in order for water in our lakes to be classed as clean, it must be fit for human consumption.

Recently a task force has been travelling throughout northern Manitoba visiting most, if not all, of the isolated areas. It has reported that there is more and more evidence of pollution in the lakes in these extremely isolated areas. This has been of great concern to this task force. Much of this pollution comes from the settlements on the shores of many of these lakes, but there is evidence of pollutants such as DDT. It is not too long ago that evidence of DDT contamination was found in polar bear carcasses in the high Arctic.

There is no use in believing that pollution is only a matter of concern to the urban centres. It is spreading very rapidly. When I was going to school we were taught that water would generally purify itself in a distance five to seven miles by running over rapids, etc., but this is not the case with the pollutants we have today. I have already mentioned the situation in the Saskatchewan River where the actual source of pollution is several hundred miles upstream. It would appear that the old saying about water purifying itself does not hold up under present day conditions.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The problem raised by the pollution of our environment is generally considered to be one of major concern to Canada, and indeed, to North America as a whole. Control of the pollution of our waters, air and soil was determined at the Niagara Conference to be one of the highest priorities of the Progressive Conservative party, as something urgently needed for the preservation of our quality of life. Federal involvement in the work of pollution control has been spotty and uncertain. The first positive steps were taken in the early sixties by a Progressive Conservative government when grants and loans were made to municipalities for the installation of sewage disposal facilities. This was authorized by legislation.

During the past few years there has been an increasing demand that the federal government should involve itself in pollution control as a national priority—that the federal government should take firm action to coordinate its efforts and end the jurisdictional maze in which half a dozen federal departments pass responsibility back and forth. We are urging that the government set up one agency with which provincial and international bodies can deal. As against these desirable objectives, the proposed legislation has a number of shortcomings in its general approach. One of these shortcomings is that it deals with water alone. It does not touch on soil or air pollution. Even to the extent that it concerns water, it does nothing to improve interdepartmental communications or to sort out the jurisdictional fields among the departments.

At present the departments of Energy, Mines and Resources, Fisheries, Agriculture, External Affairs and Transport all have some kind of jurisdiction, as does the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Nor does the bill make provision to establish national standards for water quality, purification equipment or monitoring. It is, in fact, still left open for one province, or one area of the country, to encourage industry to develop there by setting lower standards of pollution control.

I was gratified to see that the Canadian Wildlife Federation took a strong stand on this very matter. In addition, the federation deplored the absence of provision for any federal financial assistance to make it possible to achieve the objects of Bill C-144. The measure makes no provision for federal contributions to assist the provinces or to assist

those who will administer the water quality areas which are to be set up, and enable them to carry out their responsibilities.

Many hon. members on this side of the House have drawn attention to the alternatives which are available to the government. We hope that when the minister speaks later today he will give us an assurance that some of the suggestions, at least, will be considered seriously and incorporated in the bill. I intend to repeat some of these suggestions because we believe strongly that the government should take cognizance of the alternatives which have been put forward.

One of the our proposals is that the government should set up a national department or agency to co-ordinate pollution control efforts in all departments and that it should deal with water quality as part of this over-all approach. The bill before us is not part of any integrated plan; it is just another of these bits and pieces.

The second proposition we put forward is that the government should deal with water quality as part of a national priority to control pollution, and commit the necessary funds from taxation. We feel, also, that the government should ensure provincial co-operation before bringing in legislaiton.

In connection with this latter point, I should like to refer again to what was contained in the Speech from the Throne. On this subject of water resources, it stated that the government had made known its views on this serious matter and had begun discussions with the provinces upon the completion of which it would introduce legislation to enable it, in co-operation with the provinces, to improve and preserve our water resources. I ask hon. members to note the words which refer to the completion of these discussions. My understanding is that a further conference has yet to take place with the provinces on this very matter, and that it will be held in February. This being the case, I find myself wondering why the government should have brought forth the wishy-washy legislation before us at this particular time, though it was clearly stated in the Speech from the Throne that legislation would be presented only after conferences with the provinces had been completed.

We in the Official Opposition further believe that the government should establish national minimum standards for water quality management and provide for the prevention of pollution on a national basis, not just for special areas. As for the water quality management area system proposd in this bill, it is only one of several possible approaches. Since the government has selected this particular one we shall try to clear up its many shortcomings and attempt to make it work.

In conclusion, I want to make it very clear that we on this side of the House are particularly interested in this subject and that we sincerely hope the people of Canada will have an opportunity to look over the contents of Bill C-144 and send in their own ideas as to the improvements which we know they will find necessary. We trust, too, that they will support us in our efforts to persuade the government to make amendments to the bill which would allow it to do the imporant job which faces Canadians in controlling, or eliminating as far as possible, the menace of pollution.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): A few months ago, Mr. Speaker, a meeting was called by the Minister of Mines in Ontario to discuss the development of secondary industry in northern Ontario. At this meeting there was a large representation from the community, from labour, management, the professions and the provincial civil service. A few federal civil servants were there too, to take part in a discussion on the potential of the area and how it could be developed.

It was an interesting conference, but what surprised me were the views of one of those present who told us, during the discussion of development of secondary industry, that as far as he was concerned he did not want any such development in northern Ontario. It would mean, he said, that the air would be polluted, that the water would be polluted and that the earth would be polluted. He lived in northern Ontario because he liked clean air and clean water. If the price he had to pay for this was the sacrifice of the development of industry, or of the opening of new mines, he was ready to pay that price. Any factories that wished to do so could establish themselves in Toronto where their employees could live in the smog, but he himself had no desire to do so.

• (3:50 p.m.)

This surprised me because I had never really thought of all the things which are lost as a nation develops. There is a price exacted for everything and the price may sometimes be higher than the value received. In Toronto people who look out at the lake see the recreational facilities and perhaps decide that the environmental loss they have suffered

may not be worth some of the development that has been achieved in the area. However, probably the purpose of this bill is not to cover matters of environmental control. It is concerned mainly with the matter of water pollution. From my reading of it, it would appear to be a good bill. The criticism that has been made is that it does not go far enough, does not establish federal standards and does not make provision for the federal government to do the things it perhaps should do. All these are good criticisms. However, the minister probably does not have an answer to these criticisms because a great deal of money is involved. To date, the public has not really decided whether the price is worth paying. Until the public makes up its mind, we will have the type of pollution control the government decides to establish.

I do not intend to be nasty to the government. The government now has legislation by which it can control many of the problems that exist. Our harbours could be controlled by the National Harbours Board legislation which is very extensive and autocratic. The same is true in respect of the Navigable Waters Protection Act. This again is old legislation which was brought into effect without fanfare. It is my hope that discussions between the federal and provincial governments will progress to the point where the jurisdictional problems will be ironed out. If we are not willing to invest the money in something, then we really are not in a position to do anything about it.

It is interesting to note some objections which have been raised by people at the head of the lakes. There are reports that the United States Corps of Engineers is directly asking Canadian citizens to provide them with water information. These questions have been asked over a period of time. The provincial government has become concerned about this and has raised the matter with the RCMP. The provincial authorities demand that this type of inquiry by a United States agency be made through the Department of External Affairs of the federal government or at least through the provincial government.

The federal government has indicated that it has no information about the problem. I have a question in this regard which appears on the Order Paper. The RCMP has asked me for information to enable them to make inquiries about this matter. In northern Ontario, and I believe throughout the mid-Canada corridor a situation exists in which Canadians are becoming perturbed not only about our water resource but also about the fact that the United States authorities are looking at our resource and are applying pressure in respect of it in the hope that we will sell it. At the head of the lakes, individuals are asked to measure the water, prepare weather reports and so on and then are paid $3.50 per week. This information is being provided to the United States army authorities by 40 or 50 Canadians. It seems strange that the RCMP is not in a position to obtain the information they desire. However, I would be prepared to reveal the source of my information and I am sure other members from northern Ontario could do likewise.

I do not think most Canadians believe this is the proper way for our resources to be administered. It is being done this way because the Canadian government is not really interested in obtaining information. The United States authorities want to know what they will have to pay and the Canadian authorities do not have the necessary information available. It seems to me that in the mid-Canada corridor we will be faced with the choice of selling our water as a resource or keeping it, managing it, conserving it and enticing industries to come to the water rather than allowing the water to be diverted to the industries. Most people believe water is for drinking, for washing and then for dumping into the lakes. They believe that eventually it will come back again and there will always be nice clean water. I understand that where industries are situated on, and are using, a body of water, that water is used to the extent that even if pollutants are not employed it no longer has any friction reducing properties. Therefore, the normal properties in water can be used up by industry and the only way they can be replenished is by bringing in new water.

The United States authorities look at our water and think of taking it to the United States where it can be utilized in their environment. So, I believe we must pay some attention to this, set up a standard in respect of our resource and maintain it. The federal government will have to do this job. The federal government has the jurisdictional authority. The jurisdictional division will come into play when the provinces decide to have their own standards. However, we have a responsibility to catalogue and conserve this resource wherever possible. The area which I represent may be called the upper Ottawa River basin. Those of us in Ottawa are in a position to observe the lower Ottawa River

basin. These two basins together make a very formidable source of water in Canada and that water finally ends up in the Atlantic ocean. Many studies have been undertaken in an effort to increase the supply of water from the Arctic watershed. The dividing point between the Arctic watershed and the Atlantic watershed is in my area. The difficulties in diverting considerable amounts of water from one area to another are not insurmountable. Distribution, however, is a horse of another colour.

I do not think there is any great disagreement between the people of Ontario, the people of Quebec and the people in other parts of Canada who are concerned about this watershed about having the water diverted to the Great Lakes where it would become a useful commodity in the United States.

Before we leave the difficulties in respect of the great Lakes, I would point out that there is now an agency in the United States which is deeply involved in the establishment of a connection between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi watershed. If this were established, it would eliminate some of the problems south of Chicago where the water is contaminated and is of no industrial or other use. It has become dead water. The only solution here is to bring in larger quantities of water from the Great Lakes system, which water of course would have to come from the Arctic watershed. The Canadian people would be involved just as the United States is now.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I am more interested in this piece of legislation as it will affect the Ottawa River, Lake Timiskaming and the Upper Ottawa Valley. This area should be studied by all members of Parliament. All one has to do is look out over Parliament Hill and one can see and smell the pollution of the Ottawa River. Presumably, in Ottawa we are drinking this water. We are in a very good position to decide whether this large water source is being contaminated.

This river will fall under federal jurisdiction. I note that in this bill there are sections which will allow for control and the establishment of a water authority on Lake Timiskaming and the Ottawa River chain. They would allow for the control of that body of water, for the control of pollution and the establishment of an agency for the orderly operation of the resources in the Ottawa River basin. Therefore, I am very interested in this measure.

[Mr. Peters.]

When my father went to Northern Ontario he went by boat. He went there in 1898 on a steamer that left Mattawa and travelled to Lake Timiskaming, visiting the various ports on the Quebec and Ontario side. All the cattle, mail and everything that went to Northern Ontario went in that manner. From reports I have read, this was a beautiful waterway and a trip well worth taking. Many people went as sightseers to observe the benefits of this newly developing country and stayed to become residents of that area, remaining the rest of their lives.

Lake Timiskaming forms a boundary between the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. It is obviously under federal control. In the early days, transportation on it was controlled by the federal government. The driving of logs was controlled by the federal government. In fact all the resources that passed through that area, and there were a great many in terms of lumbering and the fur trade, were under the direction of the federal government.

In recent years, because of the establishment of a dam and the new use of that water, this authority of the federal government has been dissipated in a number of directions. I have a letter which was written in reply to a question by a provincial member of parliament for the area. He asked what effect the establishment of a dam at Lower Notch would have on the waterway. The reply came from Ontario Hydro in the form of a letter to the Hon. George Kerr, Minister of Energy and Resources Management, Parliament Buildings, Toronto. It reads in part:

> The water level of Lake Timiskaming is controlled by the federally-owned dam at the south end of the lake, which is operated according to the decisions of a regulating committee made up of representatives from Quebec Hydro, federal Department of Public Works and Ontario Hydro. The discharges required through this dam and the subsequent elevations of Lake Timiskaming are a direct result of the rate of inflow to the lake. The Montreal River on which Lower Notch is situated contributes only a small part of the total flow, and daily flows on the Montreal will not generally be altered by Lower Notch. No change in the operating arrangements for Timiskaming is contemplated.

I live on the shores of Lake Timiskaming and it is very interesting to note how well this committee can control the level of that lake. The level varies about eight or nine feet. You must realize that the lake level was raised by some 12 feet when this dam was installed. This is a low lying farm area and the water level in the newly flooded part has risen about twelve feet. The people who own land in that area previously farmed this land.

When the water level rises and falls eight or nine feet, there is considerable difficulty controlling the flow. If the water level in Lake Timiskaming rises abnormally in the spring, then the people who have cottages all the way along the Ottawa River are in difficulty. If the dam on Lake Timiskaming went out there would probably be four feet of water over most of the city of Montreal. The lake forms a fairly substantial source of water, and one which has to be controlled over a large distance.

One of the problems that is developing results from the use or misuse of the water by both Quebec Hydro and Ontario Hydro who have not thought of anybody except themselves. This means they maintain as high a water level as possible, and to hell with the tourist operators, the recreation facilities, the shoreline, the pulp and paper industry, the logging industry and other industries using this water. The hydro companies believe they have a divine right as a result of their public utility position.

The federal government has neglected to use any influence it might have. The federal government built the dam and has repaired it on a number of occasions, but it has not really made any effort to see that the fishing industry has not been hurt. It has not been particularly interested in facilitating logging operations on the lake or in seeing that one of the greatest forms of pollution in any area—soil pollution—is controlled. It has not really done anything about the sewage which flows directly into this water.

If we are really interested in controlling pollution it seems to me there are enough teeth in this measure, if they are used, to enable the federal government to immediately supply the controls necessary for the orderly management of any large water resource. Such control measures would probably start in rural areas where dams would have to be installed to stop the runoff which carries a great amount of silt into the Ottawa basin. This will cost many municipalities a great deal of money. They do not have the money and apparently the provincial government does not give a hoot. If the federal government says it is interested in orderly management, it must be prepared to make money available to the municipalities for the basic control of water levels and soil pollution, such as the kind taking place in almost all agricultural areas along this whole water chain from the head of the lake at Notre Dame du Nord to Montreal. Unless the federal government is prepared to make this kind of an expenditure on behalf of the municipality, it really does not matter what is done along the line. It does not matter whether the river is polluted with chemicals or anything else if the runoff of silt is permitted.

As you fly over the watercourse, you note that a great deal of it is a dull muddy colour. There are hundreds and hundreds of tourist operations, both private and commercial, along this watercourse. These people have not had the resources to provide proper sanitary control. The federal government will have to make enough money available to them through CMHC so that they may upgrade their facilities.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Many of the municipalities down-river are still dumping raw sewage into this lake. The minister knows this. When he lived on the Ottawa River I imagine that area got so polluted that he decided to move to another water resource area in his new riding, but I think he will find the same applies there also.

If we are not willing to make money available to the municipalities to treat the waste going into our water resources, then we can laugh at this bill. What would be the point of laying charges against some small municipality for dumping raw sewage into a river when everyone knows that the municipality does not have the financial resources to build the necessary facilities?

In Northern Ontario we embarked on a unique method of handling municipal waste. We put it in lagoons, and every year the lagoons freeze over very hard. When spring comes in the ice is quite high and these ponds are full. The one in my home town is situated quite close to the river. Water runs down off the hill into the lagoon and flushes it into the river, so that instead of getting a little pollution every day we get a lot of pollution during the spring run-off, but apparently the Ontario Water Resources Branch decided that this was fine.

Since the beginning of commercial development in Northern Ontario logs have been driven on the Timiskaming lake. In some places the bark and other things which come off the logs have polluted the lake to a depth of five feet, but no regulation is being drafted to ensure that the logs are peeled before they are put in the water.

I am sure that the departmental officials who drafted this bill have no intention of enforcing it. What they and the government

want is to have this bill to deal with cases of obvious pollution, cases where they will be obliged to do something. To this government, obvious pollution means sufficient pollution to kill all the fish in a river or lake. When they are found floating belly up, then the government will get after somebody and make him pay a few bucks. But, Mr. Speaker, that will merely be a licence to pollute.

The people of Canada are now concerned about the uses of water. They see the abuses perpetrated by hydro, and in some cases by provincial departments of lands and forests. In some areas these provincial departments placed poison in lakes to kill all the fish, but when they tried to restock those lakes at a later date they found it impossible to do so.

People are also giving considerable attention to the recreational and transportation uses of water. In the interval between two elections a few years ago, the Liberal party in Northern Ontario came out with a grand scheme to cope with the problem of Lake Timiskaming and the Ottawa River. Not only did they propose to bring barges up to Ottawa on the river, but also to bring them up through Lake Timiskaming. They were even going to take them into the French River and over into Sault Ste. Marie. But the Liberal party was not interested in controlling the environment of that water facility.

This is a nice bill. I hope all hon. members will support it, but it will not do any good. It is a sop to those people who believe that pollution has become a problem. In my opinion the government has no intention of providing enough money to municipalities or to provinces to establish the necessary controls. The federal government will not even make a survey of our water resources so that their orderly development may be planned. The only time the federal government will make use of this bill is when nothing else works, or in the case of a calamity.

For years the International Joint Commission has been looking at the problem in Lake Erie, smelling it, measuring it and tasting it. Every year the problem gets worse. We will never solve it until we decide to devote enough money to its solution. The amount of money that will be provided through this bill will be very small.

For these reasons, I say the bill is a nice one, but it does not meet the aspirations of almost all Canadians who want to avoid the water pollution problems that are besetting the United States. Canadians wish to develop the controls that will make it possible for them to pass their natural water resources on to their children and their children's children in as pure a state as possible.

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation reflects perfectly the attitude of the government to the whole question of pollution and environmental control. This attitude continues to be timid, indecisive and confused. The bill before us contains all these undesirable qualities and more. Perhaps this is not to be wondered at when we realize it is only a hastily prepared answer to those who have been reproaching the federal government for being indifferent to the menace of pollution.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The minister and the government of which he is a member have come into the antipollution picture very late—at the 59th minute of the eleventh hour, one might say. The circumstances under which this measure was announced by the Minister without Portfolio last fall indicate to me that the purpose was more to save the government's face than to take any serious steps toward solving our water pollution problems. The minister and his aides have consistently striven to usurp the credit built up by those provinces that have already done much within their own jurisdictions to fight pollution and to make the Canadian public believe that the only thing holding back decisive action is the failure of the provinces to co-operate with the central government. The fact of the matter is that this government and its predecessor did little or nothing about pollution, even within the exclusively federal jurisdiction. It was never accorded any priority. The only real effort to meet and master pollution of our natural environment has come from the provincial governments.

In this regard I will speak only of the government of the Province of Ontario because that is something of which I have first hand knowledge as a former head of a municipal council. Over a period of roughly 15 years, Ontario has evolved an extensive program of air, water and soil protection. For more than a decade the Ontario Water Resources Commission has been active in water control and, in that area of antipollution work alone, the province has sunk more than $3 billion already.

This has been a tremendous effort. It has been an effort carried on with only lip service co-operation from the federal government. Under Premier Frost and, later, under Premi-

er Robarts, the Ontario government tried repeatedly to get federal assistance and co-operation in cleaning up the Ottawa River. When the Ontario authorities tackled this problem they quickly found that it was hopeless without the full co-operation of both the Province of Quebec and the federal government—the government whose job it is to take care of interjurisdictional waters such as the Ottawa River interprovincial boundary.

It was no dice. There was no action. There was no interest. It was the same story when Ontario tried to co-operate with some seven states of the United States across the Great Lakes. Intentionally or not, the minister inferred in his pre-introduction publicity campaign that federal action was now being taken because the provinces had shirked the job. It is time to set the record straight. The failures of omission were federal, not provincial.

Finally, the federal giant has awakened. Unfortunately, this bill represents only the giant's yawn before rolling over and going back to sleep. The general concept of strict control of our natural environment—water, air and soil—we, as a party, support wholeheartedly. What we are attacking in this bill is the half-hearted approach to the problem. The utter inadequacy of the means so far advanced is illustrated by this shoddy piece of legislation. What we want to see is strong federal leadership, federal initiative to establish national standards, national goals, a national crusade.

In Canada today we have a very sorry and confused picture of antipollution effort. Some provinces and municipalities have done much. Many private industries have also done a great deal. Many private citizens have made an outstanding contribution. But the sad fact is that the federal government has done little or nothing and many industries and individuals will never do anything until the machinery to compel them to conform to standards of environmental control are established on a nation-wide basis. One cannot blame them too much. Until pollution of our air, water and soil is made an offence in every part of the country and until Canada as a whole proceeds positively against the threat, the industries and the citizens of the country are unlikely to observe antipollution measures.

To confine concern to a restricted list of specified bodies of water, as this bill does, is a useless gesture. It begs the question. It makes no sense to say, as this bill in effect, does say, "pollution is only officially pollution in this lake or that river because we have been able to set up a joint board to control its waters".

What about the lake next door or the water in the river farther downstream? Despite the fatuous statements made the other evening by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) about water being different in different areas, it is obvious that water is water wherever it is when you are dealing with pollution of it.

We must have national standards of water quality. We must have national definitions of pollution and the offence of pollution. We must have uniform methods of controlling water and protecting it. We must ensure that pollution can be controlled wherever there is water, not simply in a scattering of designated areas under some cumbersome type of joint control board. Reading this bill, the impression is given that pollution only exists where there is a joint interest. What about all the vast areas of this country where the federal jurisdiction is paramount and absolute? I am thinking of the Arctic, for instance or the territories or the off-shore waters? Perhaps the federal government is hoping to set up a joint control board with the United States in these areas. Having heard the views of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on the benefits of pooling continental resources, I can imagine that this may well be in his mind.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has consistently refused to recognize the menace of pollution and has evaded its responsibility for leading a national effort on what is, clearly, a national problem. Now, it has suddenly awakened to the realization that Canadians want action and has rushed into the field too late and with too little.

Pollution does not stop at provincial boundaries. It is not susceptible to being neatly allotted to various political jurisdictions. It is all-pervasive and truly a universal threat. Pollution is a national threat and an international threat. The federal responsibility to act in this area is just as clear and urgent as it would be in the field of national defence were Canada to be threatened by hostile forces from outside our borders.

I find it amazing that the federal government is being so coy about invading provincial jurisdiction in this field and so scrupulous about staying within its own narrow constitutional areas. It never was so nice about things in the past. We can all recall the thinly disguised invasion of provincial rights and juris-

diction that accompanied the imposition of a nation-wide pension and medicare plan. Those plans were successfully forced upon many of the provinces by coercion. If such coercion were necessary and acceptable in the case of pensions and medicare, why not try a little in the far more pressing and serious problem of preserving our national physical environment?

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) rightly pointed up the failure of the bill to provide municipalities with the sinews of war, the municipalities that are the front line in the battle with water pollution. This, I might point out, Mr. Speaker, is the very area in which, for the past 15 years, the Ontario government has been waging its principal fight by enabling municipalities to get capital at nominal cost to enable them to build and operate the sewage disposal plants and filtration plants that are the essential units of antipollution effort. I suggest to the minister that, if and when he ever gets around to trying to set up his joint control boards, he will find provincial and municipal authorities are already enjoying a wealth of experience and success in this field. He may even be forced to admit eventually that he and his army of experts have no exclusive jurisdiction when it comes to knowledge, ability and know-how.

• (4:30 p.m.)

This, of course, is one of the great weaknesses of a generally weak bill. Nowhere in it is the fundamental question of the financing of water control measures dealt with. Yet this is vital to effective action. The absence of this basic provision from the bill is sufficient reason in itself to withdraw it and have it completely redrafted.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), who enjoys the odd distinction of being unknown to his own leader, talked glibly of the necessity of getting the co-operation of municipalities and provinces in putting the provisions of this bill into action. He should know, and his government should know, that this co-operation can only be forthcoming if the federal authority is willing to get down to brass tacks and talk about the financing of antipollution measures. This question will not just go away if it is not talked about. There is hardly a municipality or a province in Canada that is not away ahead of the federal government in appreciation of the menace of pollution and the need to fight it everywhere and all the time. But they know that effective action requires more than fine words and ringing slogans at a ministerial press conference, and more than a bill with more holes in it than a round of Swiss cheese.

They know that effective antipollution work takes money, tax money in massive amounts. They know, too, that they do not have that kind of money and little prospect of raising it from the share of the tax base at their disposal. I am afraid the minister and his colleagues are going to have to put their money where their mouth is if they expect to get the required co-operation from those who are already veterans of the fight against pollution.

The member for Burnaby-Seymour said at least one thing that made sense. He described this bill as "modest" and without any claim to being the instrument to "solve these problems". Perhaps we can persuade him to add his voice to the voices of those in this House who believe this bill to be completely inadequate and who believe it should now be withdrawn and redrafted.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I think it is very difficult to evaluate the hazards due to water, air and soil pollution. As regards health, the present situation may be compared to a time bomb. In fact, the effects of pollution have just begun to appear but they will be felt more strongly within the next few years.

The wind may bring us foul smells, but it happens also that our rivers leave traces of dirt.

We, in the Quebec region, more particularly those of us who live in the St. Lawrence valley, have already felt the effects of water pollution, especially at the socio-economic level.

In fact, during the summer of 1967, commercial fishermen who had been fishing in the St. Lawrence river for several years and successfully earning their living and that of their family, had to give up their trade. In spite of the fact that two and a half years have passed since, many are still unemployed and have to be satisfied with social welfare allowances.

Fishermen enjoy a reputation of long standing and they are recognized as good workers. Those from the area of Quebec city and Trois-Rivières did not rely wholly on luck, because they were well equipped. They owned very modern material such as draw-

nets several hundred feet long and enormous traps which change name according to areas and which are often made of various materials.

A fisherman does not really fish. It might be said rather that he draws up thousands of pounds of fish and, if all goes well, he may even assess his catch in tons.

Up to the fall of 1966 this was the situation in the centre of Quebec, on the St. Lawrence, between Orleans island and Montreal. Only in the fall of 1966 and in the spring of 1966 did it become tragic.

People who could manage with a salary of $5,000 or $7,000 a year saw this income reduced to nothing. In fact, all fish species—pike, doré, bass, carp and eel have vanished. And this is not merely a form of speech since the fish had been poisoned and was washed up by the sea.

We know that matters relating to water pollution are studied by the federal government in conjunction with the provinces.

However, since fish is disappearing from the St. Lawrence river, we must realize that the federal government and the Quebec government have never moved beyond the study stage. Highly-paid technicians are still pursuing studies; they do not exert themselves too much and they manage to justify their work in the eyes of the population by publishing a press release once in a while.

In my opinion, the most ridiculous step was taken in 1967 by the federal Minister of Agriculture. In the summer of 1967, if my memory serves me well, the Canadian government sent a pamphlet to the farmers in which it urged them never to dispose of old DDT containers in streams. They were asked to use any other means, for instance, to burn them or to bury them in the ground. All means except that one were good. The recommendation served to distract the attention of the people from the real problem, since, while the farmers worried about drops of DDT, the Expo Corporation was dumping into the St. Lawrence river thousands of pounds of rothane, a violent poison, commonly called DDD.

With the blessing of the federal and provincial governments this poison was used widely during the whole time of the building of the Expo site.

In the spring of 1967, 2,700 gallons of this poison, or 27,000 pounds, were dumped near the Expo site. And this criminal act was repeated regularly twice in 1966 and only once in 1965.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Today, Bill C-144 is before the House. To my mind, this bill could bring the government to take a stand. But why should the bill come to us so late, after the damage is done? Provincial governments are not assuming their responsibilities, and we know why: because of electoral funds.

For instance, when a lumber company wishes to obtain a timber concession from the government, all it has to do is give money to the electoral funds of political parties. To be allowed to dump plant wastes freely into our rivers, big industries maintain a conspiracy within provincial governments through contributions to the electoral funds.

In Quebec, companies must supply the provincial government with a water sample. It is strange, however, that the sampling should be entrusted to the companies' own technicians.

Now, the technician is smart enough to know where to get his samples so as not to cause his employer any trouble. No technician would take his sample at the mouth of the sewage system of the company that employs him.

It is clear that "troubled" water would cause "troubles". I dare say his position would be jeopardized. Provincial governments were in no rush to note the danger of pollution because, as I said, electoral funds blocked their eyes and their nose.

Some companies that are developing our natural resources were not more honest since while they were poisoning our lakes and rivers, by dumping their waste in them, they sent to the responsible department of the province of Quebec a sample of pure water that was taken at the source of the streams.

One paragraph of the bill says, and I quote:

(g) "inter-jurisdictional waters" means any waters, whether international, boundary or otherwise, that, whether wholly situated in a province or not, significantly affect waters outside such province;

Since the water dividing line has not been established yet, I am somewhat disturbed. Unfortunately that has encouraged laziness until now, for many aspects of this problem have not been clarified yet, as concerns the St. Lawrence, for instance.

In a certain area, a number of people were using that river as a dump, throwing old automobile bodies into it. Below Trois-Rivières, that practice went on until one municipality had the opportunity to lay a charge. So I sent a report to the provincial authorities who answered me that the matter

did not come under their jurisdiction, since navigable waters fall within the competence of the federal government. I was therefore advised to apply to the federal Department of Transport.

So I wrote to Ottawa and got the reply that the matter did not come under the jurisdiction of the federal government, since it had to do with trash dumped along the shores or into shallow water. The only thing that matters to the federal government is that the channel be open to shipping. It is not concerned about waste.

Confronted with a man sentenced to death, Pontius Pilate washed his hands. Today, when it comes to dealing with the Canadian waters which are a source of life, some people find it possible once more to wash their hands of the whole thing.

The federal government knowing that Expo 67 was under preparation, during the years 1965-1966, confined itself, at the time, to conducting studies on the waters of the Great Lakes. Let me quote a question I directed then to the government, as it appears on page 7462 of *Hansard* for April 14, 1969. Here it is:

1. Did the Department of National Health and Welfare take water samples from the St. Lawrence River in the summers of 1967 and 1968?

2. If so, did the analysis of this water reveal that there was a danger for bathers in (a) Tadoussac (b) Quebec City (c) Trois-Rivières (d) Montreal?

The Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) gave this answer, and I quote:

1. The Department of National Health and Welfare has carried out water quality studies on the international section of the St. Lawrence River (from Kingston, Ontario, to Cornwall, Ontario), each summer since 1965. These studies were conducted under the aegis of a current reference to the International Joint Commission on Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and the International Section of the St. Lawrence River.

2. As the studies have been limited to the international section of the St. Lawrence River, water quality data collected cannot be interpreted with regard to conditions in the vicinity of (a) Tadoussac (b) Quebec City (c) Trois Rivières (d) Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, barely a few days before I asked that question, I wrote to Mr. Lessard, the Quebec Health Minister, as follows:

Dear Sir,

A Quebecer would be interested in the rental of a public beach is now considering the possibility of carrying out his wish at one of the two following locations on the shores of the St. Lawrence: Cap-Rouge or Anse-au-Foulon, Sillery.

[Mr. Godin.]

And I went on asking—

—for a copy of the water analysis at those locations during the summers of 1966, 1967, 1968.

On March 4, 1969, I received the following reply:

Dear Sir,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated February 25 last and I wish to advise you that last year, swimming was prohibited at the Anse-au-Foulon beach by the Department of Health due to water pollution.

As for Cap-Rouge, we should have to know exactly the spot where the quality of the water is of interest to you.

Mr. Speaker, I remember quite well that during the summer of 1969, the beach at Sillery was closed to the citizens of Quebec City. On the other hand, I also remember that at Cap-Rouge, a few miles from there, Mr. Roger Lemelin, a well-known author, could still swim, as could the hon. members for Louis-Hébert and Langelier (Messrs. Cantin and Marchand).

Mr. Speaker, we must see the situation in its true light. The water from the St. Lawrence, dangerous to swim in, is the drinking water of the people of Lévis. In fact, Lévis, Lauzon, Bienville, Saint-Romuald, Saint-David get their drinking water from the St. Lawrence River. While swimming is forbidden on the north shore of the river, it provides drinking water on the south shore.

I hope that Bill C-144 will clear up the problem. Of course, those are extreme cases and I believe that the residents of that region are entitled to know exactly what the situation is.

In my opinion, given the facts, Bill C-144 could be a good measure. Will it be properly enforced, or used solely for political purposes and to foster small quarrels with the provinces?

We are aware that in our industrialized world, waste of all kind is increasing, both at the manufacturing and at the processing levels, and that to achieve high quality products, we have to get rid of a considerable amount of indispensable material. And up until now, waterways were considered as ideal dumps. The dangers of such a practice are obvious, and some companies have recognized them.

I want to mention the efforts of some industries to curb pollution, and I am hoping for an increase in the number of those that will co-operate to keep up the fight essential to our survival. But as always one has to think of the cost. Co-operation from industries

is necessary, but are all industries in good enough financial position to consider a water treatment program? Are all the municipalities which are considering an exchange program in a suitable financial position to fight pollution with means essential to the improvement of the present situation? This is open to question if we refer to a statement by Mr. Paul O. Trépanier, former mayor of Granby, who said that 75 per cent of Quebec municipalities were faced with bankruptcy.

Here is what I read on page 13 of this bill:

Water quality management agencies.

The objects of each water quality management agency shall be to plan, initiate and carry out programs to restore, preserve and enhance the water quality level in the water quality management area for which the agency is incorporated or named.

Mr. Speaker, that will be the great objective of the agencies which we intend to set up. Of course there are limitations. Here I take the liberty to read on page 16 of the bill a paragraph from clause 13:

Except with respect to loans related to the cost of incorporation of an agency and its operating expenses that are authorized to be made to it by the Minister or a provincial government, an agency does not have power to borrow moneys, to issue securities or to guarantee the payment of any debt or obligation of any person.

Mr. Speaker, in spite of the obvious dangers of pollution, the minister will be in a position to say no to corporations which, according to him, would not have the financial capacity to meet loans with a 10, 11 or 12 per cent interest rate. In short, we are looking at the "troubled" water but we cannot do anything to change the situation unless financial means are available.

That is the situation right now. Bill C-144 is another piece of legislation whose implementation will be restricted by the "buck". Let us imagine the case where we would let a forest fire spread just because of insufficient funds to fight it. That would be a ridiculous situation, but I think that it is precisely what would result from this bill unless we bring in some amendments.

Can we imagine a mayor who would let his town burn down just because he cannot afford any longer to pay the firemen? Can we think of a situation where a provincial premier would call back the workers sent to fight forest fires simply because financiers have turned him down for a loan?

Considering that the problem of pollution is a matter of life and death, the Canadian government should consider measures aimed at checking it and the first necessary step, I think, should be to secure the financing of the plans the realization of which are advocated by the bill under study. Just as the previous speakers, I suggest to the department to study the loans granted to foreign countries for such plans. Then, perhaps, the firms that are incapable of borrowing at 10, 11 and 12 per cent will be in a position to borrow at better conditions, that is ¾ or 1 per cent.

I am convinced that the federal government must assume its responsibilities towards the problem of water. The government should act with the financial help of the Bank of Canada.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, it often happens that an hon. member will rise in his place and say he did not intend to take part in the debate which is in progress but that he had been moved to do so. My own position is the very reverse of that. I intended right from the start to take part in this debate but my original intention was to make a full 40-minute speech. I have decided, because this debate has gone on for several days, and because most of the things which need to be said have been put on the record, that I will shorten my remarks to just—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCleave: That is the Lundrigan influence.

An hon. Member: Three cheers for Lundrigan.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, Stanley feels a little grey after that.

There are two ideas I should like to express before we give second reading to this bill—there might be a sub-heading or two, but in the main there are two things I should like to say. In the first place, I think we delude ourselves when we talk about pollution being something which is likely to creep up on us if we fail to act now. A good deal of the discussion has been along the lines that we must take action now so that our waters, our air and our environment as a whole do not become polluted some time in this decade or in the near future. We should face the fact that we are already living in the age of pollution. The statistics and information which have been given to the House during the course of this debate certainly support the contention that our waters are far from pure

at the present time and the same is true with respect to our air. What we have to begin now is not just a preventive job with an eye to the future but a cleaning up job as far as the present is concerned.

It is against the background of this situation, against the background of the fact that things are already serious that hon. members are perfectly justified, it seems to me, in urging that Bill C-144 is not strong enough. A friend of mine sent me a telegram a few days ago in which he suggested four things that a bill of this kind ought to do. I do not intend to read the telegram, but it does state the case succinctly. I shall accept my friend's four ideas as my own and I shall be happy to send him a copy of *Hansard*.

An hon. Member: One more vote.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He lives in Montreal.

In doing this, I shall keep the promise I made to myself to observe strict brevity. In the first place, the situation calls for tough, no-compromise federal legislation to ensure uniform, country-wide standards. There is a lot of water in this country which is clearly under federal jurisdiction. I maintain that the people of Canada would have no patience with any provincial premier or government that would fail to co-operate as far as provincial waters are concerned.

In the second place, there ought to be financial assistance by way of tax relief and write-offs of various kinds, as well as contributions, to encourage the development and use of pollution control equipment. Any incentives which can be put forward so that people will do even more than the law calls for are certainly needed because of the seriousness of the situation.

In the third place, there ought to be deadlines—and they should be included in the bill before us—respecting the implementation and completion of pollution control projects. Agreements with respect to such projects should be concluded with some of our large urban centres such as Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, Vancouver and Halifax. Here, I believe, despite our two-level type of government, we are bound to bring the cities into the picture.

Finally, there ought to be tough, no-nonsense laws providing for heavy fines or imprisonment to give resource management agencies the power necessary to deal with offenders.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

It strikes me that these four suggestions bring into bold relief the fact that the present bill does not go far enough to cope with the danger which is with us right at this very time, for as I say, it is not one which will arise in the 'eighties, or a generation from now; it is with us today.

The other main thought I want to pass on to the House before we conclude the debate is this: I believe this question of the pollution of our waters and of our environment generally is part of a larger one having to do with the role of science and technology in our society. The day has come, indeed, it is long past, when we ought to have a minister and a department of science and technology in the government of Canada. After all, it is science and technology which are virtually making possible the kind of life we live today. We are aware of the things which have improved our lives. On the other hand, because of the impact of science and technology in the profit-making system under which we live, an awful lot has been done to despoil our lives. The whole question of what science and technology should do, or what they should bring into being, should no longer be one for private industry to answer but something which is a matter of public policy and public concern.

• (5:00 p.m.)

It is not good enough to have a Science Council of Canada on the side, with a certain conflict of interest to which attention was turned yesterday. Policy in the field of science and technology ought to be part of the concern of the Parliament and the Government of Canada. It is not enough to have a weak bill on water pollution control before us; we ought to be moving forward boldly in this whole area. Whether in the future we will have for our people a Canada to live in and enjoy depends not only on industrial progress, not only on what we do about building our great cities, highways and so on, but on how we channel our capacities, resources, intellect and scientific know-how in making life liveable for a decade, for several decades or for centuries in this country of ours.

I wish to conclude by reminding hon. members of two or three paragraphs on the last two pages in a book by Blair Fraser entitled "The Search for Identity" which I am sure most members will have read. We all remember this distinguished journalist who was with us for so many years and who a few years ago lost his life so tragically. As a

matter of fact, the conditions under which he lost his life are rather significant in the light of these passages which conclude his interesting book. Let me pick out two or three paragraphs. These are the late Blair Fraser's words:

> It is commonplace to refer to Canada as one of the young countries of the world. In fact it is one of the oldest. Few others still look, as Canada does in about three quarters of its area, just as they did two hundred and perhaps ten thousand years ago.
>
> More than half of it is primordial granite, the great Pre-Cambrian shield rubbed clean of soil by the glacier of the latest Ice Age. Since the glacier receded the land has recovered, at least in the milder climatic belt that in the west runs as far north as the Yukon and the Mackenzie Delta and in the east dips to south of James Bay, enough shallow humus to support a coniferous bush. Shallow lakes are everywhere upon its surface—Canada is thought to contain about one third the fresh water of the entire world.

Then, Blair Fraser talks about this great area of our country that is largely untouched, an area which most people have not seen. But it is there, and to him it is a symbol of the future and the hope of this country. These are his last two paragraphs:

> Meanwhile "development" continues. Canada's standard of living, second highest in the world (by North American measurement), is in no danger of losing that proud position. Washing machines and television sets abound, as in no other nation save one. Superhighways devour uncounted acres of fertile land, and the second highest incidence of automobiles achieves, in the metropolitan areas, a second highest air pollution. Ugly little towns prosper, all calling themselves cities and all looking like faithful copies of Omaha, Nebraska.
>
> This is not a Canada to call forth any man's love. But just north of it still lies a different kind of land—too barren even to be thickly settled, too bleak to be popular like Blackpool or Miami. There is no reason to doubt that it will always be there, and so long as it is there Canada will not die.

Regardless of what has been said in this debate about the pollution that has already taken place and the cleaning up problems to which we must apply ourselves, the fact is we have a rich heritage in this country of land, forest, water and air. It is worth saving. It is worth protecting. Let us do it.

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, my comments will be brief. The subject has been reasonably well covered. What strikes me, however, is that if ever there was a "milquetoast" bill presented to the House, this is it. The legislation contains no teeth. It does not contain things that are necessary if we are to reach a satisfactory conclusion to the problem. I will admit that the minister has taken a very timid step in the right direction. One recalls that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), when speaking on the just society, stated that some effective solution must be found for the control of air and water pollution and that we must move faster and more imaginatively in this area. I do not see much indication of that in this bill. No one will disagree with this statement, but the government brings in a bill which covers water pollution only and does nothing about air, soil or noise pollution. I do not know whether reference has been made to this in this debate, but I believe all of us owe a deep debt of gratitude to Rachel Carson, who has since passed away, for awakening us to the damage being done and our future position if things continue in the present manner.

It is interesting to note that people in several cities of the United States are drinking water from taps after that water has gone through city sewers. Now we come to the question: do we really need this bill. As I have said, it is a step in the right direction, but I wonder whether this bill, if it is not any better enforced than the fisheries bill in respect of our Great Lakes system, will accomplish anything. It has been shown that our fish in the Great Lakes contain levels of DDT above permissible levels. The government should have put teeth in that bill in order that something might have been done about the problem. I believe the minister said that the 70's will be a period when a move will be made in respect of pollution. Surely, we should have been looking after some of these things in the 60's. I am not blaming the minister. I am merely stating that in the 70's the government must move quickly. I am also thinking about the bureaucracy we may be building up by applying Parkinson's law. We may become involved in building up department on department and bureaucracy on bureaucracy.

How are the necessary arrangements to be made with the provinces in respect of setting up joint boards to deal with this problem? Surely, the ground rules will vary from province to province. What are these ground rules? Are all provinces to be brought up to a certain level? Who will decide what this level should be? The waters of the Great Lakes system touch the province of Ontario as well as the province of Quebec. The Ottawa River is the dividing line between the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec. Will the same rules apply to the villages and towns along the Quebec side as apply in the province of Ontario? What will be the working rule in this regard? Surely, there will be

variations. The national board to be established under the Canada water bill should seek agreement from all provincial bodies in respect of what constitutes pollution and how much pollution is to be allowed. I believe we must realize, in our war on pollution of the air, water or land, that we can never hope to return to the time when waters were pure and the air was clear.

It has been pointed out by other speakers that DDT, which has proven to be a boon to the farmers, contains a particular hydrocarbon which retains its identity and decomposes very slowly. Some authorities put the rate of deterioration at about 20 per cent over a period of 20 years. This means it remains in the soil, in the water and in the fish and becomes cumulative. What provisions or thoughts are there in respect of providing something that will do a similar job for the farmers in their effort to produce the food we need? Has the government any idea what should be used in place of DDT? Has the government instituted any research on this? If such action has not been taken then it would seem to me that agriculture, which has been built up on the use of DDT, should be in some way compensated for its losses. There is also another problem. What will be done about the phosphates which are used in detergents and which cause damage?

Dr. Jones of the University of Toronto, I think last December, pointed out that there were chemicals now that would perform the same function as the phosphates and which do not have any deleterious effects. What has been done about this, and what is the time limit we are going to place on the manufacture of detergents? I suggest that we have a blank cheque. I hope when this bill goes to the committee something will be done about these problems because they exist all across Canada. The point of no return in respect of pollution is a lot closer than most of us care to believe.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I have not raised the genetic factors which might be involved as a result of pollution. I do not know whether other members have mentioned this, but it has come to my notice. There is a frightening illustration in the bird life of Canada. I think we have some 150 species of birds that are threatened with extinction. I propose to speak on this again when the bill comes back to the House from the committee. Before then I hope the committee will do something to set ground rules, and will decide how this measure can be made effective. In so doing, I hope they will deal fairly with industry and the municipalities.

In concluding I should like to quote from the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau):

> We are prepared to say it will be a crime to pollute the rivers or to pollute the air and to use the federal criminal power to force the industries or even the municipalities to do certain things. We wouldn't want to do it without provincial consent but we want to make people realize that when they make this choice it's going to be pretty costly because if you are going to send people to jail or make them pay fines, whether they be the chairman of the board of directors or whether they be a mayor of a city because they are sullying our water—

I see nothing in this measure that will make this a just society. What bothers me is that this measure does not go far enough. I hope when it comes back from the committee it will have some teeth in it and we will know the ground rules for controlling pollution.

The national commission which should be appointed will have to co-operate with their United States counterparts in the area of the Great Lakes, the waters of which are of importance to both sides. I hope this bill will be greatly improved when it returns to the House, otherwise this is an exercise in futility.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, like the two previous speakers I will attempt to be brief because I know the minister wants to make some remarks at the conclusion of this debate and before this bill finally goes to the committee. In the few minutes I have at my disposal I should like to comment on this rather flimsy document we have before us, and make a few basic points.

Since I am very pessimistic about pollution in general, I will probably be labelled as a crepe hanger by any of those jolly chamber of commerce types who happen to be in this House of Commons. I do not believe that legislators anywhere in North America are going to do anything effective to halt or reverse pollution until it is too late.

My second point arises from the first. The problem of even water pollution alone, leaving soil and air pollution out of it for the moment, is such a complex and gigantic problem that to do very much about combatting it in a positive way, virtually our whole value system and way of life will have to be reassembled and changed. Our way of life

might have to be so dramatically altered that politicians would find little public support for the rigid measures necessary to overcome the pollution problem. I think I know a little bit about what the minister and the government face in dealing with a bill that would be strong enough to overcome water pollution.

Finally, having read the bill thoroughly, I am convinced it confirms what I said regarding my first two points in so many ways I am alarmed. It alarms me when I think of the future of those children being born today, because of the kinds of things they will have to face by the time they are as old as I am.

Everybody is in on the pollution kick today. Pollution is another motherhood subject. It has become such a popular word that everybody wants to get in on the act. But I am afraid Bill C-144 has about as much resemblance to any solution to the problem of water pollution as a stage backdrop has to real trees in the forest. I think the bill before us today is but a political response to justify the government in face of the public outcry for clean water. Regretfully, what we have before us is largely a snow job or, with deference to the minister, probably a "Joe" job.

The minister must be a little bit embarrassed in coming here to the House to smuggle the Canada water act past us masquerading as anything more than a government statement of pious hopes brought in belatedly to quell the clamour. There is probably a great gnawing fear on the part of the people of ultimate human extinction that certainly has not been focused on in this bill. Like the member who spoke before me, I hope the committee will severely tighten up a number of the measures in this proposal. I think perhaps if we closed our eyes, this problem of public concern, the public rumbling might go away, but I do not think the problem would disappear.

Population and pollution experts tell us that we may have at the most one generation, or by the end of this century, to find alternatives to the disasters we will face if we do not control our population.

World population is growing geometrically rather than arithmetically. We now have more than 3 billion people on this planet and by the year 2000 we expect to have over 6 billion. After another generation we expect to have, by anyone's guess, perhaps 25 billion. Some people say this will mean a population density in the livable parts of the earth of 120,000 people per square mile, which is about the population density of the slums of Hong Kong.

How do we handle this kind of density in the year 2025 when today, in a sparsely populated country such as Canada we have dead lakes, poisoned bays, fetid, stinking rivers so laden with solid effluent you almost have to equip the fish with football helmets in order that they may swim unbruised to their spawning grounds?

Pollution increases are usually a mathematical function of population increase and population density. The magnitude of this problem is so little understood by the world at large and the Canadian general public, yet so crucial to our survival, that if I were a newly married man today, because I love children, I doubt very much whether I would bring any into the world, knowing as I do what survival conflicts they are going to face by the time they are 30 years of age.

I said earlier that the population problems are so complex that to alter them fundamentally would mean a whole change in our value system. I should like the House to consider for a moment the interrelation of the following points, and I will not elaborate on them: population growth and pollution, which I dealt with earlier; increased chemical disposal and pollution; rise in expectations or standard of living and pollution; increased industrialization and pollution; increased world and domestic trade and pollution, and increased resource exploitation, mining, logging, hydro, thermonuclear plants and pollution.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I do not think anyone in this House, least of all the minister, can minimize the complexities of the problems facing us. Our task is to develop the kind of legal machinery and the kind of public attitudes that can cope with the problems, and I personally do not believe this bill is designed to do so. I believe it is theoretically possible to reconcile all of these conflicts of which I spoke, earlier but I do not think we are going to do it in time. I despair that we won't do it in time. But I think I have said enough to indicate and briefly document the serious threat to our survival that our present human behavior contemplates.

The concern for pollution should have a much higher priority in the government's scheme of priorities. It should be assigned a priority ahead of such things as the constitution and inflation, because what is the point in solving the problems presented by inflation

and the constitution if by the year 2000 we are all going to choke on the air that we breathe, and drown in polluted waters? Life demands clean air and clean water for survival.

This brings me to something specific about Bill C-144. I am sure it has been touched on previously and therefore I will not elaborate upon it. It concerns the means of implementation of the provisions in the water quality and water resource clauses of the bill.

From time to time I speak to and communicate with municipal leaders in my riding. I represent parts of nine different municipalities. All or most of these municipalities dispose of their sewage directly into the Fraser River. I suppose they have the choice of contaminating the land or the river, and like most suburban areas they choose the easiest way, the out of sight way. These men have expressed the fear to me that even with the best will in the world, people living in urban areas cannot afford to finance the kind of treatment systems that will be necessary and effective to combat pollution.

My riding is on the edge of urban growth. We know the extent of urbanization in our country. If municipalities on the edge of urban growth, together with the major urban centres, cannot finance municipal treatment plants, and have no means to do so, all the legislation in the world is not going to assist them. Therefore, I think we should be looking for something more specific in terms of financial assistance in the Canada water bill.

What we have here in this bill is but a federal superstructure, an administrative superstructure, that is to be imposed upon what we have already, and God knows how many different agencies we now have to deal with pollution, even just water pollution.

The responsibilities for pollution control do not stop at the municipal level. The responsibilities for pollution control cannot be passed from the federal government to the provinces and then on to the municipalities. Nothing effective will be done unless we at the federal level are prepared to assist the municipalities to do the kind of things that they know now they must do.

I am confident hon. members on all sides of the House have taken advantage of this opportunity to take a swing at industrial polluters. I point out that municipalities, public bodies, are also polluting, but do not have the financial ability to avoid it. Now, we have before us a type of legislation which vaguely suggests that some kind of grants will be made some time in the future. However, at present when municipalities which want to do something about the matter apply for money through CMHC for sewage treatment financing they are told there are no funds available. That gives an indication of the kind of priority assigned by the federal government to pollution control.

It is a serious thing. As the hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens) so emphatically points out, urban growth and limited financial resources mean that the cities cannot cope with the problem without outside help, a great deal of help, and we have not examined nearly enough ways in which to help them.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that the provisions of clause 5(2) disturb me, because these clauses seem to say that if agreements for water quality fail to be reached between federal and provincial bodies then the federal government has a right to intervene. To me this indicates that there is no real confidence on the part of the federal government that the provinces can handle the problem by themselves. So, what the federal government gives itself here is an insurance clause.

Of course, the provinces cannot handle the problem by themselves. They have not been able to do so up until now, and there is no reason to expect that they will do so in the future. When this bill goes to committee I think we should look for some kind of financing formula similar to the Fraser Valley flood control formula, by which there would be a basic municipal, provincial and federal contribution for any treatment project approved. In short, Sir, I would like to see more of the preventive medicine type of thinking within the Canada water act. Let us not wait until we have to use the provisions of clause 5(2), by which time waters will have become so blatantly polluted that they are of national concern.

Why aren't we looking at these things in advance? Why are we not prepared to set up agencies to maintain water purity, rather than belatedly trying to reverse a process that may well nigh be irreversible? I am disturbed by the fact that in this bill water is emphasized solely as a resource. To me, thinking of water as a resource indicates that it is but something to be exploited. True, water is a resource but it is also an environment for life and this aspect should be reflected in this bill. Water is something crucial to our survival. It is necessary to life on this planet.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the reason I am pessimistic is that legislators do not tend to think

far ahead. Most of us think about as far ahead as the next election.

Mr. McGrath: Shame.

Mr. Rose: Even some members from the province of Newfoundland might be thinking about the next election. I suggest that we may solve some political problem with the Canada water act before the next election, but we are certainly not going to solve our pollution problems by the time of the next election.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I wish to remind the House that if the minister speaks at this time he will close the debate.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the sixth day that the House has spent on second reading of this bill. I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) referred to the length of time we have taken on second reading. I am not going to impute motives to anyone in respect of the length of time. I would point out that I did undertake in my opening speech that I would answer any queries either in my closing speech or in committee; I did undertake in my opening speech that we were anxious to hear of proposed solutions, to hear of methods of improving the bill and that in committee we would be willing to listen.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that at Westminster, and I believe even there the rules of the House are not working as effectively as they would wish, they have attempted to make the House work more effectively by refurbishing the rules and bringing them up to date. I believe that their normal and virtually inevitable practice at Westminster is to spend one day on second reading of a bill.

We have tried to reform our rules to make this House a more effective instrument. I believe that all of us who believe in this House and that it is in fact the strongest and the ultimate bastion of freedom and individual liberty, know that there must be a great reservoir of power here for use, when it is required, to preserve the liberty and the very bases of freedom.

But should we use the House at all times without consideration of its most valuable asset, namely time? I think it may be that we will so debilitate the power of the House to act in emergency that we will have done it a very great disservice.

Now, Mr. Speaker, many of the points raised here could have been very properly discussed, and I am sure will be discussed again, in committee through our strengthened committee structure.

I will say this—because I do not intend to impute motives in any way but merely to reflect upon the very length of the debate on second reading as compared to what would have taken place at Westminster. I do intend to attempt to the best of my ability to answer each individual member who has commented upon the bill. However, in closing this debate I should like to put on record that I feel it is not likely that this House will work as effectively as we would have it work if we speak as long as possible and as long as six days on the second reading of each bill.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka is rising on a question.

Mr. Aiken: Would the minister not agree that it has been stated publicly many times that this is one of the major efforts of the government in this session, the water bill, and that the minister himself has made that allegation? A good many private members would have liked to speak and it could have taken a lot longer.

Mr. Greene: I appreciate that fact, Mr. Speaker, and I have been reviewing the speeches very carefully. I hope I can demonstrate that belief either here or in committee by considering various arguments of the members who spoke. But many of the arguments were made time and time again, as I am sure my hon. friend will agree. I doubt whether in that regard this was, in fact, a debate. A debate is surely to bring points forward and attempt to answer them, not bring the same points forward ad infinitum. Certainly prior to Christmas many, many days were taken up on minor bills, which precluded this very important bill from coming before the House sooner—

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

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Comox-Alberni on a point of order.

Mr. Barnett: May I suggest to Your Honour, if I understand correctly that we are not on a point of order concerning the rules and pro-

ceedings of this House. The matter was particularly brought to my mind at the beginning of a debate, as it were, by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) when the minister was speaking about the procedure in the House. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, while one can expect a few kindly words of admonition from time to time from a minister, the minister is discounting his own argument by the length of the procedural debate into which he is launching.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I suggest to the hon. member that this is not the time to ask questions. We are not at the committee stage.

Mr. Barnett: I thought I made it clear that I rose on a point of order, and asked Your Honour to consider whether we should not be discussing the second reading of the bill rather than the procedures of the House of Commons.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I agree with the hon. member that we are actually on second reading of the bill.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I will heed the admonition of my hon. friend. Maybe we have all, including myself, spent too much time on this parenthetical reference of mine to the proceedings in the House. The words of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, who dealt with the length of the debate, rather tempted me to move into this area but I shall move on with the concluding speech on second reading. May I say to the hon. members whose particular arguments I cannot meet in the short time allotted to me, that I undertake to discuss the points with them in committee if they are not reached this afternoon.

At the outset there are one or two things I should like to say in answer to several of the last speakers whilst the points are fresh in my mind. First of all, in reply to the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott), who criticized the federal government for lack of action with regard to the Ottawa River and who indicated that he felt the governments of Ontario and Quebec were prepared to move when the federal government was not, I point out that the federal government offered, well over a year ago, to do a study of the Ottawa River at its own expense. This offer was not accepted by either province. I do not wish to rehash old problems because we want to move ahead in the future in a spirit of co-operation, but I do not believe it would have been fair to leave the record with the incorrect reflection that this allegation would have left.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre made some criticism of science in general and, again, while this may be slightly off the subject of the particular bill, I think his criticism is one to be considered. He advocated a science department or a specific minister in charge of science. I would merely point out to him that while his reflections on the importance of science in the world into which we are moving are valid, I think his specific panacea for the cure of apparent difficulties of governmental structure in controlling the scientific and research endeavours of the future was considered by the OECD in a report specifically about Canadian Science.

This report advocated that there should not be a specific science department and probably this is because science itself is becoming so pervasive that it probably would be impossible to have science assumed by any one department or minister without having an all-powerful czar who would direct every governmental activity. Science comes into almost every facet of government and every department of government. It must be the challenge of those of us in this House who have some responsibility in this direction to see if we can find methods whereby we can co-ordinate the scientific activities of various departments.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Some of the structures that have been created recently such as the Science Council, the Science Secretariat and the Science Committee of Cabinet, are attempts to achieve the goal the hon. member referred to without creating new and monolithic structures and without placing ultimate and overly great power in one department or minister.

As I say, I have heard some very valid criticisms. When opening my speech, I said that we do not profess to have all the answers. But the officials of my department have studied this question at considerable length; they wanted to know how we ought to begin tackling the problem of water pollution. They have studied the application of the law in many parts of the world; have sought for precedents, and have, after a very considerable period of gestation I will admit—but it was a very necessary period of gestation—advised as to this bill which the government thinks is best for Canada at this time.

May I say that there is no perfect precedent. There is no country, I think, that has solved the question of pollution or water management. We have sought to learn from those who appeared to have had some success or acquired special knowledge, because we wished to learn from their example. I believe that this bill, with such help as we may obtain from members of the House when it goes to committee, will be the best possible bill and will be for the benefit of Canada.

In the first place may I point out that there has been possibly a fundamental misconception on the part of many hon. members with respect to the bill itself and what it purports to do. I point out that the bill is not an antipollution measure. That is not the purpose of the bill. This is not a single purpose bill designed to clear up pollution. We think that this bill goes farther than any other in the proper direction. This bill is for the purposes of totally managing and planning the use of our water resources in future. So far as the cleaning up of pollution where it exists—yes; that is one of the things this bill would purport to do. At least, it purports to create the instrument which will do that.

But this, surely, is not good enough. It is not sufficient for us to look forward at this time to a bill which merely says, "All we want to do is clean up the dirt where it exists." We are concerned with planning for the future use of waters in such a way that pollution will be minimized, yes; but we hope to manage these resources a good deal better than in the past so that undue pollution will not occur in future and, further, we are chiefly concerned that we achieve the optimum use of our water in the future. I think if we start with that understanding, with the understanding that this is not just a bill to clean up the harm that has been done in the past, we shall see that the purpose of the bill is to enable us to manage better this precious resource of water in the future.

I think the last speaker in the debate took umbrage because the bill refers to water as a resource. I make no apology for this. Surely, in the technological age we live in, if we are to achieve at least a minimal standard of living, let alone the best possible standard that I am sure we all want for those vast populations to which the hon. member referred, we must indeed use all the resources we have, or we will not be able to achieve that standard of well being. Water is one of the resources that we must use. Thence it follows that we must use this resource differently than we have been up to now, if it is to be of continuing benefit for those who come after us and for the increasing populations that have been referred to.

I should now like, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the main objections that have been taken to the bill and, in the short time available to me, I will try to cover most of those objections to the best of my ability and in some detail, and then leave specific comments to the committee, if I may, along with any other general approaches to the bill that the committee may wish to take. First, I think many hon. members objected to the bill because of its failure to prescribe national water standards. At first sight this may appear to be a shortcoming of the bill. When I started studying the subject I looked rather hopefully for some rather simplistic type of device such as national water standards which people would have to live up to and observe, and then, hopefully, our troubles would be over.

Further study on my part with the help of officials convinced me that clearly this was not a good approach. Let me illustrate this as simply as I can this way. If you had national water standards in this highly industrialized age and in this highly industrialized country then, surely, you could not expect to achieve for all our waters that standard of pristine purity existing in some of our pure lakes that have as yet not been touched by industrial development. I say that because if we were to adopt that as our national standard we could not, and neither could any other country that adopted these standards, have bodies of water as pure as Lake Louise or as the lakes in the north.

Not only could we not have that general standard, but we would not wish to have it. Water must be used for many purposes in industry; and if you are to have one national standard you would have to take into cognizance the fact that in certain industrial areas waters must be used for industrial purposes and that, therefore, it cannot be as pure as it was in the days before we became industrialized. If we are prepared to say that under our national quality standards all our waters must be only as pure as those say of Hamilton Harbour, where quite properly certain economic activities relating to steel production and other industries take place, we must also say, surely, that waters as pure as those of Lake Louise may be polluted up to the level of Hamilton Harbour because that is what we are saying if we accept that national standard, and I do not think that is what any of us wants. We do not want to pollute down, so to

speak, to those levels where water is used for industrial purposes. On the other hand, if we say that under our national water standards all waters must attain the level of purity of Lake Louise then, clearly, we are proscribing the industrial use of many of our water basins. That would not be economically feasible, or possible, or wise. Waters used for industrial purposes could never be as pure as Lake Louise. At least, that is the conclusion that we came to, and we therefore said that this was not a good approach for Canada. We do not want to pollute down any of those areas that are still clean. We wished to avoid, wherever possible, having standards so high that they would make industrial activities which are very proper in certain areas impossible in the future. The bill does not attempt to do that, Mr. Speaker, and I think quite properly so. Instead it attempts to achieve the optimum standard. I stress that word, because that word is the key. The bill attempts to achieve the optimum standard in any large water basin.

What does this mean? In a water basin that is used for industrial purposes and the disposal of human waste, as many water basins are used, and where we may wish to preserve some aesthetic quality and where, also, part of the basin may be reserved for recreational uses, the optimum standard will be at that particular level of water purity which makes sense for that particular basin. In a basin where there is no industry and where good planning may indicate we should have a resort or recreational area in the foreseeable future, there will be a far different standard than the one applying to an industrial use of the water. In such a basin the optimum standard of water will be at a much higher level. In some water basins where the proper and best use of the water in the interest of the region, and of Canada in general, might be purely for industrial purposes or municipal waste, the optimum standard might be much lower. I do not see any specific areas where this would be the best thing. I think in all areas we can preserve some of the esthetic qualities and some of the recreational assets of our water.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I wish to emphasize the point that in our view a national standard would very definitely not have been in the best interests of having the optimum standards of water in various parts of Canada. In this variegated country, it is very seldom there is a simplistic answer for everything, that the same answer will do in all parts of Canada. In my view with water quality, as with many other things, we will have different standards in different water basins, but in each case there will be the optimum standard for the multi-use of water in that particular water basin.

The second general argument that was made, and hit hard was the question of financing. There seemed to be considerable ambivalence in my respectful view in this regard. Some hon. members indicated we should have a fund, a great big federal pot from which money could be used, to solve the problem of pollution in the various regions of Canada. At the same time and in the same speech some hon. members said, oh yes, but the polluters should pay.

I took the liberty of imposing on the very gracious lady, the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and asked her a question. The hon. member seemed to feel there should be a much greater federal financial input. I asked her whether in her view the polluter should pay and should that be the premise of the bill. If I understood her answer correctly it was, yes, the polluter should pay. With respect, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can have it both ways.

I think the premise of the bill is quite properly that the polluter should pay to rehabilitate the water, at least to put it back in the condition in which it was found and, in many cases, to improve it. I think that is the proper approach because it induces improvement. It is an incentive to use the water in such a way that it will not be polluted. If the user knows he must pay in order to rehabilitate, he will set up his systems of production in such a way that he will not pollute.

There is a real incentive to non-pollution. If there is to be a large fund and the public is to pay for the cleaning of polluted water, I suggest there is absolutely no incentive to the improvement of industrial practices in the future. I do not think we can have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, by having this paid from the public purse and at the same time having the polluter pay.

The philosophy of this act is that the polluter should pay. This is quite properly a cost of production in the same way as municipal and school taxes. Just as in the many areas of public contribution that the private user of resources must make in the form of a stipend paid to the public purse, so in future will the cost of rehabilitating water be a very proper cost of production.

The other two main complaints that were made by most speakers were in the area of phosphates and the proliferation of committees. Because my time is about to expire, I undertake to the House that I will deal with these matters to the best of my knowledge and in whatever length and depth the committee feels necessary, as well as with the respective criticisms of individual members, in Committee.

I again refer to the question of finances. May I say I appreciate the municipal problem. There was and will be again the Central Mortgage and Housing fund to help municipalities, but I do not think we should skate around this too glibly. In the past municipalities have accepted the fact that disposal of their waste as well as providing water, education and roads, was a proper municipal charge. I think all hon. members will agree with this. Municipalities have said it is a proper charge that the homeowner pay for the disposal of his waste. There may have to be a reconsideration of the ethic at the municipal level to see whether disposal of the waste alone is to be a proper charge on the municipal taxpayer. Is not the disposal of his waste in such a fashion that it does not contaminate the water for future or downstream users, in the ethic of tomorrow, the proper responsibility at the municipal level? I know the municipal taxpayer may need help to finance the capital charges required. I suggest that the user at the municipal level, as well as the industrial level, is the proper place to put the responsibility for the maintenance of the quality of our waters and the improvement of that quality.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I undertake to answer the two further major points, as well as the individual representations of hon. members, at the committee hearings.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, January 22, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It has to do with the order of business for this day's sitting. In view of the understanding, and I think it is common knowledge, that the hon. member for Athabasca will be proceeding with his motion under Routine Proceedings, I wonder if the Government House Leader would be willing to ascertain whether there is unanimous consent to the oral question period being called before we deal with that motion?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I have already done so, Mr. Speaker, and I think the general feeling is that we should get right on with the debate to be instituted by the hon. member for Athabasca.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—FREEDOM OF JOURNALISTS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to move a motion, which will be seconded by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom), under the provisions of Standing Order 43. The urgency of my motion will be apparent to anyone who has watched television or read the newspapers in the last two days, and I will not elaborate on it. The motion is:

That this House requests the government to make immediate representations to the government of Nigeria urging that journalists representing news agencies, newspapers and television networks throughout the world be given full rights of access and full freedom to report facts and to file dispatches throughout the former secessionist territory of Biafra, and that in view of the appalling conditions of starvation revealed by journalists who have been in the area, calls on the government now to make a last desperate effort to secure the consent of the Nigerian government to the acquisition by the Canadian government of the available stocks of food at Sao Tomé, their transportation by air and their distribution within the area where this tragedy is taking place.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood. There can be a debate on the motion proposed by the hon. member only if there is unanimous agreement.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimous agreement; therefore I cannot put the hon. member's motion for consideration by the House at this time.

AGRICULTURE

STATEMENT ON 1970-71 CAPITAL BUDGET OF FARM CREDIT CORPORATION

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in order that plans may be made and programs developed for the fiscal year 1970-71, the government has now approved the capital budget of the Farm Credit Corporation. There are certain aspects of this budget that will be of considerable interest to members of this House and to farmers across Canada.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Adjustment of production practices is taking place all across Canada. In the prairie provinces many farmers are currently shifting or planning to shift to the production of livestock as an alternative to producing grain for direct sale. In other parts of the country dairy farmers and others are facing decisions of the same nature. Such changes of enterprise must be carefully planned, with due regard for the long-term market prospects as well as other considerations such as the provision of buildings, machinery, and the alternative of farm rotation to meet the changing pattern. Such changes must also be properly financed on a long-term basis. I wish to confirm that the Farm Credit Corporation may provide long-term credit to farmers who wish to adjust their resource utilization to

better meet the market demands. The budget of the Farm Credit Corporation for the coming year has been adjusted to provide additional funds to meet the increase in demand which is expected for loans for this purpose in the coming fiscal year. The field officers of the Farm Credit Corporation can be a valuable source of information and assistance to farmers in these matters.

An additional feature of the new budget is that it will provide funds to permit farmers who find it necessary and desirable to refinance current liabilities. These loans will be made available to cereal grain producers operating viable farm businesses who under ordinary circumstances would be able to operate satisfactorily but whose ability to do so has been impaired by inability to market their grain and who thus may need to refinance short and intermediate-term liabilities over a longer term. Applications for such loans, of course, will be subject to the usual other criteria for loans from the corporation.

The corporation will take steps to inform farmers that this assistance is available to them.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, the statement of the Minister of Agriculture regarding the capital budget of the Farm Credit Corporation will certainly be studied with a great deal of interest by the agricultural industry across Canada.

His statement is very modest in tone when it says that "adjustment of production practices is taking place all across Canada." In essence what he is alluding to is the fact that the agricultural industry is staggering because of the lowest return it has experienced in its history.

Although the minister states that money will be made available for long-term loans for the provision of buildings, machinery and the alternative of farm rotation to assist in shifting production from grain to livestock, I think this program is weak. There are two apparent weaknesses which will be evident to the farmers immediately. First—and this concerns the west particularly—it is stated that loans will be made to cereal grain producers operating viable farm businesses who under ordinary circumstances would be able to operate satisfactorily but who may need to refinance short and intermediate-term liabilities over a longer term. This point will need some clarification on the part of the department because what the farmers need especially is not money to refinance short and intermediate-term loans but immediate operating capital. I hope this will be taken into consideration.

[Mr. Olson.]

The other weakness, Mr. Speaker, which I think is more apparent and is a major one, is the fact that the government is proceeding now to lend the farmers of this nation additional capital for the purpose of refinancing, which will put them further in debt. The weakness lies in the fact that the farmers of this nation are not aware of the long-term policy of the government regarding agriculture. It is of no value to refinance farmers with respect to a particular field of endeavour if it is long-term government policy to curtail the production of the essential products in which they are involved. It is a fact that many farmers have undertaken a tremendous amount of debt only to find there is no longer an economic market for the supplies produced and they are therefore unable to finance the debt.

Until the government is able to spell out its program in its entirety and say whether it is going to enter the field of supply management and under such a program curtail production to meet domestic requirements only, the Farm Credit Corporation will not be able to solve many of the problems farmers face today merely by granting long-term loans.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, this program is, of course, another ad hoc approach to the problem that exists in Canada as a whole and in western Canada in particular. If the Farm Credit Corporation makes additional moneys available to the farmers, undoubtedly some of them will borrow.

One bad feature of the announcement is that nothing has been mentioned about adjusting interest rates to meet the probable ability of the farmer to pay. Apparently he is expected to borrow money at high interest rates for a long term.

The second weakness I wish to point out lies in the fact that we know changes are taking place in production patterns in western Canada. Indeed, some provinces are already assisting these changes; Manitoba and Saskatchewan are two examples. If money is now made available these changes probably will be accelerated. What is needed is an assessment of the market situation and the demand for various farm products. Some people may have to go out of grain production on a long-term basis. The question is, how much land should they take out of production? In a recent news-

letter the Department of Agriculture made an estimate of 20 million acres.

We have seen in the past crop year that a change in pricing and marketing practices has increased substantially the marketings of barley, a feed grain. What we need is an accurate assessment of the potential market for grain, feed grains and oilseeds in the years immediately ahead, and the probable absorption by the market of livestock production. Only on forecasts of this kind can the farmer make a rational judgment. That, of course, is the real basis of his problem. He must be able to make a rational judgment.

The government of Canada through the Department of Agriculture is making increased amounts of money available. If this money is utilized for types of production that will be in trouble in a few years, we shall not have solved the difficulty. Therefore I plead with the government and the Minister of Agriculture to get some people working on a long-range as well as an immediate-range program along the lines I have outlined so that the farmer may, hopefully, make intelligent decisions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, the minister's statement seems interesting in many regards. However, one should also refer to a statement he made in Quebec on January 29, 1969, and I quote:

> In many sectors of agriculture, scientific progress is just beginning to be felt and to promise for the first time revolutionary innovations. The history of mankind teaches us that technology—

"Technology" is a very big word, and already we have begun to suffer from it. The statement goes on:

> —is an international commodity. Gunpowder, a Chinese discovery, reached Europe like a train of powder, so to speak, and revolutionized the art of war.
>
> Improvements in the field of agriculture may be due to experiments in genetics carried out in Mexico, in a laboratory in the United States, in Europe or elsewhere. Whatever their origin, their effects will finally be felt in Canadian agriculture. It is precisely the high-geared pace of technological developments that makes it so complicated to devise an agricultural policy.

We are given another proof today that we are living in an extremely complex world, when we read the following part of the minister's statement:

> Adjustment of production practices is taking place all across Canada. In the Prairie provinces many farmers are currently shifting—

on the advice of experts I would imagine,

> —or planning to shift to the production of livestock as an alternative to producing grain for direct sale.

• (2:20 p.m.)

In the eastern provinces, learned economists, those who come up with solutions when we are in a complete state of stagnation, have advised our processed milk producers to take the same course of action. They said: "There are milk surpluses. Produce alternate goods. Take up cattle ranching." Then, in western and eastern Canada, farmers are encouraged to raise cattle. And when there is a meat surplus on the market, farmers will be blamed and told: You are the most stupid, because you are all producing the same goods. You alone are responsible. You produce too much beef, prices fall, bear your rate patiently.

In advocating this policy, the minister necessarily wanted to create new debts. Indeed, to undertake a new kind of production, the equipment must be changed. The new production will have to bear the burden of debts accumulated during a deficit period. This change of program will be called debt conversion in order to prolong the martyrdom which is the fate of farmers already burdened with terrible debts, while an appeal is made to them to have patience in these words: Wait, exercise patience, the situation will improve.

The minister is well aware that to make sure that eastern and western farmers can live reasonably and enjoy a fair share of the national revenue, prices must correspond to production. The minister knows it very well because he said it often and I congratulate him. I hope however that his memory is good. He said that the problem in 1966 was one of "cost-price", and the problem is still the same. We are in a squeeze, we are choking and we are trying to get out of that.

In my opinion, if we really want to improve the condition of eastern and western farmers, interest rates will have to go down so as to reduce the production cost and leave the producers with a small profit. It is thus that, in my opinion, we will be able to give to farmers a fair share of the national revenue.

[*English*]

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

TABLING OF REPORT BY ANDRÉ SAUMIER—STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, on December 18 last, at the

request of the Government Film Commissioner and Chairman of the National Film Board, I entrusted Mr. André Saumier with the task of making an analysis of the staff reductions planned by the management of the National Film Board as a result of the budgetary restrictions imposed by the government's austerity program. This appointment of a person outside the NFB seemed at the time to be the best way of studying the difficulties between the board's top management and its production staff arising from the reductions announced for December 15, 1969. The report was submitted to the commissioner on January 15 and I am tabling it today, together with the commissioner's comments.

The primary finding of the report is that the board is not threatened with imminent paralysis, as certain persons have given to understand during the past few weeks. It is true that its over-all production level for the 1970-71 fiscal year is to be reduced to what it was in 1964-65; nevertheless, this represents a net budget of $10 million, which is far from negligible.

[*Translation*]

In order to gain a proper perspective, the National Film Board's activities must be viewed within the broader and more realistic context of the government's activities as a whole in the field of cinematography; here I should like to emphasize the continuous growth in this sector and the unremitting attention given to it by the Secretary of State. The Board's present difficulties should not hide the activities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or of the Canadian Film Development Corporation. In 1964, the CBC spent the sum of $9,500,000 on the production of films for television; in 1970-71, this sum will be $13,000,000.

In 1964, there was no such thing as the Film Development Corporation; during its first year of existence (1968-69) it invested $366,639 in the production of 20 feature films and made awards amounting to $100,000. In 1970-71 it plans to invest a total of 2.5 million in Canada's film industry.

In addition to this, the government is negotiating co-production agreements with a number of countries with a view to helping Canadian films gain admission to the international market. Thus it is obvious that the government is taking an ever-increasing interest in the film industry as a whole, and that NFB activities must from now on be considered in this global context.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

The question that must be confronted is this: what should be the role of each of the institutions involved in this over-all activity and what relations should they have with one another? This question has been under consideration for several months now and we hope to offer an answer before the present session comes to an end.

Furthermore, the difficulties the NFB is now experiencing are forcing it to take a hard look at its structures and policy, having regard both to present-day realities in the realm of cinematography and budget restrictions. I feel certain that the Board will have no trouble finding its place in this new expanded context and that its contribution therein will continue to be essential. Obviously, the transition must take place with minimum delay while respecting the fundamental integrity of the organization itself.

[*English*]

It is also essential that following the present difficulties the number of inevitable lay-offs among the production staff be kept to a minimum. This objective has been given particular attention. I have been assured today by the management of the board that the number of lay-offs on the English production side, which was to have been 37, will be reduced to 32 and that 12 of those affected will receive a one-year termination notice instead of the usual three months. Following these lay-offs there will be 146 employees in the English production unit and 70 in the French production unit. It is therefore obvious that the National Film Board's vital creative staff will be maintained. Its development will be assured by a dynamic new definition of its role, and the unique contribution it has to make to the cultural life of Canada will also be assured.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, there are two initial comments I should like to make in connection with the Saumier report. The report came into my hands only just before the opening of the sitting this afternoon, so I have only been able to peruse it briefly.

• (2:30 p.m.)

On the basis of that perusal, I can say that it is an excellent report and one which goes far beyond the original terms of reference, which were to inquire into the dismissals at the National Film Board. Mr. Saumier has gone far beyond an examination of that immediate problem and in the process has

given us a very excellent outline of the problems that beseige and beset not only the National Film Board operations but also the whole cinematography industry in Canada. Actually most of these difficulties were known prior to the tabling of the report because the problems were discussed as recently as a year ago by the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, which came to the same conclusions.

In addition to Mr. Saumier's outline of the broad problems in his report, he pointed out the immediate crisis which precipitated the demonstration on Parliament Hill by employees of the NFB, and which eventually forced the government to look into the matter, arose from the implementation of the current austerity program in a rather crude and blunt fashion. I am sure this same criticism can be made of the application of the austerity program in other departments and government activities.

Those of us who took the trouble to meet with the employees of the National Film Board when they were on Parliament Hill just before Christmas heard them outline the main difficulties that are again enumerated in the report. Mr. Norman McLaren, one of the most creative individuals not only in the industry in Canada but throughout the world, was one of the spokesmen on that occasion. The substance of the points made was that creative talents were going to suffer from the blunt application of government austerity. It was said that the English division of the National Film Board was going to be starved under the application of the austerity program. It was also said that there was an emphasis on management at the expense of production and creative talent in the National Film Board.

The report, as the Secretary of State has indicated, has reaffirmed these comments and criticisms made by representatives of the National Film Board early in December, and already some corrective action is to be taken to deal with this difficulty. With reference to management problems it is worth while to note that on page two Mr. Saumier emphasized that difficulty in these words:

> It should be emphasized here that the senior management of the board, located moreover far from the capital, had scant knowledge of the mysterious workings of government in Ottawa.

He is not the only one who has that difficulty, Mr. Speaker, because even those of us in this House could make the same observation. This statement indicates that the highly controversial move of the NFB in the 1950's from the capital to Montreal was a mistake, as many said at that time, and is perhaps one of the major reasons for the worsening position of that branch of government service.

The main difficulty, which should be emphasized in respect of the broad perspective, that is, other than the immediate crisis caused by austerity, has been pointed out in Mr. Saumier's report in these words:

> There does not exist at the present a comprehensive federal government policy with regard to information or cultural affairs.

He enlarges on that general criticism by saying that the major difficulty in the whole field of cinematography and audio-visual communications is that there is no comprehensive federal government policy regarding information on cultural affairs. This not only affects the operations of the National Film Board but also deeply involves the private sector of the industry. I remind hon. members that during a series of meetings of the committee last year it was pointed out to us that the whole audio-visual industry in Canada, the motion picture industry and the cinematography industry are in a state of crisis at the present time and as a result are forming a Canadian motion picture academy in an attempt to come to grips with the problem. Much more expeditious and vigorous action on the part of the government is required to find a solution than such palliatives as the establishment of the Canadian Film Development Corporation and some of the other measures the Secretary of State has referred to in his brief statement this afternoon. In particular we will have to deal with the invasion of the motion picture industry by that great republic to the south of us. This represents one of the main areas of difficulty.

Finally, Mr. Saumier also dealt with another aspect which I think is of primary importance. If the objective outlined by the Secretary of State is to be realized, namely, to make the National Film Board more visible, we must remember that one result of the present austerity program has been to cut out free distribution of National Film Board productions to community film councils. The NFB has been one of the main sources of adult education in the more outlying parts of the country. I urge the Secretary of State, as does the Saumier report, to review this matter carefully. It is quite possible that in this regard the government is being penny wise and pound foolish.

National Film Board

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, the National Film Board, as members of this House know, has over the years built up an international reputation. It has won awards at film festivals throughout the world. It has built up a devoted following in Canada. Co-operatives, labour unions, home and school associations and community groups of all types have used National Film Board productions extensively. It is little comfort to the Film Board and its employees to be told by the Secretary of State that there has been an expansion in the production of films financed by the government through the CBC and the new corporation which finances film-making by private companies.

The Film Board is faced with a reduction in staff, despite the slight modifications announced by the minister, by 100 people in the next couple of months. Of these a very substantial number, in fact the largest percentage, will come from the English production division. In addition, the user fees which the Film Board has instituted as a result of the austerity forced upon it by the government will have a bad result. I know that hon. members and the minister have received representations from various groups in all parts of Canada that they cannot afford the user fees and will be forced to curtail sharply or discontinue completely the use of films they have been procuring from the Film Board. So we are faced with a further reduction in staff of possibly another 50 people who work in the distribution field if the use of films produced by the board is cut substantially.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Let me tell the minister that in spite of his kind words today there is panic in the National Film Board and morale has dropped to an all-time low with the result that people are going to leave just as quickly as they can find something else to do. It is an interesting commentary on this government that the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State, who came into public life with a reputation for being intellectuals and persons of culture, are in charge of a government which is going to preside over the virtual demise of the National Film Board and a very sharp reduction in the creative facilities of the CBC. That is something which ought to be noted very carefully.

There is one other point I must put on the record and I hope the minister will take note of it. In his report Mr. Saumier points out that as a result of the planned cutbacks in English language production the staff will be reduced to a level of 90 per cent of what it was in 1964-65 and that on the French language production side the staff will be 142 per cent of what it was in 1964-65. All of us in this group come from constituencies whose people are largely English-speaking. We have tried very hard to explain to our constituents and the people of Canada why the proposals of the government to increase the use of the French language and to make it easier for people whose mother tongue is French to work for the government and live in all parts of Canada are necessary in order to maintain this country as one nation. But I say to the minister that such an unfair cutback on the English production side will make it very difficult for us to explain that kind of policy to our constituents.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, in his statement to the House about Mr. André Saumier's report on the analysis of the staff reductions planned by the management of the National Film Board, the minister said:

> —The Board's present difficulties should not hide the activities of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation or of the Canadian Film Development Corporation.

The minister states clearly that three agencies financed by the government are concerned with the distribution of films produced in Canada and abroad. The minister added:

> In 1964, the C.B.C. spent the sum of $9,500,000 on the production of films for television; in 1970-71, this sum will be $13,000,000.

That means an increase of $3,500,000 in appropriations for production of films to be shown on television.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who looks at the television films produced by the C.B.C. and compares them to those produced by the N.F.B. can readily see how superior the latter are to the educational films made by the C.B.C. for the people of Canada. As a matter of fact, the N.F.B. seeks to educate Canadians, instead of brainwashing them as the C.B.C. does. Why, then, should appropriations for the C.B.C. be considerably increased while those of the N.F.B. are being reduced.

Each time I have had occasion to view a television film produced by the N.F.B., I was aware that it was of a highly educational nature. For instance, we are informed about the North-West Territories and various other areas of Canada.

And the C.B.C., what kind of film does it make in Canada? I will recall in that respect that, during the Christmas season, it showed a one-hour telecast produced in an Old People's Home in Montreal and during which Robert Charlebois swore like blazes for an hour, the whole program being sponsored by the C.B.C.

If one considers the type of films made by the C.B.C. about our own area, Abitibi, when we are shown uninhabited shanties to illustrate the poverty which is rampant over there, one concludes that there is no need for the C.B.C. to go to Abitibi in order to produce such feats. After all, it would be enough to cross the Ottawa River to see the rats over in Hull, and the poverty which is prevalent there. And how about the slums of Montreal! But, on the contrary, efforts have been made for too many years to show despicable films to the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, the government should not reduce appropriations to the N.F.B. but rather help this organization more generously than it does now the C.B.C. which does not fulfill its mission, which is to further the general welfare of the people.

[*English*]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs, in view of the conflicting reports coming out of Nigeria, whether it is his intention to make at least a brief statement to the House with regard to this matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must remind hon. members we are still on motions.

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca) moved that the first report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development presented on December 16, 1969 be concurred in.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I propose that the House concur in the first report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It will be evident that any member of the House who has the honour to represent a northern territory such as mine has a special interest in the north. Our interest arises not simply because we who stand on Canada's last important frontier are aware of its vast potential but because we are aware of what can be lost through failure to act properly and prudently in the interest of all Canadians. By asserting Canadian sovereignty over the land and water of the north which traditionally has been considered as belonging to Canada we stand to benefit our own people as well as reassure them that we are firm in protecting their rights.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: This is not a time for national timidity. The government's reluctance or tardiness in asserting Canadian sovereignty is doing great harm to our nation. Its pussyfooting can be construed by some nations as an indication that the government has some doubt whether that water and those islands are actually Canadian territory—

Mr. Nesbitt: Well put.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Yewchuk: —and the longer we wait before asserting ourselves the greater this doubt will grow.

The claim for Canadian sovereignty is a matter which should be above partisan considerations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: This, I think is the case, as is evidenced strongly by the committee's recommendations which were unanimously agreed upon by members representing all parties in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: Canada owns the waters of the Arctic Archipelago and should be prepared to exercise complete sovereignty over them. We could rest our case on the principle of long-established claims without challenge by other states, and upon our long-established exercise of effective sovereignty in that area. However, there are many other points to be considered.

Members of all parties have expressed concern about this issue. Some Liberal members opposite have indicated that they are concerned. Indeed, it is of interest to read in the Vancouver *Sun* of September 16, 1969, an article by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre). I would like to quote a few paragraphs from this article since he is a member of the Standing Committee on Indian

Affairs and Northern Development and a former vice-chairman of that committee:

There is a pattern of ship loss in Arctic waters. The losses occur usually when a ship becomes wedged and immovable in the ice. Pressure builds, either by tide or by winds. The ship is crushed and, when released, sinks.

The ecological disaster of a 250,000-ton supertanker spilling crude oil into waters of 27 to 30 degrees fahrenheit strains the imagination. It certainly exceeds our knowledge. The Canadian government, to its discredit, has not even yet undertaken tests of Prudhoe Bay crude oil action under these circumstances. Only during the recent visit of the parliamentary committee to the north did the Fisheries Research Board send its first researcher to those waters to make preliminary investigations.

The suggestions are that crude oil at temperatures below the freshwater freezing mark will form a gelatinous mass which, when deposited on shorelines, may remain for decades and possibly for a century. The lethal effects upon marine life (another subject on which our government remains ignorant and apparently indifferent) are beyond calculation. However, it is recognized that many crude oils contain substances as lethal as DDT. A quarter-million ton tanker could contain killing chemical substances of a scope never inflicted before on any ecology of the world. The Arctic skein of life is probably the least suited to withstand pollution on this gargantuan scale.

I pause here in the quotation to express concern for the people who depend on the land and the waters of the north for their very livelihood, to express concern for the native people, the Indians and the Eskimos who stand the risk of being exploited by commercial plunderers before they can be said to have even lived. Their living conditions are still 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. The figures I have at hand show that even in 1964 the average age at death of the Eskimo was 32.2 years.

Are we considering these people? Are they to be part of a give-away? Are we bringing them into discussions regarding their own destiny? Is the Northwest Territories Council involved in discussions, or do we just intend to bulldoze over these people and leave them with the scars of commercial exploitation that already disfigure the permafrost and threaten to cut off survival of the wildlife of the north?

Let me read more of the comments by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin—

An hon. Member: Who is making the speech?

Mr. Yewchuk: These remarks are very pertinent to the subject, and I said that we wanted to point out that members on the government side, in spite of the fact that the ministers do not favour it, have indicated that they are in favour of our sovereignty over the north.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: I do not apologize for quoting so much of the hon. member's article, which I thought was a pretty good one.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: Don't get too sensitive, boys.

Mr. Yewchuk: I continue the quotation:

In her national interest—the prime concern of any nation's government—Canada must control any oil shipments through the Northwest Passage.

We could not deny the rights of innocent passage from one ocean to another if technology has made this possible. But the determination of what constitutes innocent passage must be ours. We are the nation vitally concerned. The determination of which ships are safe and which are dangerously unfit cannot be left to Humble Oil or any of the international companies. It cannot be left to a foreign power. It cannot be left to the United Nations. The Canadian Arctic is the concern of Canadians, unless we choose to abrogate that responsibility.

If enough Canadians know the facts, I don't think they'll choose to ignore this challenge.

We have ample right to claim the waters within the Arctic Archipelago as our own. We have rights of discovery, of continuous occupation, and we have rights by reason that this is a continuous archipelago of the Hinterland doctrine. Ours is not an ocean archipelago, comparable with Indonesia where international shipping has passed for millennia, beginning with Chinese explorers. The Arctic islands are an extension of the Canadian continental land mass and our internationally recognized control of the Labrador coast and of Hudson Bay extends logically and naturally into the High Arctic Islands.

We have further rights. The Arctic and Antarctic seas are not like all others. They are frozen for much of the year. The definition between land and water is sometimes detectable only by instruments. At least one authority has stated that a ship frozen in Arctic seas, far from land and communicating with land only by surface vehicle, is more effectively a part of the Canadian land mass than is a ship at anchor in one of our southern harbours.

For these and other reasons, I am convinced that the waters within the archipelago have been Canadian, are now Canadian and must remain exclusively Canadian.

As I mentioned before, Mr. Speaker, I am not the author of those words. They are the thoughts of the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin, expressed in an article.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Yewchuk: I am amazed at the attitude of the Government House Leader in his efforts to obstruct this motion and prevent

a debate on such a vital issue. He has intimated that the committee did not wish the report to be considered by the House. That is absurd. The report was agreed upon unanimously and individually by every member of the committee. The report was written after hearing evidence by many experts, including Dr. Maxwell Cohen, and after study of an extensive research paper on the subject as well as a trip to the Arctic last summer.

I would like to read a paragraph from the first report of the committee:

Members of the committee, during their visit, also had an opportunity for discussion with experts in the oil transportation industry and talked with some of Canada's most expert icebreaker marine officers, as well as the transportation officers responsible for Panarctic's shipping operations in the Melville Island area where the loss of two Panarctic barges occurred in August. Members also had discussions with a leading Canadian marine biologist and ecologist investigating the effects of the Panarctic barge accident.

After the visit to the Arctic members of the committee met four times before producing this report. I would like to draw attention to a couple of other paragraphs on page six of the report:

• (3:00 p.m.)

Your committee rejects the suggestion that an international waterway exists through the Canadian Archipelago.

At page 7 the report reads:

Your committee recommends that the government of Canada indicate to the world, without delay, that vessels, surface and submarine, passing through Canada's Arctic Archipelago are and shall be subject to the sovereign control and regulation of Canada.

I should like also to quote from the testimony of Dr. Maxwell Cohen appearing on page 624 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence, No. 18, of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, dated April 18, 1969, where he states:

But if you add together the archipelago theory and the sector theory, I think that the Canadian case for total control over the water system between the islands is not unpersuasive.

He goes on to say:

But when you add to the sector theory the notion that the whole of the Arctic island system is a common archipelago, and as a common archipelago it is within the sovereign jurisdiction of Canada for all the reasons I have given, and you take the Norwegian Fisheries judgment as a further wrapping up of the doctrinal issue, I think you treat this as the Norwegian Fisheries case treated the Norwegian coast where all the waters between the fiords are now treated as inland Norwegian waters and not high seas. Therefore, subject to innocent passage, of course, subject to rights of passage through straits, one could make, I think, a reasonable case for the inland waters character of the waters of the archipelago.

I make reference, Mr. Speaker, to a research report made available to us. I should like to read two paragraphs from that to establish that Canada has made its presence known and has exercised sovereignty in that region for quite some time. The report reads:

In 1903, the *Neptune* patrolled the waters of Hudson Bay and the eastern Arctic islands to aid in the establishment of permanent stations for the collection of customs, the administration of justice, and the enforcement of Canadian law.

In 1906-1907, Captain Bernier in command of the *C.G.S. Arctic*, carried out similar operations. He proceeded to Albert harbour, North Baffin island, where he informed the whalers that they must take out licences under Canadian Whaling regulations; he landed at no less than 15 places, on different islands, and took formal possession of them in the name of Canada, usually by raising the flag, reading a formal document, erecting a cairn and depositing in it the document of possession.

The Government House Leader's dictatorial attitude simply reflects his disdain for Parliament and for the usefulness of committees.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Yewchuk: In his efforts to undermine Parliament by means of the rule changes, he considered that he should occupy the minds of members by scattering them off into a corner somewhere to sit at a committee meeting and then forget about their work and forget about their committee reports.

Mr. Bell: Where is he now?

An hon. Member: Time you had a new House Leader.

Another hon. Member: Where is your House Leader?

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, your ruling to allow the motion was a major victory for Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Yewchuk: It has given to committees a new sense of vitality and vigour.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the line of thought of the hon. member, but I think all hon. members will recognize that it is not in order to comment on a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. Yewchuk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought it was pertinent to the issue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Yewchuk: I expect the Government House Leader might start juggling the rules again and I just wanted to indicate that we would not stand for it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Participatory autocracy!

Mr. Yewchuk: Much of our concern for the Arctic involves the question of pollution. We now believe that Canada should be responsible for effective control in this area. It cannot be left to other powers or the United Nations. What do we know about the effects of pollution in the north? We may know something of its effects on the Ottawa River, though I really wonder, but even so, we do not seem to know how to provide the leadership to prevent this man-made mutilation of our environment which is happening on our doorstep.

But concern there is on pollution, and we need to know more. The Committee on Northern Development has made such a recommendation. I refer you to the sinking in Viscount Melville Sound on August 21, 1969 of the Panarctic barges, "*Learmouth*" and "*John A. Norberg*". The latter was loaded at the time with 470,000 gallons of bulk oil, mostly Arctic diesel. The Department of Transport reported a week after the sinking that:

> The diesel oil spilled into the sea is a relatively light distillate and as a result, long lasting pollution will not occur.

I quote now from the circular published by The Arctic Circle, Ottawa, dated November, 1969, which reads:

> Crude oil certainly makes a more obvious and unsightly mess than diesel oil. Reports indicate, however, that diesel oil is much more toxic than crude oil. For example, the Smithsonian Institution Centre for Short-lived Phenomena records (in Marine Pollution Bulletin, No. 16, October, 1969) that an estimated leakage of only 10,000 gallons of No. 2 diesel oil from the barge "*Florida*" off the coast of Massachusetts, on 17 and 18 September caused "extensive mortality to marine life—At least 24 species of fin-fish are dying in large numbers—scallops are hardest hit. Even in West Falmouth Harbour where there is no visual or olfactory evidence of oil, they are dying by the thousand."

It must be made clear that these Arctic waters and straits are Canadian and will remain Canadian. The Northwest Passage is not an international strait because there have been virtually no passages of the sort required in the past centuries to establish it as anything other than Canadian waters. It has been said before, and bears repeating, that the passage is not an international one because it is not customarily and cannot customarily be used as an international strait.

Without Canadian sovereignty we cannot control pollution, and we cannot guard against wicked exploitation of the north and its people.

At this stage I do not know what antipollution measures the government envisages for the north or how these will be controlled. It may be they have huge reserves of straw from the prairies just waiting to be used to sop up spilled oil. Perhaps a contract has already been signed for a ten-year supply of detergent. I just hope that if the Arctic waters are to be open to every Tom, Dick or Harry, the planned measures to combat pollution will be adequate.

The risk of a *Torrey Canyon* disaster hangs over all of our heads today and 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 north and may lead to complete ecological breakdown in the Arctic. It could reach out to every man, woman and child on this earth.

Sovereign control of the Arctic does not imply interference with innocent and peaceful passage. I want to make this clear, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned I welcome marine traffic through the straits as I think it will encourage development in that area. However, Canada must ultimately decide what constitutes innocent passage and must have the right to make and enforce regulations which protect our national interest.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Because of your positive and progressive ruling, Mr. Speaker, the committees of this House have been given an important role. Their reports are that much more important because of the close attention that these committees can pay to detail. These are committees of the House, and not instruments of government. We have before us the recommendations of one such committee which, I believe, expresses the concern of all thinking Canadians. To vote against this motion or to further stall its consideration by this House is a vote against Canada, a vote against claims of Canadian sovereignty in northern lands and waters rightfully ours, and a vote against humanity itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Greene: Will the hon. member permit a question? I noted that the hon. member subscribed to the views of Professor Cohen with

regard to the right of innocent passage. I wonder if he could let us know whether he subscribes to the initiatives of the Prime Minister namely, that any passage through the northwest passage shall be subject to Canadian rules and regulations with respect to the protection of the area's ecology and with respect to antipollution measures in the north?

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, that was a very nice speech by the hon. minister.

Mr. Greene: Would the hon. member answer the question?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. member either cannot or will not answer the question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Why not discuss it at ten o'clock.

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion.

In both this report and this committee's ninth report presented during the last session of Parliament, the unanimous view was expressed by all political parties represented on that committee and by members of all parties that the Canadian government should move promptly and positively to make it clear to the world that the waters within the Arctic archipelago are Canadian.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. St. Pierre: Although I was much heartened by the statement the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made on leader's day in the throne speech debate, I am, as I was last year, still impatient because further action has not followed these words.

Mr. Speaker, I should like in these remarks to make some argument for the Canadian position which I hope hon. members of the House will find persuasive, because it is my hope that this motion will carry unanimously in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. St. Pierre: Before I do so, I should like to take a few minutes in order to expand on remarks I made briefly in the House the other day.

I am not convinced that the action being taken here is a wise one; I am not convinced that it will strengthen the position of committees, because I fear that it may have another result.

This is not in any sense a criticism or comment upon Mr. Speaker's ruling, and is not intended as such. I know that all hon. member's of the House hold Mr. Speaker in the very highest regard. We know that his decisions are made judicially and with nothing except the best interests of the House of Commons at heart.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. St. Pierre: But, Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the possible results of a decision.

It should be realized that this committee report, as well as the one brought down last year, contains more than a statement on Arctic sovereignty or what might be called a statement of principle; these reports were very detailed and committed the cabinet and the government to, among other things, the expenditure of money. I doubt very much the propriety of this course.

I do not oppose a movement towards a congressional system of government.

I do not oppose the adoption of a congressional system which would give greater powers to committees and which would bring many changes to Parliament. Nevertheless, neither I nor the Canadian people are prepared yet to abandon the idea of cabinet responsibility.

The committee may recommend the expenditure of money but is not charged with providing it. Only this House has the power to provide money and, according to my understanding, it is the cabinet that initiates such expenditures before the House.

Hon. members who have read this report carefully will no doubt note that it was not written in the usual style of committee reports, in which it is usually stated that "the government should consider the advisability" of doing this and that or, that the committee recommends such and such a general course of action. This report does not recommend that the government should study the advisability of do ng such and such a thing merely because the members of the committee believe it should be done in that way.

Let us see what the cabinet would be committed to by way of the expenditure of money if there were concurrence in this committee report. On page 210 of *Votes and Proceedings* of December 16, we find the following:

> The Committee recommends that appropriate agencies of the Government move immediately to

conduct research in the Arctic to gather information on the following:

(A) Physical properties of crude oils and other hydrocarbons in cold waters, the dynamics of their dispersion, and their persistence in water and on and under ice;

(B) The toxicity of various hydrocarbons to plant and animal life;

(C) Methods for control of oil spills, removal or neutralization of pollutants and destruction of pollutant cargoes in cases of marine disaster—

Your Committee recommends—

(A) An operational research study to determine polution safeguards to be required of oil tankers and pollutant-carrying maritime traffic in Arctic and North Atlantic waters;

(B) A research project into the effect of oil and other chemical pollutants on the marine biology and ecology of the cold waters of the Arctic and North Atlantic Oceans;

(C) A supporting programme aimed at developing improved methods combatting pollution in low temperature waters.

In last year's report, the committee also urged the government to take prompt action to establish our Arctic sovereignty. There was no motion for concurrence in that report which also contained recommendations, I believe, with respect to increased government spending.

Although I do not have last year's report before me, I can recall that it urged the government to spend more money on certain matters. One was that it spend more money on Indian Centres.

May I say that I am not retreating from my previous position. I still think it was wise for this committee to recommend what it recommended. My mind has not been changed. Nevertheless, I urge members of this House to consider carefully what will happen if they give to committees the power, apparently, to put the Canadian cabinet in a straitjacket.

Mr. McGrath: Why do we bother with committees?

Mr. St. Pierre: To answer the hon. member, may I say that this committee report shows the necessity of our having committees. Perhaps I will be able to suggest a better answer later.

At present the committees have the power to amend legislation, which is important; the power to investigate, which is important; the power to recommend, which is important and the power to pass or, for that matter, stall legislation. This, too, is important.

May I consider for a moment the attitudes of our opposition parties on this national issue. Of course, I am not speaking of members of the opposition on the committee. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the relations between members of the Committee have been excellent.

I feel that we have worked as a team.

I hope we have worked effectively.

While, of course, one ought not to single out any one hon. member in particular, I should like to mention two hon. members especially. One of these is the committee chairman, the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) who has been absolutely indefatigable in working on this and associated projects. I think it is appropriate, in a more narrow sense, to mention the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson).

• (3:20 p.m.)

Following the trip of the subcommittee to the Arctic, my feeling was that we had accomplished all that we could. I was not particularly enthused about writing another report on the matter which would, in effect, be a repetition of the report we submitted last June.

In case the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) is concerned about this matter, I am not repeating conversations from the steering committee which were private. I am referring to the record of an open committee meeting.

The hon. member for Churchill felt very strongly that a report should be written.

I now wish to say that he was right and I was wrong. I think it should have been written.

I wish I could speak with as high praise of the actions of the opposition parties as I can of the actions of the opposition members on that committee.

This problem has been looming in Canada, Mr. Speaker, and growing by the week for a considerable time ever since the Prudhoe Bay oil discoveries.

Later in these remarks I intend to point out why I feel the Canadian government has not reacted to this situation as vigorously as it should have. I say the same of the opposition parties.

The opposition parties, Mr. Speaker, have a highly unusual opportunity of bringing matters of national importance before this House.

I am referring to opposition days, in which the choice of subjects is entirely theirs.

I do not know how many opposition days there have been since this Parliament com-

menced, Mr. Speaker, but on not one of them was this matter worthy of their attention.

What did they talk about?

Biafra!

Mr. Nystrom: Wasn't that important?

Mr. St. Pierre: That is what they considered to be of national importance to Canada, Biafra.

During the question period of the first sitting day of this Parliament I was astounded when the first question asked of the government of Canada concerned Biafra.

I thought I had been elected to a Canadian Parliament. I wondered if I had blundered by chance into some meeting of an organization of African states which would more properly be seized of that matter than the Canadian government.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. St. Pierre: I do not know why we should look abroad to find trouble, when we have government work here at home. Is that responsible opposition?

I just wish to put on the record, in connection with this subject, a statement made by an hon. member of the opposition who is now visiting that country, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson). The hon. member has cabled this message:

> Reports of starving millions have been victory for skilful propagandists.

I now wish to turn to the north.

An hon. Member: Yes, turn to the north.

Mr. St. Pierre: Yes, like a compass needle.

I wish to open my remarks with a statement that was made in 1963 to the Canadian Political Science Conference in Quebec. The quotation is from a speech by Gordon W. Smith and reads as follows:

> Canadians might be a little less complacent about the vast northern areas shown in bright red on Mercator's familiar projection if they appreciated fully the tribulations that accompanied the acquisition of it—

I want to underline these words as best I can:

> —and if they understood that with little more ineptitude, or a little less luck on our part, or a little more aggressive competition from some other statutes, they might not have become ours.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, he was referring to our land areas of the High Arctic, the Territories and the Yukon.

Until very recent years, these areas were our only real concern in the north. I do not think many of us were concerned about water.

We are by no means a xenophobic nation. I do not think anyone has ever wanted to seal those waters against the legitimate commerce of the world.

I feel we have not studied the fish resources adequately, but we have studied them to some degree. This study has not been extensive since the whalers moved out from their operations early in the century.

There did not appear to be such urgency in the declaration of sovereignty over the waters, providing we had full and untrammelled sovereignty over the land areas which, according to any authority I have been able to find, we have, and providing we had full access to the resources of the seabed which again according to any authority I could find, we do have.

Then, whether we liked it or not, technology overtook us and oil was discovered at Prudhoe Bay.

Another big pool has been discovered by Imperial Oil at the mouth of the Mackenzie and in the High Arctic there is the Panarctic consortium partially supported by the government and partly by private money. There can be little doubt that that consortium has a handful of kings and aces in its search for another pool of oil in the High Arctic.

This oil, as well as oil that will be found, must somehow be moved to market.

In the search for efficient transportation methods the Humble Oil Company, in association with some other companies, undertook a daring and welcome experiment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we can shrug off or evade the challenge of modern technology. We have to meet it head on.

I congratulate that company for its initiative in testing whether an ice-strengthened ship could operate regularly through the ice of the northwest passage.

This experiment has proven to be less than a complete success, although it has undoubtedly added a great deal to our knowledge of ice and Arctic conditions.

Perhaps I do not need to belabour this point because I think it is generally recognized by all hon. members—the perils associated with transportation of crude oil or any hydrocarbon through ice filled waters of the north verges on the intolerable. I do not suggest they are completely intolerable, because

the problems technology presents to us in one form it can meet us with solutions for in another form. However, as yet it has not provided a solution to this problem.

The hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) quoted from an article which I wrote recently. The common peril of ships in the Arctic has always been to be besieged by the ice, to be crushed by the ice and to sink.

The S.S. *Manhattan* returned with a hole in her side large enough to drive a truck through, even though the ice conditions in that area were the easiest in many years. In connection with tankers moving through the archipelago, on the surface or under the sea, I might point out that there is a study under way and plans are being drawn which may or may not come to fruition for 40,000 or 50,000 ton submarine tankers operating under the ice.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The peril under the ice does not differ entirely from the peril to which surface vessels are exposed.

Someone must control this movement through the passage.

We must be satisfied that the ships are safe and that they are not designed in such a way as would permit them to be crushed, losing their cargoes.

Alternatively, we must be confident that technology has provided a means for the total neutralization of oil cargoes or their total destruction in the event of shipwreck. To the best of my knowledge, technology has not yet provided us with these means.

The important point—one which was well made by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) and I expect to hear it made again in the House today—is who will be responsible for doing this?

Logically, the responsibility not only on behalf of Canada but on behalf of the whole world community falls directly upon this nation and upon this government.

If we are not sufficiently concerned about the danger of the greatest ecological disaster in human history befalling the Arctic it is idle to expect that other nations will assume this concern for us. Their attitude will to a large degree be determined by our attitude, because these are our waters and our islands.

May I ask you how much time I have left, Mr. Speaker? I am sorry, but I have lost track of the hand of the clock.

An hon. Member: Take all the time you need.

[Mr. St. Pierre.]

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. St. Pierre: Thank you. Of course, we are not alone in our concern about the danger of pollution.

I am not suggesting that the United States or any other of our neighbouring nations are indifferent to it. In fact, it is my understanding that on the day following the address given by the Prime Minister on leader's day, the United States government communicated with our embassy in Washington expressing support for his views about the need for measures to control possible pollution in the north.

But again—and this cannot be said too often—the need for concern is primarily ours.

It may be suggested in some quarters that there is a reasonable basis for the statement by the Canadian government that no further pronouncements are necessary because, after all, these are our waters, and they are accepted as being ours by the world community as a matter of course. Unfortunately, it is not necessarily accepted by the world community as a matter of course, and in this connection I wish to deal for a few moments with an article which appeared in the White Horse *Star* and was reprinted in the Edmonton *Journal*.

The writer is Mr. Peter Calamai of the Southam News Service and the article is important because it reflects the attitude of at least one group of Americans who are concerned about this matter and the repercussions do not bode good for us. I shall read a few paragraphs.

> Boston. The controversial use of the Northwest Passage to ship oil from Alaska was discussed here Friday—without benefit of any Canadian participation and with only fleeting reference to the fears of a disastrous oil spill.
>
> U.S. and Humble Oil officials in the discussion panel at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science here also carefully skirted the question of Arctic sovereignty.
>
> Russell Venn, Humble vice-president who was aboard the tanker Manhattan for part of its historic September crossing of the passage, said he was sure Canada would not try to impose fees on U.S. oil companies making use of Arctic waters.
>
> In response to a question about ownership of the waters around Banks Island—a key piece of land in any Northwest Passage—Mr. Venn said the Canadian government was leary of publicly renouncing any claims on the waters because then the ownership of seabed mineral wealth would be calculated from the Canadian continental coastline rather than from the islands.
>
> Because Canada wanted to be able to export natural gas and other products to the United States without paying tariffs it was unlikely that the Canadian government would attempt to impose any economic restraints—

The article continued:

Mr. Venn told his audience that the Manhattan was visited by "a bunch of MPs."

"They were very worried about sovereignty; I figure that must have been among the more liberal ones in the bunch," he said.

Members of the Commons Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development greeted the Manhattan at Resolute Bay on Cornwallis Island.

There was no mention from any of the three speakers of the environmental threat of an oil spill in the Arctic. When an audience member raised the problem at the end of the three-hour session, Mr. Venn said Humble had done research on the techniques of cleaning up such a spill. "I think we can avoid them."

I have already praised Humble Oil for their initiative in making this scientific experiment and I do not retract those words. But what took place at that conference does not reflect the concern which should be felt for the preservation and safety of the Canadian Arctic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. St. Pierre: Officials of the Humble Oil Company do not speak United States government policy, I recognize this. But their approach is one more reason for the Canadian government to make an early statement on the matter in order that the attitude of any foreign companies may not stand up.

This casual, I might even say cavalier, attitude to the near-intolerable threat posed by tankers going through the passage calls out for a response from this country.

I should like to deal briefly with the position of the United States government on this matter.

It is not entirely clear to me.

I find that the statements made on the subject are sometimes a trifle conflicting.

Let me say this: I think the Americans might well ask themselves which nation in the world has been America's best friend for the longest time.

I suggest it is not in the best interest of the United States that the waters of the Northwest Passage should be regarded as high seas any more than such a declaration about the Panama Canal would be in their interest.

Do they want these waters supervised by their main trading partner, their military ally and faithful friend, or do they want them to become an international no man's land with all the security risks which might be entailed?

I hope that any American who might speak impulsively about the freedom of the seas in connection with this matter will first pause and consider the repercussions.

As to the Canadian legal position, I have more references here than time will allow me to read, but there is one to which I should like to draw attention because hon. members may not be familiar with it.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the former prime minister, the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, urged that we should make a clear and direct claim to the Arctic, including the icy portions, not only because of the risk of foreign control but because he was concerned about the possibility of the establishment of IBM's on the ice to the detriment of Canada's position.

I intend to quote another speaker, one who can, I think, be considered an expert on this subject—Dean George Curtis of UBC. Dean Curtis is one of those who has represented Canada at international conferences on these matters.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Dean George Curtis was an adviser to the Canadian government in the early 1950's regarding the DEW line construction and matters concerning Canadian sovereignty.

He spoke briefly to the Canadian Bar convention here in Ottawa last summer.

He was not reported and what I give you is a paraphrase of his remarks. I can assure you that this is correct as I have checked it with him by telephone.

He made three points:

First, he thought the Norwegian decision as confirmed by the Geneva conference made it feasible for Canada to lay claim to the waters within a system of headland to headland straight base lines.

Second, he felt it was extremely important to do this in order to protect the ecology of the High Arctic and that this was a responsibility that Canada had in her own interest and in the interest of the world at large.

Finally, he said, and again I am paraphrasing him, that if this area were left in the realm of the high seas there would be no protection.

As to the extension of a state's power beyond its shores to control pollution or the threat of pollution, I refer to one current and one recent incident in the United States which indicate that the United States fully understands the necessity for this.

The United States has set one or two precedents.

One precedent, and this is a small matter, but significant, concerned the salvage of a

Liberian oil tanker in January 1968 about 400 miles off the coast of Washington.

The Vancouver Island Salvage Company sent two tugs out to pick up an oil tanker which was on fire. The fire burned out but there was still some oil in her holds.

The *Sudbury II* and the *Island Monarch* were the two tugs.

As they brought her in, heading for Vancouver Island and nearing the United States coastline, the officers were informed by the United States through its coast guard that they could not bring that ship within 50 miles of the United States coastline.

I do not blame the United States in the least for making such a decision. I think that was quite wise. But it certainly indicates United States acquiescence to the principle that a coastal state has the right to such controls beyond what are normally considered to be territorial waters.

Let me refer hon. members to two bills, one before the United States House of Representatives and the other before the United States Senate. They are roughly of the same intent although there are some differences between them.

A joint committee of those two houses is now attempting to meld them into a single bill for presentation and presumably for passage.

If adopted they will give the United States the right to fine companies for pollution of sea water and to control the activities of vessels which might pollute these waters. This is quite a comprehensive piece of legislation.

The point which I draw to the attention of hon. members is that the United States by this legislation, if it is passed, does not adopt this right in terms of the 3-mile limit to which they adhere today in international discussions.

The United States legislation would apply to the 3-mile limit and the contiguous area; that extra nine miles, bringing it to an effective 12-mile limit.

If nothing else, I hope the Canadian government can move quickly to establish the 12-mile limit for Canada instead of the present 3 plus 9 mile limit. But it is possible, probable perhaps, that the 3 plus 9 miles is sufficient for our purposes after drawing the base lines. I regret I do not have time to pursue that matter.

There are one or two other matters which I may have time to bring to the attention of the House.

I should like to touch very briefly on the attitude of the Soviet government and quote from Mr. Lakhtine who wrote some time ago in the *American Journal of International Law*. He summarized his points as follows:

(1) Polar states wield sovereignty over sea regions covered with ice, according to their sectors of attraction.

(2) Littoral states wield sovereignty over land locked seas free from ice, and over gulfs and bays.

(3) Littoral states are entitled to a somewhat limited sovereignty over all remaining sea regions free from ice, as well as over territorial waters, maritime belts and waters between islands according to their sectors of attraction.

If action by the Canadian government should lead to a dispute in any international court I do not think the mighty Soviet Union would be in a very good position to oppose the Canadian government's position in establishing our sovereign control over the waters of the passage.

In closing, and for the sake of clarity, let me say I hope that nothing I have said here has conveyed the impression that I should like to see Canada seal the Northwest Passage.

Nothing could be further from my thoughts.

We, as Canadians, should look forward hopefully to a day when technology provides ships which will move much of the commerce of the world across the north of Canada.

However, Mr. Speaker, we must take the authority to control that shipping which we consider dangerous.

At the Geneva conference of 1958 there was adopted a definition of innocent passage, and innocent passage is certainly what we should offer to the world, together with our declaration of sovereignty over those waters.

Innocent passage may generally apply not only to territorial waters or to internal waters but may apply also to waters recently enclosed by base lines, such as in the Norwegian decision.

Generally, innocent passage provides that ships may pass through waters providing three things; they are not a threat to the security of the nation involved; that they are not a threat to the peace of the nation involved and, quite adequate for our purposes in the north, that they are not a threat to the good order of the nation involved.

There is no national court or body of the United Nations, in my opinion, that could possibly accept the notion that the spillage of a quarter of a million tons of crude oil in Canada's north would not be a threat to the good order of our country.

I maintain that our legal opinion, based on a number of references for recognizing authority, is sound and that our view should now be heard internationally.

I thank all hon. members for their courteous attention.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to congratulate the mover of this motion for concurrence in the report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I think he has rendered a genuine service to the House by insisting through his motion that this report from an important committee of the House be discussed. Reports of committees should be discussed and a decision should be taken on them by the House. I have long thought that there should be some change in our standing orders to the effect that all committee reports would have to be called within a certain period of time. The length of time that such reports might be discussed could be limited by allowing one speaker from each party, or by some other limitation. When they could be called might be established by the house leaders.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I might point out that if we allow, as we have been doing, the reports of committees merely to die on the Order Paper the work of these committees will become meaningless. The members who do not belong to those committees will have no opportunity to express their opinions regarding the matters which are contained in committee reports. The Prime Minister has talked a great deal about participatory democracy. If there is to be adequate participation in the democratic process by members of Parliament they must not only have an opportunity to discuss important public questions in depth, but must also be assured that the recommendations they make will be discussed by the House—not necessarily adopted by the House but at least discussed by the House and either amended, sent back to the committee or endorsed.

If I may, I should like to congratulate the members of the committee whose report we are now discussing for their ringing and forthright declaration regarding Canadian sovereignty over the Arctic Archipelago. What they have said needed to be said. I am glad it has been said in such forthright language. The whole kernel of our case is summed up in three paragraphs. I think I should read them. At page 6 the report reads as follows:

> Your Committee considers that the waters lying between the islands of the Arctic Archipelago have been, and are, subject to Canadian Sovereignty historically, geographically and geologically.
>
> The imminent prospect of maritime oil tanker traffic through the Arctic Archipelago and the potential threat such traffic poses to Canada's Arctic environment makes it imperative to Canada's national interest that the Government of Canada take whatever steps are necessary, consistent with international law, to assure recognition of Canadian Sovereignty by all vessels, surface and submarine, passing through the Arctic Archipelago.
>
> Your Committee recommends that the Government of Canada indicate to the world, without delay, that vessels, surface and submarine, passing through Canada's Arctic Archipelago are and shall be subject to the sovereign control and regulation of Canada.

A few moments ago while the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) was speaking a cabinet minister said "What is the debate for". The answer is simple. The debate is to give the members of this House an opportunity to endorse unanimously and enthusiastically this declaration of Canada's sovereignty over the Arctic Archipelago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I must confess, sir, it is difficult for me to understand the government's reluctance to have the report of this committee discussed and approved in the House of Commons. The problem of Canadian sovereignty over the Arctic will not go away merely by being ignored. Quiet diplomacy is not likely to bring a solution. As a matter of fact, it is more likely to raise a doubt in the minds of Canadians and to encourage those governments which are desirous of claiming some vested interest in the far north.

Canadians do not want another Alaskan panhandle and they do not want Parliament to refrain from making a forthright declaration of Canada's legitimate rights to the Arctic Archipelago. The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), in statements made outside the House, seeks to excuse his delaying action by the statement that the matter is under discussion by the government and that debate at this time would be premature. This government has been in office since April, 1963. Surely, by this time it has formulated a policy in respect of Canada's position vis-à-vis the Arctic regions. Previous administrations have been much more forthright. I will discuss later on the statement made by Canada in 1946 through Mr. Pear-

son, when he was ambassador to Washington. There was also a statement by Prime Minister St. Laurent which is found in *Hansard* for December 8, 1953 at page 700. He said:

We must leave no doubt about our active occupation and exercise of our sovereignty in these northern lands right up to the pole.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sharp: Did he say "lands"?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That is what he said—"lands". I shall deal with waters as well. The minister points out that Mr. St. Laurent said "lands right up the the pole". Mr. Pearson, in 1946, talked about more than lands. I shall come to that in a moment. I think, in the new developing field of international law, Canada must assert its position and justify its claims. In an article which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of September 18, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) who just interjected, was quoted as saying:

—if it were (possible to obtain anything at all by unilateral declaration of intention) there would, of course, be international anarchy.

That is exactly the situation in the world today. With regard to territorial waters, only some 20 per cent of the nations of the world have established a 12-mile limit. More than 25 per cent still are on the 3-mile limit. Others have various figures. Three countries, Peru, Chile and Ecuador, have established a 200-mile limit for fishing purposes. What has happened in this new field of law of the sea has been that coastal states have made unilateral declarations. Those declarations, if objected to, have gone to the courts. As a result of the decisions in the courts, and as a result of conferences on the law of the sea, treaties and conventions have been established. The responsibility for making the assertion of sovereignty lies with the government of this country.

I should like to point out that Canada has good precedents in international law for its claim of sovereignty over the Arctic Archipelago. So far, no nation has ever questioned Canada's sovereignty over the islands between the mainland and the North Pole. The question at issue is whether the waters between these islands come exclusively under Canadian jurisdiction. I am not a lawyer, but through reading articles by lawyers in this field it becomes increasingly clear what happens is that out of precedents doctrines are built up and finally conventions are arrived at. There are three doctrines which to me as a layman make very clear the justification for Canada making a declaration of sovereignty. The first is what is commonly called the sector claim doctrine. In 1946, the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, who at that time was the Canadian ambassador to Washington, reasserted the sector claim which Canada had made as far back as 1908, which claim included all land, water and ice up to the pole. The Soviet Union still maintains this extensive sector claim which it first propounded back in 1926 and which it interprets as including not only lands within the sector but also ice, water and air space.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The other doctrine which has come to be recognized is the base line system, whereby a nation draws straight lines from headland to headland and claims all the waters within those lines. This system was first adopted by Norway, and was upheld in the well known fisheries case by the International Court of Justice in 1951. At the Geneva Conference on the law of the sea, this system was approved and incorporated in the convention of 1958, and has now become accepted as part of international law.

The third doctrine is that of the continental shelf, which was propounded by President Truman of the United States, who proclaimed that the resources of the subsoil and seabed of the continental shelf adjacent to a country's shores belonged to that nation. This principle was accepted and incorporated into an international convention at the United Nations Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958. This convention specifies that a coastal state has the sovereign right to exploit the resources of its continental shelf lying adjacent to its coasts at a depth of 200 metres or less, and to a greater depth if exploitation proves feasible.

Some reference has already been made to the statements made by Professor Maxwell Cohen, the Dean of Law at McGill University. I noticed in an article which he wrote some time ago that he dealt with this matter, and I would like to quote just a paragraph from it:

And recent marine geology and cartography in the Arctic confirm that almost the entire archipelago and its waters are part of a shelf system within such average water depths except for one or two trenches and in deeper Lancaster Sound. There is therefore no doubt of exclusive Canadian control of the seabed beneath the entire waters area within the archipelago except for some limited geological aberrations where the depths exceed continental shelf standards. And even here there is a growing concept of claims to the continental slope to justify exclusive exploitation at greater depths.

I was glad to note that the committee, after examining the representations and the evidence given by Professor Cohen, had this to say in its report:

> Your committee rejects the suggestion that an international waterway exists through the Canadian Arctic archipelago.

And later on in its report the committee said:

> The waters of the Canadian Arctic Archipelago lie over the continental shelf; the Arctic islands and the continental shelf are a geological extension of the Canadian mainland and the North American land mass.

So, it seems to me on the basis of any one of the three doctrines, whether it is that of the sector claim, that of drawing the base lines from headland to headland, or on the basis of the continental shelf doctrine there seems to be an irrefutable case for Canada to claim complete sovereignty over the entire northern area from our mainland to the North Pole.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are compelling reasons for Canada to assert its sovereignty, and for it to do so without any further delay.

First of all we must establish Canada's right to develop any petroleum or any other resources lying offshore from the Arctic islands. I think it is significant that the United States has never questioned Canadian sovereignty over these waters until recently. The only reason that our claims to sovereignty are being queried at this time is the oil discoveries in Prudhoe Bay, and from our point of view these discoveries have been followed by an even more important discovery of an oil well by the Imperial Oil Company in the Northwest Territories. These discoveries, along with other geological data which have been collected, give credence to the claim by many prominent geologists that the Arctic may well contain some of the largest oil reserves in the world.

Our failure to assert our jurisdiction at this time could mean that we might lose by default the right to develop vast resources which are so essential to the future development of Canada. The New Democratic party takes the position that Canada should clearly assert its right to its share of the Arctic continental shelf, and that we should get on with the task of discovering and developing the resources which are to be found there.

The second reason we ought to move, and move quickly on this matter, is that Canada must have jurisdiction over the northern waters in order to prevent disastrous and lingering pollution. As the committee pointed out, the sinking of two barges owned by Panarctic Oil Ltd. points up the danger of pollution in this area.

The Humble Oil Company of Texas, which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Standard Oil, has announced that it is studying the feasibility of constructing six 250,000 ton tankers, each of which would be twice the size of the *Manhattan*. Any mishap to a tanker of this size would have disastrous effects on the marine life of the Arctic. It will be noted in this morning's newspapers that over the past number of months some five super oil tankers have sunk in various parts of the world. Mr. Speaker, I contend that since Canada would be the main victim of any pollution which might occur from such a mishap, surely we ought to have the authority to exercise the necessary control to prevent such pollution from taking place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Certainly, if we do not exercise it, nobody else is going to exercise control. There have been suggestions by prominent figures in the United States that Canada, instead of exercising pollution control on its own, should be prepared to delegate this responsibility to some international body, or through some international agreement. I think this would be disastrous, and I agree with the committee when it says, as printed at page 5 of its report:

> Your committee is unimpressed with arguments that adequate pollution safeguards could be effected by international agreement.

Since it is Canadian terrain which would suffer the consequences of pollution I maintain that Canada has an inalienable right to exercise the necessary controls and to set the necessary standards which would hold pollution to a minimum.

The third reason I think we must move quickly is that only by the exercise of our sovereignty would Canada be able to facilitate and direct navigation in Arctic waters. These waters have never been part of the high seas and open to navigation. They are ice-locked for the major part of the year, and if they are used this can only be done with the navigational aids and the icebreaking services provided by the people of Canada. Needless to say this does not mean that we are suggesting that Canada should deny to any nation the right of innocent passage. On

the contrary, we feel that the Canadian government should proceed with all haste to provide the navigational aids, pilot services, navigation standards and the icebreaker escorts which will make possible innocent passage through Arctic waters. But there must be no doubt about who controls the navigation of these waters. By drawing baselines between the islands Canada can make the Arctic waters subject to Canadian legislative control, and that should be done immediately.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that in my opinion this is the time for Canada to make a clear and forthright declaration of its sovereignty over this great northern area.

The government's admission of uncertainty has been interpreted as weakness by our American neighbours. The government's diplomatic pussyfooting has merely demonstrated to other nations our lack of courage and conviction concerning Canada's claims to exclusive jurisdiction over the Arctic Archipelago and the continental shelf.

The Americans like straight talk and I think they would respect Canada for asserting its legitimate and long recognized rights in the Arctic. There is an old saying "Silence gives consent". If the government continues to waffle on this question, no one can blame the United States or any other nation for assuming that we are prepared to accept some compromise which would negate our ability to effectively control an area which is vital to the future development of this country.

The matter which the committee has brought to the attention of the House through its report is only one facet of a much larger problem, namely, Canada's diminishing control of its own affairs. The accelerating rate of takeovers by American corporations is eroding our economic independence. Attempts are being made to entice us into a continental energy policy which could well condemn us to be a nation of extraction industries, supplying raw materials and energy for the American industrial complex.

It is rather significant that the reports which came out of the meetings between the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and secretary Walter Hickel in Washington suggested that part of the total energy policy would be some type of guarantee of the Northwest Passage. We have not had any definitive statement from the minister on this question. If we are talking about merely allowing American ships to use that passageway, of course everyone would agree. But if it means some surrender of our sovereignty, some agreement to a bi-national control of that waterway, then we are giving up something which legitimately belongs to the people of this country, not only the present generation but for generations to come.

In addition to economic takeovers and in addition to a continental policy on energy integration, we are being queried on whether we have sovereignty over the Arctic waters at the very time when this area gives promise of being a veritable treasure house of resources.

The Canadian people are becoming increasingly concerned about the steady erosion of our sovereignty and the diminution of our economic independence. They are bewildered by the government's timidity and its continual waffling on matters which affect Canada's future as an independent, viable nation. I believe the decade upon which we have just embarked is crucial for Canada. I believe that we will emerge from the seventies either as a strong, united Canada with a potential for greatness or we will find ourselves absorbed as a junior partner in an American hegemony.

At the turn of this century a great Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, talked about the 20th century belonging to Canada. That vision has not as yet materialized but there are still 30 years to go, Mr. Speaker, so we still have time if we have the will, the courage and the energy we can make that vision come true and help Canada attain the destiny of which it is capable.

I want to appeal to the government—

Mr. Woolliams: There are not many there to whom to appeal.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I appeal to them not to use devious procedural manoeuvres to prevent the House of Commons from expressing itself on the report of this committee. I know, as does every member, that the government can talk out this motion. If no decision is taken by ten o'clock tonight, it will go into the hopper of government orders.

Mr. Nesbitt: With cobwebs on it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): It will be smothered out of existence. The government can do that; it has the num-

bers, it has the muscle. But I ask them to think what this will do for Canadian prestige in the world, what it will do for the self-confidence of the Canadian people, what it will do in encouraging other nations, and particularly our friends to the south, to think that we are ambivalent and uncertain about our sovereign claims in the northern part of this continent.

I am asking the government to give the members of this House a chance to speak for Canada. Members of the committee in whose report we are now being asked to concur have spoken out with courage and have made an unequivocal and ringing declaration. That report was unanimous, endorsed by every party represented on the committee. I am asking the government to let the House endorse that report.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I am asking the government to give this House of Commons the opportunity of endorsing an all-party committee report, to tell the world that we are Canadians irrespective of our political, religious or ethnic differences, that we are determined to assert our sovereignty over the northern waters. If the government will allow Parliament to do that, I think the effects of it will be felt all over this country and all around the world. Give us an opportunity to make a ringing declaration for Canada. Only in this way, Mr. Speaker, can we let the world know that we Canadians have faith in our future and that we are determined to play our full part in world affairs as a free and independent nation.

[*Translation*]

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I want first to congratulate the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) for going ahead and putting the motion now before us.

Having not had the opportunity to go North with the committee on his study trip conducted at the time of the passage of the U.S. ship *Manhattan,* as I was sitting on the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, I was surprised by the government's reluctance to accept the report that the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development submitted on his return and which was tabled on December 16 last.

I have perused this report and found nothing in it nor in its recommendations which went against the present or future rights or needs of Canada in the Arctic Archipelago that we consider as being part of Canada. The members of this committee and apparently the opposition members and at least one Liberal member are all in agreement, which seems to indicate that the committee's recommendations are meeting with approval. In my view, the government should take it upon itself not only to accept these recommendations, but also to implement them.

Considering the recent developments that were preceded by the performance of the American ship *Manhattan,* we must make our position known today because it has become necessary to do so.

Several people are urging the Canadian government to take over the Arctic Islands, our northern shores and surrounding waters. The government should not however act in too great a hurry. Other countries, like Russia, have taken over neighbouring regions in a big rush. The development of Siberia had already begun by the time they realized they should have taken a closer look at it.

While the Canadian government should proclaim its sovereignty over the Arctic territories, however, it should not run the risk of committing some regrettable errors that would soon prove costly.

In my opinion, the Canadian government should assert its sovereignty on the Arctic for some reasons referred to in the committee report and also for others that are altogether worth studying.

In fact, we know that the Arctic islands are reproduction areas for some species of migratory birds which sometimes migrate as far as the United States. The American government as well as ours is keen on taking the necessary steps to prevent water pollution by ships inadequately fitted for Arctic navigation.

We also know that Arctic waters are breeding grounds for certain aquatic animals such as whales, seals, walruses, etc. This is why we must take certain preventive measures in order to avoid polluting Canadian waters. Scientists have reported that the icy waters of the Arctic are different from temperate waters or from the warmer waters of other oceans.

We know how difficult it was to fight the pollution caused by the oil tanker that went down near the coast of England, for instance, where waters are temperate. What would have happened if this incident had occurred

in the icy waters of the Arctic? We shall have to insist that people who will someday navigate these waters take all the necessary precautions.

The report of the committee, as can be seen in *Votes and Proceedings*, at page 209, include this recommendation, and I quote:

> Your Committee recommends that:
>
> A) Panarctic Oils Limited should rely as much as possible on ice working cargo ships for supplies rather than entering the Arctic transportation business themselves, at least at this stage of its development. The discovery of oil in the Arctic Archipelago would call for a further reappraisal of Panarctic's transportation role.

This committee recommendation must not apply to Panarctic Oils Limited only, but too any shipping company that would want to take to the Arctic materials required for the development of the natural wealth to be found there, or to carry back to the South the riches themselves.

There are still other reasons why Canada should claim sovereignty over the Arctic territories. As a matter of fact, those lands abound with natural wealth which we can develop and process ourselves.

I would now like to mention oil, iron and other natural resources even though up to the present time exploration has been rather limited considering the vast expanse of territory to develop. Nevertheless we find in those places considerable mineral deposits and oil fields.

For the above reasons we should proclaim our sovereignty over these territories by effective occupation. To this end, we must help the companies wishing to carry out prospection in those areas. They must have all the necessary facilities for so doing.

• (4:30 p.m.)

To achieve this end, I think we should give our coast guard the necessary authority, because the inspections they have been submitted to showed their efficiency particularly in the Arctic. Of all the countries in the world, Canada is probably the one that has the longest coastline. From inspections of our coast guard, we have been pleased to find out how efficient they are.

The government should also establish research and development centres on the Arctic islands. Our university graduates, our technicians and our engineers would be happy to make use of their knowledge for the benefit of their country. When the Committee on External Affairs and National Defence conducted an investigation last summer within the Navy and the Army, it was suggested, and quite rightly, to set up guard stations that could be manned by members of the Canadian armed forces, in order to facilitate the movements of individuals in those regions.

Responsibilities should also be given to companies developing the natural resources of the Arctic, because it has unlimited wealth which should be worked.

It was said a few months ago that a mining consortium was interested in a ferrous deposit on Baffin Island containing, according to a preliminary study, 22 billion tons of 69 per cent pure iron ore. Apparently, such natural resources are to be found all over the Arctic islands and even on the neighbouring mainland.

Considering the development and research being carried out in all fields, water transportation for instance, it is obvious that if the government does not let opportunity knock in vain, the prospects are very good for the Canadian economy. I believe that it was the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) who mentioned a little while ago the developments that would probably take place in the transportation of oil and iron ore by cargo submarines.

An editorial in today's *Le Devoir*, a Montreal paper, reads as follows:

> In a recent number of l'*Actualité économique*, there is an article by Mr. Michel Brochu about experiments carried out in Siberia. Placing a thin film of sand on the ice increases the action of the sun and makes the ice melt faster. Mr. Brochu believes that with the extended period of sunlight in northern regions during the summer, such a method, over several years, would permit the clearing of sea passages which could then be open to navigation each summer.

These experiments and research are being conducted now. It has not yet been possible to check whether they are conclusive, but we are continually being surprised by discoveries in all fields. I feel the government must immediately implement the recommendations of the committee whose report is before us today and take efficient though cautious steps in order to proclaim its sovereignty over the territories of northern Canada, and more specifically over the Arctic archipelago.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention in the limited time I propose to take to deal with the subtleties and intricacies of international law with regard to the matter now before us, except to make some reference to the aspect which is of direct concern to me and for which I have some responsibility.

I refer to the conference on marine pollution held at Brussels in November of last year and which I attended as head of the Canadian delegation.

This matter is of considerable irrelevance to the subject we are discussing today because, in addition to the undoubted problems that have quite properly been raised during this debate with regard to pollution in the north, there is the fact that on a day to day basis, and on an almost immediate basis, we have a serious problem with regard to the waters around all of Canada.

It is my judgment, and I think I can support this by saying it is also the judgment of my department, that while we should not for a moment lose sight of the extremely important aspects of northern pollution, at the same time in terms of immediacy it is not as vitally important as what we do now with regard to all of the waters that surround Canada. I, therefore, do not think it is a deviation for me to touch briefly on some other matters regarding pollution for which I have a direct responsibility.

As some hon. members know, during the past week I had discussions with the United States authorities on questions such as jet pollution, the poisoning of our air by these new technological advances. We have also been very deeply engaged in studies on the amount of pollution that results from the emissions of automobiles. I am simply pointing out that while understandably the developments which I suggest were really triggered by the voyage of the S.S. *Manhattan* through the north are of supreme importance, nevertheless we ought not to consider these in isolation or be sidetracked in a sense to a total involvement on this particular question and this particular issue to the detriment of the kind of serious obligation that we ought to have on the whole pollution question.

With regard to the question of pollution of all marine environment, plus the air pollution as a result of the new type jet aircraft and as a result of automobile emissions, we are only starting to scratch the surface of what has become in these early days of the seventies probably the single most publicized subject. It is one which I think publicity reflects as being a real sense of concern not only to Canadians, but to people in many different parts of the world.

The totality of the effects of pollution is almost indescribable and in fact almost unbelievable. I came across some figures today which, although perhaps not completely relevant to the subject under discussion, may be of interest to hon. members. I ask Your Honour's indulgence for 60 seconds. These figures reveal that in terms of garbage, 250 indestructible bottles are abandoned every year by each person in the country, 135 tin cans, 10 gallons of sewage per day per person and 4 pounds of solid sewage wastes per day per person. A lot of this garbage is going into our modern environment. These items are direct contributors to pollution and I repeat the totality of these in some respects is a more serious and more immediate problem than the potentialities of pollution in our northern areas.

• (4:40 p.m.)

In effect, then, even given the greatest possible technological advances and even if the decision were made to employ ships for the transport of oil through northern waters it appears now it would be some time, perhaps years, before this could be accomplished.

We in Canada learnt a good deal from the so-called *Manhattan* experiment. Hon. members will, I am sure, agree with me that our coastguard demonstrated a world wide level of expertise in the work it did during that venture. I think it is safe to say that when it comes to any kind of navigation through ice and the like there is no country, with the possible exception of the Soviet Union, which could carry on such activities without Canada's assistance. I mention this, apart from the natural pride I have as the minister responsible for the coastguard, by way of reiterating my comment that while I do not minimize the gravity of this threat the more serious danger at the moment is, rather, that which might result from the huge tankers which are in operation right now. For example, Halifax in recent months has been visited by tankers having a capacity larger than that of the *Torrey Canyon*. At any moment of time, there are hundreds of tankers along our coasts, and it is because of this threat that we took the very hard line we did at the Brussels conference.

In this connection, in response to some of the comments which have been made about the wisdom and effectiveness of taking unilateral action, let me say there is no question that this is a strongly emotional and appealing approach. It is one which commends itself to people who wish merely to put something on record or to put something in the window. Having gone through the Brussels experience and seen, in terms of international affairs, the enormous number of conflicting viewpoints which are expressed on many of these issues,

I have had personal experience at least in learning how difficult it is to secure international agreement and also how futile it is in many ways to take a strong, unilateral stance in the face of overwhelming opposition from other countries.

At the Brussels conference it was our intention to move for an international agreement concerning responsibility for the prevention of oil pollution and the establishment of standard international rules with regard to carriers and the like. In the second place, we wished to define clearly where responsibility lay when one of these spills occurred on the high seas. Initially, back in June, I think, of last year, we introduced into the Canada Shipping Act a number of amendments, one of which was designed to pinpoint this responsibility more specifically than in the past. However, since the Brussels conference was opening at that time it was agreed, with the approval of opposition parties, that we would not press for the enactment of this particular amendment in the House because we wanted to wait to see what happened as a result of the international discussions. Since my return I have been awaiting a report from the delegates who represented Canada throughout the meetings in Brussels. I had undertaken to make a statement on motions in the House in connection with the outcome at that conference, but it seems to me that in view of the arrangements made for today's debate this might be an appropriate point to report on exactly what did transpire. In addition, I thought I might give some indication of what we propose to do.

The Canadian position at this conference was squarely grounded upon two aspects of our experience. For many years the Navigable Waters Protection Act has provided for the removal of wrecks interfering with navigation at the expense of the owner without limitation of liability or the requirement to prove fault. Responsibility for the removal of wrecks lay with the owners. Significant pollution incidents had occurred on our coasts even before the loss of the *Torrey Canyon*, and preventive measures were taken at the expense of the government in the absence of legislation providing for recovery. An amendment to the Canada Shipping Act proposed to Parliament early last year which would have gone some way to meeting this problem was, as I have explained, held over in the hope that the Brussels conference would provide adequately for such a contingency on an international basis.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

Our stance at the conference, arising naturally from our own experience, had two principal policy objectives. The first was that the commercial movement of noxious cargoes, particularly oil, should in no way impose burdens upon innocent third parties or the states of which those parties are citizens. The second was that each form of transportation, should, so far as is feasible, bear its own costs—a principle laid down in the National Transportation Act. The government believes this principle to be necessary for the efficient use of our collective resources. In other words, what we asserted was that in the event of a spill on the high seas which affected the Canadian coastline in any way there should be no responsibility placed upon the aggrieved party, either the nation of Canada or some private person, as a result of something which was clearly no part of their responsibility.

Against this background, the conventions produced by the conference fell far short of what Canada considers to be satisfactory, particularly as to liability for pollution damage. We found it almost totally impossible to achieve any degree of unanimity among the countries concerned, and for a variety of reasons in which hon. members may be interested. For one thing, a great many of the oil producing countries possess very little coastline. Others have large shipping companies in which they are specially interested even though they may possess a certain amount of coastline. So there is no unanimity of concern, and, basically, most countries react subjectively in these matters.

However, the Canadian delegation gained the distinct impression that many of the delegations to this legal conference went there with the prime purpose merely of obtaining a determination of the legal and financial position of ship owners in the event of further incidents of the *Torrey Canyon* type. There is evidence that a nation which is a very important shipping nation has this as its primary concern, often because its coastline is decidedly limited, or, indeed—though this may at first appear somewhat curious—it may not have a coastline at all.

In these circumstances the Canadian delegation seems to have made some impact. I do not wish to exaggerate, but I feel we have made an impact which improves our situation and which may well do so in fuller measure in the future. This is because, as a coastal state with a limited merchant fleet, our attention was focussed on the substantive conse-

quences of a major oil spill rather than on the legal rights of one of the parties. We were able to make the case strongly that in any such incident which might occur along our coastline we would likely be the sufferer, without any continuing advantages, because we are neither a large merchant marine owning country nor are we an exporting country to any large extent in terms of the use of tankers.

Among other things, the conventions declare the right of a coastal state to intervene on the high seas, place a requirement for proof of absence of fault upon the shipowner, nearly double the traditional amount of the limitation of liability for the shipowner and provide for compulsory insurance so that bankruptcy cannot be used to avoid payment.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Many of these points were included as a result of the urging of Canadian delegates, both at the prior committee work and at the conference itself. Since this is a rather complex subject I do not wish to labour it before the House but I will be pleased to provide a copy of this statement to interested members.

Even more important, the Canadian attitude at this conference encouraged the Belgian government to put forward a proposal and the conference to endorse a study of the establishment of an international fund, financed by a levy on oil cargos moved by sea, which would compensate victims of pollution before not covered by ship owner's strict liability. A conference is to be held in 1971 to consider the results of this study with a view to a further convention, which the House will note relates to liability to be placed on the cargo owner as advocated by Canada in addition to the limited liability of the ship owner. At the present time almost universally it is the ship owner who bears the brunt of the responsibility, such as it is, and the owner of the cargo being transported in that vessel, unless it happens to be one and the same organization, is more or less absolved of any responsibility. We think this is an improper situation primarily. In addition, it is not always possible for the ship owner to get the kind of insurance or related protection we feel is necessary if these massive spills and their effects are to be avoided.

We understand that some other governments are now contemplating national funds of this sort. Others are considering alternative means of achieving similar ends. I may say in terms of the Canadian position that we are now looking at the possibility of levying some form of assessment against vessels moving within Canadian waters to establish this type of fund against possible future spills because we think this will help in part to resolve the situation. I think we may expect increasing support from such countries which may now be considering the broader implications of this question.

Against this background, the government of Canada is now giving active consideration to interim measures in light of the Brussels conference. Clearly, we did not achieve what we had set out to achieve. It may be that we were too ambitious in the first instance or perhaps especially conscious and realistic enough to realize in advance that we were looking for more than we would achieve. In any event, we made the position very strongly as I have outlined to you here today. As a result, I believe there was more in the way of endorsation of our position than there might have been had we not taken this firm, and what some regard as extreme, stand. In any event, we are now examining possible interim measures.

This is, of course, part of the larger and more general question of pollution, including that from noxious substances other than oil and, pollution of coastal waters from sources other than ships. This, too, has become an increasing problem within the context of the outline at the beginning of my remarks concerning the totality of the pollution problem. There is the matter of oil drilling with rigs, and there are all manner of other sources which are now pumping potential pollution into our coastal waters. So, again it is not just a simple matter of saying if we cut off these sources of pollution at one particular point we can breathe easily. If I could mix a metaphor a little bit, perhaps we will not be able to breathe at all, unless we approach the whole subject and try to deal with it in some decisive manner. This is part of the over-all picture.

The proposals now being developed in respect of pollution from ships have as their objective the attainment of our goals at the conference to the extent that this is possible by one country acting alone. In other words, what we have said is, since we have not been able to achieve international agreement at this time on the question of how to control this type of pollution, we will take the same goals and set them as our objectives, then ask ourselves the question; acting unilaterally what can we do? Once we have arrived at

those answers, then my intention is to introduce further amendments to the Canada Shipping Act. I am sure they will receive rapid response and endorsement by members on all sides.

At the same time, we will continue by seeking to ensure that our actions in respect of the various aspects of this total problem will conform to a consistent pattern. Interdepartmental discussions are now going forward with this objective in mind. As soon as these discussions and considerations can be concluded, I will be bringing forward proposed amendments and appropriate legislation.

I know this is a rather frustrating kind of position because what it really admits is that spilling can take place and there is always the danger that, in spite of everything we do, we will have a disaster of the magnitude of the *Torrey Canyon* incident or one even worse. We have to think about this when members are referring to the north and the potential problem there, and I put that word in quotation marks because we do have a particular reason in some areas to anticipate some of these things.

A potential problem in the north, however far removed it might be, taken against the real problem for example within the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the St. Lawrence seaway or at some point in our inland waters, is important. So, in addition to thinking about pollution and how to correct it to the best of our ability after it happens, equally as important—one might be prepared to agree that it is more important—is to put in the most stringent regulations possible so that these spills will not take place. This will involve standards for vessels that carry oil and our ability to ensure that vessels that do not meet these standards do not enter these waters over which we have control.

This again is a rather difficult problem but one with which we are coping through design standards and specifications. There is an international question here as to just how far, even with the new conventions to which I referred as agreed to in Brussels, we can go in terms of moving out into the high seas. Certainly, we would not be entitled in terms of inspecting a hull to determine whether it was adequate to meet our standards. There is also the question of navigable waters and a lot of other things to which carriers do not agree.

Perhaps the most pressing of all in many respects, because this is the insidious part of the problem, are the relatively small spills that take place either as the result of carelessness or "I don't give a damn" attitude on the part of certain carriers. In the last year we have stepped up our inspection activities considerably throughout those areas of our waters where it is possible for us to do so.

What I have touched upon is only a small part of the story, but I thought it might be helpful in light of this present discussion for hon. members to know something about what has transpired; first of all the position that Canada took, which is still our stand in this regard, and secondly how extremely difficult it is because of the variety of things involved to achieve international agreement on a question of this kind. In addition, to repeat what I said earlier, it is difficult when one takes unilateral action to be in a position to impose regulations in any meaningful way.

I do not believe in repeating something I said at the beginning, but simply having something in the window is not of very much consequence unless you have the means, the authority and the power, if you like, to enforce any regulations you might decide to impose unilaterally. But I believe many of these things are within our competence, and whenever it is, members of this House can be assured we will move ahead with the measures I have outlined today which I hope will take legislative form before too long. This will move us ahead significantly in what is a most crucial battle against this present day threat of pollution.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a brief question? In view of the remarks he has just made, does he not think that if this House unanimously agreed to the report it would back up his and the government's position at the Brussels conference?

Mr. Jamieson: No, I do not. I do not think it would be of any real significance in terms of the matters discussed at Brussels.

Mr. McGrath: Would the minister permit another question?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must draw the attention of the House to the fact that we have reached the private members' hour. I understand there has been some discussion in this regard and perhaps we could hear about that first and then continue, if I anticipate correctly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, you seem to have anticipated what I wanted to say at this point. There have been

some discussions, and on behalf of those who took part I should like to ask that by unanimous consent the House give up its private members' hour for today in order that the discussion on this important issue might continue. I believe there is such consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (5:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before recognizing the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) 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 Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Consumer Affairs—alleged misleading advertising by Imperial Tobacco Company; the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle)—Sports—Financial support for olympic games bids; the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton)—National Film Board—Request for statement on role.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

CONCURRENCE IN FIRST REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

The House resumed consideration of the motion (Mr. Yewchuk) that the first report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development presented on December 16, 1969 be concurred in.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I understand the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) would like to ask a question of the minister.

Mr. McGrath: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact this is the first opportunity we have had to hear a statement on government policy in respect of the Brussels conference, I should like to ask a question of the minister. What position did Canada take at this conference respecting the rather serious and continuing problem of tankers dumping oil ballast at sea?

Mr. Jamieson: This is not a matter that was discussed at the Brussels conference, which was a conference concerned wholly with liability in terms of the *Torrey Canyon* type incident. Nevertheless, there are other international meetings held under the auspices of IMCO. I hope the hon. member will not ask me to tell him what "IMCO" stands for. I am not certain.

There is a degree of consultation going on. My hon. friend will appreciate that with the oceans as vast as they are, policing is very difficult. The basic problem is incompetence, plus a devil-may-care attitude on the part of some crews. Where this brings about a detrimental situation we have the right to take action, but as I say it is a very difficult problem.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit another question? Can he tell us whether Canada took any position at the Brussels conference, or at any other conference, in respect of preventing or impeding a declaration by the Canadian government that Canada has full sovereignty over the islands of the Arctic Archipelago, the waters lying between them and the waters adjacent to them to the east and west.

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Speaker. There was no reference to any of the questions the hon. member has raised. We were dealing with international matters in terms of the global picture and there was no regional consideration at all.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I must remind the hon. member I am trying to be as lenient as possible in accepting questions, but at this point I would prefer to recognize the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, in view of the last remark made by the minister to the effect that this conference did not have any connection to the subject under debate, why was this minister allowed to make a statement which he knew was out of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure all hon. members will applaud my persistent effort to get the floor. This is a rather unusual debate. After listening to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) one would be afraid it might

oe known as the debate of the red herring if ministers of the Crown persist in participating in this debate by discussing matters which have nothing to do with the issue before the House. I would not be surprised to hear a minister stand in his place and tell us about his heroic battle against inflation.

Seriously, this is rather an historic occasion, it seems to me because this discussion arises from an assertion by a member of this House in respect of the basic right of a member of this House to move such a motion against the wishes of the government on a matter of very vital importance to the people of Canada. This is perhaps an historic debate in this respect.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: It seems to me there is a serious reluctance to concur in the report of the committee which is the substance of this motion. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) for having moved the motion. I wish also to congratulate the hon. member for Coast-Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) who, although he criticized me somewhat in the process, had the courage to take a strong position on the side of what he considered to be the right position, the concurrence in this report and the adoption by the government of the position taken by the committee in this report. I congratulate the hon. gentlemen.

The board chairman of the Humble Oil Company, a company frequently referred to in the course of this debate, in briefing the news media on the Arctic voyage of the *Manhattan* welcomed the gentlemen of the press to the world's largest and most expensive edition of the Ice Follies. He may stand to be corrected as to whether it will prove to be the largest and most expensive edition of the Ice Follies. He may stand to be corrected if this government does not indicate to the world without delay that vessels, surface and submarine, passing through Canada's Arctic Archipelago are and shall be subject to the sovereign control and regulation of Canada.

This, of course, is the view so eloquently expressed by the committee in its report. The committee made this recommendation after considering the potential threat of maritime oil tanker traffic through the waters of the Archipelago and the threat to Canada's environment in the north. Members of the committee had an opportunity for discussion with experts in the oil industry, with our own icebreaker marine officials, and with leading Canadian marine biologists and ecologists investigating the sinking last August of the two Panarctic barges off Melville Island. The committee states:

> However, your Committee shares the concern of most Canadians and of conservationists throughout the world of the dangers of pollution inherent in any future oil tanker maritime traffic through Canada's Arctic waters. Your Committee is convinced that the safeguards and pollution controls necessary to protect Canada's Arctic environment and ecology will neither be possible nor enforceable without an effective exercise of Canadian control over the waters and the ships using the waters of Canada's Arctic Archipelago.

That quotation is the heart of the recommendation of the committee and goes to the very core of the debate we are having here today. Following that, the committee further states:

> Your Committee is unimpressed with arguments that adequate pollution safeguards could be effected by international agreement.

Of course, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) certainly said nothing here today which would lead us to believe there is any immediate prospect of international accords to prevent the disaster happening which we are afraid might happen. It may very well be, and I assume it is, that the Minister of Transport had business to which he must attend following the termination of his speech, but even if I had nothing to do after making a speech in such an irrelevant way I, too, would have left the House very quickly.

An hon. Member: He is back.

Mr. Jamieson: Will you please correct the record, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: He just left his seat.

Mr. Stanfield: Yes, he just left his seat, Mr. Speaker. I think we all recognize that in this area, the opening of the north, the development of oil resources there and the movement of oil and other substances, we are moving in the unknown. We have been reminded here today that even a vessel as strongly constructed as the *S. S. Manhattan* was five times caught in the ice on her trip. We have heard about the gaping holes in her side. We can visualize very clearly what this might mean in the event that such a vessel were loaded with oil. And yet again, as we have been reminded today, big though she is the *Manhattan* may well be dwarfed by specially built 250,000 ton tankers contemplated for the future Northwest Passage service.

• (5:10 p.m.)

In the December issue of the *Imperial Oil Review* it is stated:

> Humble Oil speculates that various companies will have 25 or 30 huge icebreaking tankers in the Passage by 1975.

It is all very well for the Minister of Transport to engage in international discussions, and we can encourage him in this, but surely in the light of this prospect Canada must be prepared to move to discharge her responsibilities to her own people?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether by 1975 we will have the answers to the ecological problems raised by these probes into the north. Certainly, there will be a real threat to our environment. Surely, in these circumstances we must assert our sovereignty. Of course, we must ourselves pioneer this area to see how best it can be used for the benefit of the Canadian people, more particularly of the native people who stand to lose all by an unfettered outside exploitation of their homeland.

Secondly, we must maintain firm control over the environment, not just for ourselves but in a very real sense for the whole world. I do not wish to exaggerate, but it may very well be that here our whole future lies in the balance, and that a wrong movement by the government, or the failure to make the right move merely to satisfy the economic interests of our neighbours to the south, or some timidity on the subject, may well contribute to the environmental breakdown of the world. Certainly, this is what many fear.

I say, Sir, that we have the political power to assert sovereignty, but what the government needs is the will to assert sovereignty. What we need today is a little bit of the guts that went into the making of Canada in the first place.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: The government talks about pollution control. I think control of pollution in the north is practical, although I have not got very much confidence that the government would exercise the necessary controls even if it declared sovereignty. Certainly, if we are to judge by the Canada water act, we have not very much upon which to build confidence. Then, too, we have the mention in the committee's report of the failure of the interdepartmental committee to do anything effective with regard to the barge sinkings in connection with the Panarctic operations. It is time we acted. It is time we acted effectively, and if we don't we may be welcoming what will be, in fact, the world's largest and most expensive edition of the Ice Follies, and the chairman of Humble Oil may prove to have been wrong.

I welcome, in a sense, the information given us by the Minister of Transport with regard to international discussions and the tentative steps taken toward the achievement of some international agreement respecting pollution in international waters. That is a sort of side-effect to this debate. We have been trying to get a statement from the minister about what went on at that conference ever since it was held, but it took a motion such as this one and an effort to try to distract the attention of the House and of the country from the essential point in this discussion get this statement from the minister. Anyway, we are happy to have it and I think we still have plenty of time to discuss the relevant matters. I repeat that that statement has nothing to do with the case at all.

May I just draw the attention of the House to the fact that, even if there were any prospect that such an international agreement could be achieved in the immediate future, it would not be sufficient. The minister spoke about the sanctions. He spoke about firms and perhaps countries being required to make deposits so that those who suffered financially would be reimbursed. But, Mr. Speaker, financial reimbursement is not going to meet this problem in the north. This problem is not something you can fix up with money, short of enormous expenditures which would only go part way.

What we are so concerned about is the possibility of irreparable injury being done that cannot be compensated by money. So, Mr. Speaker, what the minister was talking about was completely irrelevant; first of all because it applies to international waters; secondly, because it shows no prospect of coming about in the near future; and, thirdly, because in any event it would be inadequate even if it came into effect in the very near future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: On October 24 last the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of Canada told this House:

> First of all, we will never sacrifice, in the name of progress, a clean and healthy environment to industrial or commercial development.

The only way that the government of Canada can prevent the sacrifice of the north, can prevent the sacrifice of this clean and healthy environment, is by claiming the power to exercise, and by exercising, effective control. Nobody else is going to exercise that control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are various recommendations in the committee's report. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) referred to them. He suggested that the adoption of the report might force the government to take measures involving the expenditure of public money. But surely, Sir, that is not so. Surely, that is another red herring. I say quite frankly that that has nothing to do with the case.

If the House adopts this motion, as I hope it will, the government is not committed to the expenditure of a cent, but it does express to the government the unanimous views of the members of the House. I do not imagine, Mr. Speaker, that the government will pay very much more attention to the views of the House as a whole than it does to the views of the Opposition as a whole. But in any event, it is not right to suggest that it is a poor practice to move this kind of a motion because it may involve the government in the expenditure of money. That is not so. It is perfectly proper for the House to adopt this motion expressing its view on the desirability of the government doing something, the desirability of it adopting some policies. That is what is being done here. The House is being asked to recommend to the government of Canada the adoption of certain policies.

What possible reason could there be for the government refusing to declare Canada's sovereignty over the north? What possible reason is there for the government refusing to carry out the basic recommendation of this committee? Any adequate reason has certainly not been disclosed. Certainly, I have not heard it. Evidently the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin has not heard it. None of us heard it.

There are obvious reasons why it is important that the government should move. Every day of silence on the part of the government increases the conviction of other countries about the doubts Canada may have of the validity of her claims. I think there can be no doubt about that. Secondly, every day that goes by increases the possibility that dangers and difficulties may arise for which we are not prepared, so it is urgent, sir, that we move. This resolution is not going to put the

cabinet in a straitjacket, but it will indicate very clearly to the government of this country what members of this House feel on a matter that is essential to the future of our country. There is real urgency in view of the possibility of pollution, but there are longer term factors indicating the importance of Canada's claiming sovereignty over the waters between the Archipelago and the mainland of Canada. This is surely essential to the development of the north; it is not a matter of making this claim through any sense of imperialism. It is necessary to make it for ensuring the development of the nation.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The report refers to fishing. We cannot see at this time what the resources in the northern waters may be; we cannot see at this time who may wish to exploit these with the techniques that may be available in the future. It is essential for the protection of Canadian interests and the realization of Canada's destiny in the north, that the government stop fooling around and take the necessary position.

There has been a fair amount of discussion about precedents and a fair amount of discussion about innocent passage. I could go into all that, but I think the position is pretty clear and I will not worry the House with too many legal discussions. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, first of all, given that Canada has undisputed claims both to the Arctic Archipelago and the continental shelf extending from its northern shores, and that Canada has by exploration and other activities shown a concern for the polar area to the north, that we should declare our interests in that whole polar sector. This would not be done through any sense of imperialism or aggression but because Canada believed that its national interest must be protected from the devastating results that unrestricted activities in the area may produce.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we must be alert to the dangers that may arise outside our territorial waters to the north. We must be alert to the colossal calamities that may take place within that polar sector and we must be prepared to take action. This is not only necessary in our own interests but I believe we have a duty to take such action if we are to discharge our duties to Canada today and in the future and, indeed, to the world. At the present time nobody else is going to worry very much about disasters that may take place in these waters.

In addition to this, the least we should do in accordance with existing legislative policy is draw base lines around the whole of the Arctic Archipelago, reducing the intervening waters to the status of internal waters. I take this to be the substance of the recommendation of the committee, notwithstanding the fact that some of the straits are twice the width of the Canadian territorial waters.

I suggest without hesitation that this is justifiable under international law on the grounds which have been referred to today and expounded in the Norwegian Fisheries question and the Convention on the Territorial Seas, and also having regard to the special nature of the waters concerned. In doing so, Canada does not deny that there might be a right of innocent passage through the Northwest Passage but we must, and again not for the purpose of asserting our rights but in order to discharge our responsibilities, assert that any claims to innocent passage or right to innocent passage is contingent upon the approval of Canadian authorities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: This is justifiable and legal for the following reasons. First of all, there is no customary international trade route through the Northwest Passage, unless there is a customary right of innocent passage, which certainly does not apply.

Secondly, it is in the interest of Canadian security to protect the resources of the area and to restrict certain categories of vessel, particularly tankers, from using it unless they can meet the standards set by Canada.

Thirdly, in view of the large investment, it will be necessary to provide navigational and meteorological aids, icebreakers, charting services, safety and rescue equipment. It may very well be necessary to levy charges for these services on vessels using the Northwest Passage.

Fourthly, in view of all this, the Northwest Passage possesses many of the features of an internal waterway, a fact which imposes severe limitations on the right of innocent passage.

I think members in all parts of the House must be very puzzled as to what is wrong with the government. What is really standing in the way of the government taking action which I think we are all convinced is necessary for the welfare of our country? Certainly, it is dangerous for the government not to do so, confusion thus being created and risks run. Certainly, if there are valid reasons, the government is keeping them very secret.

The member for Coast Chilcotin was rather critical of me. He did not mention me by name, but I think I asked the first question in this Parliament and it did relate to Biafra. The member felt there were more important things to discuss and rather suggested that this was not a matter that ought to concern this House. Mr. Speaker, I am going to make it very clear that I shall never apologize, either for asking that question or for my subsequent interest in what is going on in Nigeria.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: This, unfortunately, has been one of the great tragedies of our time, with millions dying and being permanently maimed by malnutrition. Surely, sir, no one need ever be apologetic for urging upon our country and our government a decent humanitarian role, which in this instance I would say ought to have been a role uninhibited by a concept of sovereignty. This should be irrelevant to the suffering and the dying. I am not speaking of interfering improperly in the affairs of another country, but surely the concept of sovereignty ought not to have been allowed by this government to interfere with the succour it offered to the maimed and dying. Surely, it is a proper interest for the government and Parliament of Canada.

In that instance, as I have said many times, I felt the attitude of the government was legalistic. I believe the government itself finally came to the conclusion that it was wrong, but only on the eve of the termination of the war.

Mr. Sharp: That is not so.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Transport spoke about pollution control in the international area. A growing number of Canadians are concerned about pollution within our own country but here the government seems to have a hang-up in connection with the constitution. In Biafra, it was the concept of sovereignty; in connection with pollution, it seems to be the concept of our constitution. Surely, in the light of this it is a little ironic, if it were not so serious, that a government which has used the concept of sovereignty to prevent it from doing something in connection with Nigeria, namely, rendering help and succour in an adequate way to the dying, uses the constitution in connection with pollution. It is rather ironic that in this

connection it is so reluctant to make a declaration of sovereignty which is essential if we are to protect the north and protect our country. I am a lawyer by training.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Sharp: Apparently the hon. member agrees with General Gowon.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I invited the minister to make a statement on Nigeria this afternoon. I should be very happy to discuss this matter with him this afternoon, tomorrow or at any time. I am making the point that the government seems to become embroiled in legalistic considerations. It seems to become hung up on legalistic considerations, no matter whether they relate to the concept of sovereignty in one connection or with some view of the constitution in another. Here, again, the government seems to be hung up on some legal fears relating to the interpretation of the law.

These are legalistic concerns. Surely the government is wrong in its interpretation of the law in this case. There is no real reason for the government to have the slightest concern about international law with regard to this claim. Surely, even if there are a few doubts, which I do not admit, it is the duty of this government to state the only position that can protect the north, the only position that can preserve the environment of the north.

The Minister of Transport told us what went on in Brussels, but all he did was reinforce the idea that if anyone is to protect the north, it must be Canada. Canada can do that only by asserting control. In order to assert control, Canada must claim sovereignty. I therefore hope that the House will endorse this resolution and, after that has been done, that the government will somehow or other summon enough fortitude to do what must so obviously be done in the interests of Canada and, indeed, of the world.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It has been suggested that questions should not be encouraged because there is a long list of hon. members anxious to take part in the debate. Perhaps the hon. member might be allowed one question.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member stated that the government pays no attention to his views and, also, that base lines should be drawn.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

An hon. Member: That is not correct.

Mr. Hogarth: May I point out that in late October or early November during the question period there was an exchange in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asked the hon. member specifically if he would put forward his views as to where the base lines ought to be drawn. My question is: Did the hon. member at any time give to the government his views or those of his party as to where the base lines should be drawn in the Arctic Archipelago?

Mr. Stanfield: Oh, the poor government: it depends on suggestions from the opposition. Of course, it does not take any notice of them. If the Prime Minister wants to consult me on any matter, I will be very happy to give him the benefit of my advice and I hope he will follow it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, for more than seven years I have been present here on opposition days, budget days and leaders' days, but this is the first time I have ever been present on a backbencher's day. I say that because when today's debate began it might have been called a backbencher's debate. I suggest that when the problem of the far north has been forgotten, Your Honour's ruling will be well remembered because it has set a new precedent for this House, this government and, indeed, the parliamentary system. That, really, is the significance of this debate. We have in Your Honour's ruling a check which must weigh in the balance against the more powerful rules that have given the government perhaps too much power without the sanction of the whole House.

Mr. McGrath: Hear, hear.

Mr. Otto: I submit that to some extent the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) has been browbeaten, because he said he did not wish to take part in the debate but continued arguing along lines begun by the government House leader who said that in a responsible system of government we cannot afford the luxury of giving some responsibility to the backbenchers. I have taken issue with the House leader on this matter.

Mr. Woolliams: Then why does the hon. member vote with the government all the time?

Mr. Otto: The institution of Parliament is undergoing change and the House leader

must realize that the government is not abdicating its responsibilities when it allows reports of committees which are dominated largely by Liberal members to be considered by the House. I think he and others are far behind the times when they say, "If we allow backbenchers to initiate government policies, how can the cabinet, when it goes to the people, explain its actions?"

The fact is that the cabinet does not go to the people. It is the party that goes to the people, and the backbenchers of this party also have a sense of responsibility. We are no longer here merely for two or three months of the year; we are full-time members. The fact that this debate has taken place will not hinder future government planning but will make ministers realize it is high time a backbencher's position meant something, and that they and officials of their departments must consult with members of committees and advise them of government plans and policies. Before action is taken, hon. members of this House at least should be listened to. I do not for a moment agree with the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin when he says this is a bad day. I think this is a good day for the government.

An hon. Member: It will shake up the mandarins.

Mr. Otto: Much as I hate to do so, Mr. Speaker, I must side with the government as to the contents of the report.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Feet of clay!

Mr. Otto: I think hon. members will realize that this is most unusual for me.

An hon. Member: The hon. member once said he was fair-minded.

Mr. Woolliams: He always votes with the government.

Mr. McGrath: He has just ruined his speech.

Mr. Otto: I cannot understand the government's reluctance to concur in this report, because notwithstanding what has been said, the report says that the government should immediately consider certain recommendations.

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member has been his own heckler.

Mr. Otto: It does not say that the government should adopt any measures; it merely says that the government should consider giving immediate consideration to certain recommendations. There is nothing wrong with that. Both the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) have said they are giving consideration to the matter. What, therefore, is the great objection to adopting this report? We have had debates on the question of the continental shelf, inland waters, the right of innocent passage, and so on. When we get to the essence of the report, what is dealt with? It is pollution—plain, ordinary, simple pollution.

• (5:40 p.m.)

We are not concerned with any matter other than this brand new danger which has never in the past been discussed with other nations. Indeed, many other nations are not even concerned with the subject matter. Therefore, why does Canada have to declare sovereignty? If it declares sovereignty, how will it express it? Will it do so by using an icebreaker? Against whom will it express sovereignty? Who is challenging the sovereignty?

Mr. Woolliams: Why deny it?

Mr. Otto: Nobody denies it. The government does not deny sovereignty. The government says there is no necessity as yet to put our foot down and say we are the king of this little castle. As hon. members opposite have said, it is recognized that the archipelago, the islands in the north, are Canadian territory. Who is questioning this? Why do we have to say at this time that we are the sovereign rulers of this land and of this channel? What we are really concerned about is the danger of pollution.

Why do hon. gentlemen think the United States are less concerned about this matter than we are? Surely no one would suggest that the United States would be glad to have this channel recognized as international water. They certainly would not want to see Russian or Chinese ships in this channel. We have explained our position. We have received consideration from the United States government and the corporations that are developing the oil reserves. I am sure we can come to some agreement.

As the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) pointed out, it does not have to be an international agreement, because other nations are not concerned; they do not care. The Minister of Transport admitted at the Brussels conference there was not much likelihood of an international agreement. But

why do we need an international agreement? Why can we not have a dialogue with the other country concerned, the United States? Surely we can come to a rational agreement whereby the United States will recognize our problems and our apprehensions, and will come to an agreement if necessary whereby a fee can be charged and we will have some insurance against pollution caused by oil spillage.

I have no doubt that the United States would also agree that Canada should have a much stronger voice, and possibly the majority voice, in the administration of regulations and the surveillance of the construction of ships to ensure that there is less likelihood of danger. It seems hon. members opposite are not expressing their apprehension as to the danger involved but want to make absolutely sure there will never be any spillage. This is impossible.

If Canadians want the north to be opened, we cannot say that we want the passage to be opened at absolutely no risk to ourselves. We have to take some risk. We have to ensure that if ships, are allowed to go through, we have the final say as to their construction, not necessarily unilaterally but we should have a strong voice in indicating the type of ships we will approve and the type of navigation we will accept to at least protect ourselves from the possible dangers of pollution.

Until now we have been speaking entirely of oil pollution, but there is nothing to guarantee that at a later time nations which have a problem in disposing of nuclear garbage will have to transport it great distances. That in itself would create a problem. All these problems are unforeseen now, but we cannot say we will not allow anyone to go through this passage unless we are absolutely sure there is no danger. This is nonsense. We cannot do it. We must say that we want the north to be opened up and that we want development there.

The Canadian government has a great interest in the Panarctic and we expect to have more. United States businessmen have put over $800 million into part of their territory in order to explore it and obtain oil. They also have responsibility as well as rights. Why do we have to concern them and the world by saying, "This is our territory. We are the sovereign power and you cannot do anything unless you ask us and abide by our terms"?

An hon. Member: It is time to tell them.

[Mr. Otto.]

Mr. Otto: My good friend to the left says it is time to tell them. Let us suppose we did that, and that a tanker went through, anyway: what would we do with the coast-guard cutter or icebreaker? Would we sink it and pollute our own waters? What is the hon. member talking about? Who are we to say we control this whole territory? As long as there was no confrontation, we would look foolish. We would look like Peruvians if we said we were going to declare a 15-mile or 20-mile limit. We agreed internationally that there would be certain limits for fishing, defence and commercial purposes. This is the first time we have encountered the pollution problem. If we act unilaterally, we will get nowhere.

An hon. Member: We did that on the west coast.

Mr. Otto: Yes, one Russian trawler was brought in. Korea took advantage of the very crucial international situation and brought in a United States ship from a distance of 28 miles. Unilateral action would not make us mature. Maturity depends upon recognizing the fact that we have a problem, and that throughout history the United States has never tried to hurt us. The United States government would not suffer embarrassment merely because of the action of some oil companies. That country has oil galore. I think this problem can and should be solved, but to do so unilaterally would be wrong.

I am not going to deal with the continental shelf argument except to say the report also suggests that the government of Canada should take whatever steps are necessary consistent with international law. The report contains many items which certainly will not be recognized under international law. I agree with the hon. member who this afternoon said that international law is quite confused. Indeed, there is very little international law today in the terms in which we once knew it.

The Minister of Transport commented on some of the problems in dealing with other nations. It was pointed out that other nations are not concerned with pollution, which is a new problem. They are not concerned with the pollution of Arctic waters when there is no possibility of cleaning the water or disposing of the pollution.

The Canadian government failed to obtain international agreement at the Brussels conference I think they should get together with the only other nation concerned and reach agreement as quickly as possible to control

this pollution and to find ways and means of obtaining money, whether by fees, tolls or otherwise, to research the problem and lay down the law. If the United States proves that it does not want to do this, that would be the time for our own government to lay down the law specifically as to pollution control.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Nothing else should be done, because nothing else is bothering us at the moment. We should also recognize that the *Manhattan* project was a failure. I think it is generally admitted it was not a success. This should make us even more apprehensive and careful about the type of regulations we should put into effect.

I shall end my remarks soon because I want other hon. members to have the greatest possible opportunity of taking part in the debate. May I summarize my views as follows: I am glad this report was brought down, and I think it is good that a motion was made to concur in it. I congratulate the committee on a report which was prepared entirely by its members. Far too many reports appear mysteriously from nowhere, completely typed and printed, approved by the steering committee and so on, yet no one knows where they originated and there is a great suspicion they come from the department concerned.

I am happy that the report with which we are now dealing is not one of those. It is vital to a successful committee system that reports should reflect the views of the steering committee and of the committee generally. Although I disagree with parts of this report, I admire the calibre of the men who sat on the committee which was responsible for it—the chairman, and especially the hon. member for Coast-Chilcotin who led this fight from the beginning, almost from the day he arrived in the House. He assumed to some extent today the role of minister without pay. He led the debate; he organized the speakers. I am glad his efforts have been recognized. I recognize him as a man who holds very strongly to his views. If more of us were like him, we would not have nearly as much trouble in obtaining recognition.

Having said this, I regret very much that I cannot agree with the body of the report. The Prime Minister made a clear statement when he said, in effect, that we ought not to become emotional about this issue, because being emotional would do no good; that we should be practical, and give attention to the problem while recognizing that it is futile to take action unilaterally if that action is unlikely to be successful, or if it is not necessary. My right hon. friend also stated, and I agree, that we should realize there are others concerned who are not our enemies but, rather, friends who by and large face the same problem in Alaska and around their coasts. We are not alone in this dilemma.

Nevertheless, I shall vote for the report if it comes to vote. Of course, it will not come to a vote. That is not the way in which these things are done: Indeed, it would be hypocritical to suggest that this motion will ever come to a vote. In the circumstances, I believe the government should give careful and immediate attention to these recommendations. I believe the nation desires these suggestions to be considered—hon. members certainly do—and for my part I urge the government to do so.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) stated this afternoon that Parliament was living a historic day. I share his view entirely. The House has indeed, with the present debate, set a precedent, thanks to the awareness and courage of the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) who moved concurrence in this report.

Parliament has won an important victory over the executive power. The principle recognized by the Chair reinforces the rights and privileges of hon. members to participate in major government decisions and to do so with all the objectivity which must preside over this debate.

Several government members agree with us on this important matter. This is clearly indicative of the fact that all Canadians are most interested in this question. They are tired of the government's shilly-shallying and the time has come for it to forget its reluctance and make the sovereignty statement which is called for.

We shall probably have tonight the occasion of hearing the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). I ask the minister to show his courage by telling the House what the government thinks of this matter and I hope that he will make, on behalf of the government, the sovereignty statement we have been expecting for so long.

If we refer to the report under study, Mr. Speaker, we realize that the committee is worried by the possibility that oil tankers will very soon be plying the waters of the Archipelago and by the inherent hazards.

I congratulate all the members of that committee for the enormous task they have accomplished in connection with this question and for the undeniable value of their report.

In the committee's view, the prospect of oil tanker traffic makes it imperative for the government to proclaim that surface ships and submarines sailing through the Archipelago will be subject to its control and to the regulations which it might adopt.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Faulkner): As it is six o'clock, 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.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned at six o'clock I was saying that the matter under discussion is extremely urgent if we want to ensure the security, welfare and future of the Canadian population.

But it seems that our ever so wise government wishes to ignore the report tabled in the House. It is rather strange that the government should disregard the report of one of its committees in view of the ever increasing importance of the functions of the committees since parliamentary reforms were enacted. This can only be explained by the fact that the conclusions of the committee are in direct conflict with the government policy in regard to Canadian Arctic waters.

And if, by chance, the government should, with the help of its majority or some contrivance, determine tonight to give this report a first class funeral, this would mean that it does not trust the work of the committees and that when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) talked about parliamentary reforms, it was simply a smoke screen.

Should the government decide tonight, owing to its majority, not to implement the recommendations of the committee, there would be only one thing left for the members of the committee to do, and this, in order to protect the rights and privileges of all hon. members who sit on committees of the House: all of them should, in one gesture of solidarity, resign from the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Thus they would prove to the people that the government disregards the committee reports which are submitted to its attention.

I was saying at the beginning of my remarks that we are living a historic moment, because the House, pursuant to the Chair's ruling, has set a precedent. The government rarely takes objection in the House to the presentation of a committee report. Should it persist in refusing the reports presented by committees, it will be severely judged when the time comes by public opinion.

• (8:10 p.m.)

By refusing to assert Canada's sovereignty over the Arctic waters, the government shows clearly that he understands neither the importance of the interests at stake nor the seriousness of the situation.

The government believes that by negotiating an international agreement against pollution, it will assert our sovereignty. Far from asserting our sovereignty, such action will not even succeed in protecting Canada from water pollution in this area. Such a position is particularly illogical and dangerous because how can we enforce an agreement concerning an area which we are not even sure to possess? Any protective measure against pollution is impossible and inapplicable if Canada does not exercise effective control over the waters of the Canadian archipelago and over the ships that will use them. The need for a declaration of sovereignty does not arise from the simple fact of a recommendation to this effect by the committee.

The immediate declaration by the government of the Canadian sovereignty over the waters of the continental shelf is called for the following reasons: first, in order to be effective, any international agreement aimed at removing the danger of pollution in the Arctic waters demands, first, a declaration of sovereignty. The simple fact that some countries are already studying the use of the Northwest Passage for commercial transportation and that large companies are carrying out their activities in these regions should encourage the government to state right now and unequivocally its sovereignty over this region.

Canada cannot afford to wait for universal consensus since two ships of the Panarctic Oils Limited, one of which was carrying oil, have already gone down in this area.

We must first of all realize that there is no danger of pollution in the Arctic waters. Much is at stake for Canada, for the Arctic waters are a hunting ground for Indians and Eskimos, 8,500 to 10,500 of them respectively.

Humanitarian and economic considerations are therefore involved.

Does the government refuse to proclaim our sovereignty in the Arctic for fear of certain legal consequences?

Obviously, if Canada allows other countries to move in—I now refer to the international aspect—it may be far more difficult in the future to prove our sovereignty before the competent tribunal. But if the government took concrete steps immediately, and moved into the field we already hold, it might be easier to refute the claims of other countries, including the United States and to refute legal arguments before the international Court.

I still wonder why the government is reluctant to make that statement; I suspect they may fear its legal consequences.

If they really want to test that sovereignty, let them do it now and let the countries that want to dispute it make out their case before the International Court of Justice.

One must realize first of all that much of the natural resources in the Arctic waters are only partially developed and that they are priceless. It is a must for Canada to establish effectively, for future generations, her sovereignty as well as navigation security in that area.

As desirable as international control of water pollution could be, it is but one of the consequences of a statement on sovereignty, as I said a while ago. The delicate ecological balance in the Arctic must be preserved, for the sake of its population and its animal life.

The *Manhattan's* journey through the Northwest Passage has opened a new era. The economic development of that area, the oil and ore resources of its maritime subsoil and their development depend first of all upon a vigorous statement of sovereignty if Canada wants to remain in the race. This country cannot afford to jeopardize the future of her citizens, her animal and plant life and her natural resources.

The Canadian people have a right to expect efficient measures from the government, for their future is at stake. A firm and clear statement of the Canadian sovereignty over the Arctic waters is the first step to take before formulating a policy on Arctic waters.

Such a statement on sovereignty should obviously be tied in with the passage of several pieces of legislation not only to uphold the occupation of Arctic territories but also to state precisely the legal question as to that very important problem.

The need for a statement on sovereignty, as I said a while ago, is also urgent. Indeed, the fragile ecological balance of the Arctic is already threatened. On Melville Island, where Panarctic Oils Limited is conducting explorations, there are thousands of empty oil drums scattered about the island. The delicate wildlife of the island has already fallen a victim to the machinery in use there.

This is only the first problem, for Canada will certainly very soon discover oil and other minerals. As we know, companies are busy exploring in this area.

The government should realize that pollution is only one of the problems that should induce it to solve, right away and for all the world to know, the problem of sovereignty.

In its eagerness to have the people take part in the administration of the country, the government is gradually leading us to believe that the country is run by rumours coming from everywhere.

Concerning this important question, there have been rumours abroad to the effect that Canada had established strict control in the area of the Arctic waters, but these were just pompous statements of policy; no positive steps were ever taken.

Canadians are beginning to wonder seriously about the failure of this government to assume its responsibilities when it comes to firmly asserting the sovereignty of our country over its national heritage.

We know there are, in this area, many resources which need to be protected—and here I am talking to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp)—even if we have to exchange with the United States some strong and straight forward arguments about what we believe to be our sovereignty over this area of the country.

I think that the Canadian government and the Secretary of State for External Affairs are mature enough to formulate themselves the foreign and domestic policy of Canada without having them being dictated by Washington.

If this problem is set out in clear and specific terms, the Washington government will be able to understand our position and it will be the first to recognize that we have taken a concrete and strong action which will be respected not only by our neighbours to the South but also by all the other countries which get some benefit out of their presence in that area.

We know that the Canadian people are greatly concerned about this problem. I would also submit that Quebecers do not remain indifferent to the harmful effects that the pollution of the Ungava and New Quebec areas would have.

We are entitled to know the opinion of the government in that respect and I hope that tonight the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs will make it known to us. The only way to deal with the matter would be for a member of the government or the Prime Minister himself to make a clear and precise statement with regard to our sovereignty over the Arctic waters. Should the Prime Minister refuse to abide by the wish of the committee and of most hon. members in that respect, he would indicate by his action that he leads a monolithic government which has no consideration for the opinion of the majority of hon. members.

• (8:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, first I wish to congratulate the committee on its excellent report.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Sharp: It has brought to the attention of the government, of this Parliament and of Canadians generally the importance of taking timely action to preserve and protect the Arctic environment against the danger of oil pollution. Nor is there any particular objection on the part of the government to this debate, so far as substance is concerned. However, I think I should say that in view of the very heavy backlog of business before the House one must regret that we are taking a day now to debate this report when there will shortly be an opportunity for exactly the same subject to be debated when the government introduces its legislation on this subject, as forecast in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Nesbitt: We have heard Throne Speeches before.

Mr. Sharp: This was one of the reasons why, when the motion was made, the government expressed some misgivings. I hope that the Opposition, in understanding this, will hereafter assist us a little more than they have in the past to get through the great backlog of legislation that is facing us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. Asselin.]

Mr. Sharp: It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) also did some disservice to his own report by insisting upon this debate, although I must say that in terms of quality it has been an excellent debate.

Mr. Woolliams: Up until now.

Mr. Sharp: The report, as I said, is an excellent one. It is straightforward, clear, constructive, and most significant of all, it is unanimous.

Mr. Monteith: Then why were you ashamed of it?

Mr. Sharp: I am not ashamed of it.

Mr. Nesbitt: Why don't you move concurrence in the report, if you like it so much?

Mr. Sharp: I will deal with this point presently. The hon. member has put his finger exactly on the point at issue here. The report is a very good example of the way in which committees can be used to contribute to public understanding and to the understanding of this House on matters of such difficulty and complexity. However, under our parliamentary system of responsible government it is not the function of committees to usurp the responsibilities of government.

While it is true that the report of the committee is only a recommendation to the government to take certain action, and concurrence of the House cannot change its essential nature, to ask the House to concur in a report which makes so many specific recommendations requires the members of the government who are members of the House, if they take their responsibilities seriously—as I hope we all do—to express the points upon which they may differ from the committee even if they find the general tenor of the report to be valuable and acceptable.

To vote against the report could, on the other hand, be interpreted as a vote against the principle of Canada's sovereignty over the waters lying between the islands of the Canadian Archipelago. While the government may be generally sympathetic to the views of the committee, it may in the exercise of its responsibilities believe that it is necessary to adopt a strategy different from that advocated by the committee in order to attain the agreed objectives. I think the House will agree that this is understandable.

The committee does not have the responsibility of government. It does not have to weigh one objective or one priority against

another. The committee cannot answer for the consequences of its own recommendations. On the other hand, the government must answer for the consequences of all its policies and all its actions. It cannot blame a committee, even if it accepts its findings, for mistakes which may result from the acceptance of the committee's report. I can assure the House that the recommendations of the committee will be given the most careful consideration by the government in framing the legislation to be proposed to Parliament.

What the government has been doing goes further than the approach suggested in the committee's report. We have not hesitated or delayed in determining our basic objectives, or in announcing them to the House and indeed to the world. These objectives were stated in the Speech from the Throne and in the Prime Minister's address in the Throne Speech debate. They are to encourage the development of Arctic navigation and to ensure the preservation of the Arctic environment. I am certain there is agreement on all sides with these objectives.

To translate them into practical terms, however, and to incorporate them into detailed legislation requires time and much study. We have taken our time and we have given the most careful thought to the process of implementing the basic policy which we have already stated, because the interests involved are of the greatest importance to the country. Mr. Speaker, the government has almost finished its work and we will be submitting the results to the House in the near future.

There is, I believe, no fundamental difference between the views of the government and of the committee as to the extent of Canada's sovereignty in the Arctic region. There is certainly no difference of view as to the necessity of taking action to control pollution. How best to reinforce Canadas' claims to sovereignty, and how best to use that authority to control pollution are problems of a different order. It is not sufficient, for this purpose, simply to make declarations and lay claims. I am sure those members of the House who are much more learned in the law than I will agree with this. This is a practice they follow in their own profession. These declarations may be challenged; these claims may be resisted. It becomes then of the utmost importance to proceed in such a way as to maximize the chances of acceptability and success. As in so many other fields, timing is of the essence.

As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said on October 24 of last year:

> There is not now, nor is it conceivable that there will ever be from any source, challenges to Canadian sovereignty on the mainland, in the islands, in the minerals lying in the continental shelf below the Arctic waters, or in our territorial seas. This happy situation is the result of quiet, consistent policies on the part of all Canadian governments. The present government pledges to be equally consistent. Those policies will reflect Canada's proper interest not only in the preservation of the ecological balance ... but as well in the economic development of the north, the security of Canada, and in our stature and reputation in the world community.

To judge from some articles in the press and from various statements and speeches one would almost be led to believe that the *Manhattan* discovered the New World with the *Nina*, the *Pinta* and the *Santa Maria*. This, of course, is not the case.

Canada was present and active in the Arctic and the Arctic waters for a century and more before the voyage of the *Manhattan*. The *Manhattan* project would not have been possible without the preparatory work, the scientific research, the investments, and the pioneering activities which successive Canadian governments have encouraged or undertaken over a vast area of the north. I refer to the systematic mapping, the hydrographic charting, the geophysical exploration and the sea-ice studies carried out by this country. Canada is not a newcomer to Arctic navigation. Canadian skills go away back and were demonstrated in historic voyages of the *St. Roch* and the *Labrador*. They were demonstrated again last fall when the *John A. Macdonald* escorted the *Manhattan* through Canada's northern islands and repeatedly freed her from the ice.

• (8:30 p.m.)

We are not unprepared for developments such as the Prudhoe Bay oil discoveries, the exploitation of Canada's own offshore Arctic resources and the commercial navigation of the Northwest Passage which may follow. 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.

At the same time, however, we have also recognized that the danger of pollution by ships in the Arctic is particularly grave. Ice is the chief obstacle in these waters, but other

Arctic features are also a great hindrance, such as the extreme cold, the almost continuous fog and overcast, the 24-hour darkness in winter, the magnetic disturbances and deviations, the absence of distinctive landmarks and the need for extensive aids to navigation. Not only is there a high risk of accident, but the pollution damage resulting from an accident involving a supertanker could have a catastrophic effect upon the fragile ecology of the Arctic because of the slow workings of the biological processes which in more temperate areas effect a natural cleansing and healing operation. We do not know enough about some of these problems, but we are keenly aware of the potential dangers and we are determined to do what is necessary to minimize and avoid them.

Much has been said in this debate about international law with reference to the Arctic waters. The Prime Minister and I have both had something to say on this question on a number of occasions and I will not repeat all our previous observations here. I only wish to reaffirm a few points. The law of the sea is indeed a complex subject involving political, economic and security interests which are both national and international in scope.

This body of law has changed a great deal over the centuries with the growth of technology and shifts in the relations between states. It has undergone particularly rapid change in recent years, and Canada has made some contribution to its development to our national advantage. The Arctic seas represent a spec al situation which has so far received insufficient attention. There are obvious differences between ordinary water and water in its frozen state. Men can walk on the ice. Some people I am told can walk on the water, but generally speaking they can walk on the ice; they can shoot polar bears on the ice; they can commit murder on the ice. We all know that the flag state has jurisdiction over a crime committed on board a ship 60 miles from shore. But who has jurisdiction over a crime committed on the ice 60 miles from shore? The Canadian courts have provided effective answers to this question without feeling a need to refer to some stirring manifesto.

With respect to the Northwest Passage, one thing seems clear. As I wrote last September in an article in the Toronto *Globe and Mail:*

> Heretofore, no one, be he Arctic expert, international jurist or government spokesman, could allege that the Northwest Passage is already an international strait under international law. If that were the case, we would not require now the massive effort which we are witnessing for the purpose of forcing one ship and two icebreakers through the passage. In other words, we are not talking about established sea lanes or straits. We are talking about an area covered by solid ice through most of the year in some places and all of the year in others.

One last and most important point with respect to international law is this: I have already emphasized the importance the government attaches to keeping the Arctic waters open for innocent passage. 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 his statement of October 24 on the Throne Speech debate, the Prime Minister declared that Canada would not permit the pollution or artificial deterioration of the Arctic environment, either in the name of freedom of the seas or in the interests of economic development. He emphasized that we were determined not to bow in the Arctic to pressures of any state. With respect to the course of action proposed by the government he said:

> Canada will propose a policy of use of the Arctic waters which will be designed for environmental preservation. This will not be an intolerable interference with the activities of others, it will not be a restriction upon progress. This legislation we regard, as a contribution to the long term and sustained development of resources for economic and social progress.

The special objectives we intend to achieve are known. The concrete action we intend to take will be spelled out in the legislation soon to be submitted to the House. I can assure the House that our proposed legislation will afford the protection required for Canada's vital coastal interests in the Arctic. It will not be a sterile exercise in chauvinism, blindly disregarding Canada's real interests and international responsibilities. It will, however, represent an affirmation of our right and our duty to use and control our national heritage. And it will vest in Canada the maritime jurisdiction which is essential for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian north is beginning to undergo a period of rapid and profound change. We are disturbing its eternal silence and challenging its forbidden empti-

ness. At the same time, we are creating new problems and seeking to resolve them in new ways, with new techniques, new attitudes and new laws. The future of the north is the future of this country. The government is dedicated to that future, to the development of the north and to its preservation from the ravages which man has inflicted upon his environment elsewhere.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I listened with very close attention to the extraordinary and, I might say, soporific remarks of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). For a few moments I could not help feeling that I was in the middle of one of the chapters of "Alice in Wonderland." If all of the members of cabinet are so much in agreement with the proposals expressed in this report, I fail to understand why we have had to take up a day of valuable government time in discussing the matter. It just does not make any sense.

Mr. Sharp: That is right.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, we have to look at what has been going on, never mind the red herrings and smoke-screens put up by government members. The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development drew up a report. It was drawn up by government members on the committee—

Mr. Crouse: A majority of government members.

Mr. Nesbitt: A government majority, of course, and it was unanimously concurred in by all members. It did not seem in any way controversial, and it was placed before the House. When anything is tabled in this House, Mr. Speaker, it is the property of the House and not of the government. Why was a move not made to concur in this report in the ordinary, routine way? It is all very strange. Members on this side of the House took no steps in that direction because we thought the chairman of the committee, on behalf of the government, would probably move concurrence in the normal way. We waited, but nothing happened. Although one cannot pay attention to all one hears around Parliament hill, there is usually no smoke without some fire, and we did hear things. We began to realize that the government, for a reason which has never been explained in spite of all the fancy today, did not like this report.

• (8:40 p.m.)

What is it in this report that in any way ties the government's hands in regard to details of legislation pertaining to domestic matters or international negotiations? Nothing. Parliament has had presented to it in a committee report certain general principles with which I am sure all Canadians, including members of the government, must agree. This whole performance is incredible.

Mr. Orange: So is the hon. member's.

Mr. Nesbitt: I hope the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) will support this report, because if he does not it will look very strange to his constituents. As I say, Mr. Speaker, our having to debate this matter seems incredible. The vice-chairman of the committee had to move concurrence in the report. Surely there can be no argument about this matter. The government is complaining that it cannot get its legislation through Parliament. It says it has so much to do, and then refuses to accept this report. I ask, what is all the argument about?

Mr. Orange: We are waiting for the hon. member to say something.

Mr. Nesbitt: The hon. member for Northwest Territories will have his chance to speak in due course, and we shall be very interested to hear what he has to say. Shakespeare had a word for nearly every situation one can imagine, and in this case, having heard the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), the Secretary of State for External Affairs and one or two other government supporters, I am reminded of Lady Macbeth's words:

> All the perfumes of Arabia will not sweeten this little hand.

All the explanations that may be presented here—and believe me they are phony explanations—cannot rub out the knowledge that the government does not like the report and its principle. It contains a statement of principle, and nothing else. All the foolish and phony explanations do not hide the government's thinking. Let us take a good look at this whole business, Mr. Speaker. We have had so many red herrings drawn across the trail that the Grand Banks, where they fish them, must be pretty well depleted. We have seen a very good smoke-screen put up.

What is the basic problem here, Mr. Speaker. The matter of concurrence in this report brings to mind two very important principles which are before the House. That is why this matter has received so much attention from the public, the news media and others. The two principles are quite obvious. The first is the substance of this report, the principle

expressed in it for which concurrence is sought from members of the House. The second point has to do with the whole purpose of our parliamentary system as seen in theory by the government and as put into practice.

We know that when this government came into office, it came in on a wave of slogans like, "Participatory democracy" and, "We are going to give the backbenchers a real chance to take part in the proceedings of Parliament and to help the government." We heard a lot of talk about that, Mr. Speaker.

What have we had since? As one government supporter said, and I agree with him, no government should be obliged to accept every recommendation of every parliamentary committee. Nobody who has had any experience around here would suggest otherwise. However, in view of all the trumpeting about how much democracy there was going to be around here, the government might on occasion—perhaps not very often, but on occasion—consider adopting some of the recommendations of some of the committees. Unfortunately, there has not been the slightest sign of that taking place.

Consider, for example, the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. It was sent to Europe, at great expense to the taxpayers, to look into matters pertaining to NATO. I was a member of the committee at that time and I recall that members, regardless of party, worked extremely hard drawing up recommendations. Immediately upon our return we sat down to work on our report. What happened? Before we had a chance to present the report requested by the government, the government announced what it was going to do.

Why was there all this waste of the taxpayers' money and of members' time? Goodness knows, members of the House have enough duties to perform relating to constituencies, committee meetings, work in the House and elsewhere. Why should they waste their time, at the request of the government, only to have the government make its decision before the report could be presented or even drawn up? The same sort of thing happened in the Transport and Communications Committee and on the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The latter committee was discussing the question whether the voting age should be lowered to 18 years, and before it could complete its work a cabinet minister rose and said, "We have made up our minds." The same sort of thing happened with the Committee on Agriculture. In fact, it has happened with almost every committee of the House.

Mr. Orange: Stay with it!

Mr. Nesbitt: I know the hon. member for Northwest Territories does not like this, but I am afraid he will just have to listen. He can answer in due course.

An hon. Member: He has not been able to be recognized.

Mr. Nesbitt: I thought he said he would speak.

Mr. Orange: The hon. member can sit down any time he wants.

Mr. Nesbitt: If the committee system of this House is to work, some attention must be paid to Committees' reports. The government should have the good grace not to announce that it has made a decision before the matter the committee is investigating has been reported on. If this policy is continued, hon. members—I do not care in which part of the House they sit—will get damn well fed up and will not go to committees. Frankly I do not see why they should, if this policy is continued. It is useless for the Secretary of State or the minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) to rise in the House, as happened this afternoon, and say that the committee was not apprised of all pertinent facts when it drew its report.

If the government had been paying attention to what was going on in committees, and if it knew that committees were not receiving all the information they should have had before them, all it had to do was use its good offices and request, perhaps through committee chairmen, that certain witnesses from departments of government and elsewhere present evidence. We can take the instance referred to this afternoon: the evidence sought might pertain to the Brussels conference, or it might pertain—the Secretary of State for External Affairs referred to this tonight—to some of the problems we are facing in international situations. If the committees are not being properly informed, it is the government's fault. If the government has information that it wants to present to committees so that those committees may draw up reports, there is nothing stopping the government making that information available.

I think members on all sides of the House will agree that there has been remarkably little partisanship in committees. Most committee members, no matter where they sit in

the House, have tried to do useful work and to bring out useful and helpful reports. But whenever the mandarins in the government do not like something—although the term "mandarins" usually refers to senior civil servants, we must remember that some of them have graduated to the cabinet—they merely say, "We are not in favour of this and we will not have it." Apparently they like to use the system that was used some years ago by members of the Capet family and kings of France such as Louis XIV. If they did not like something, they just tossed it out.

Just consider the remark the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) reportedly made to the inhabitants of Banff Park and Jasper Park. Apparently he said that if they did not like things as they were, they could get out. This is just like ordering the peasants off the property. That is symbolic of the attitude of the government, although I am careful to say that this remark does not apply to a very large number of government backbenchers. The other matter that has come before the House is the substance of the committee report. This question has been dealt with at great length by a number of hon. members including the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the Leader of the NDP and others.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I do not intend to take the time of the House to repeat what has already been said, particularly with respect to international law. I would like to make on thing clear because it may be raised at a later date by members of the government, that is, that members of the opposition are not anti-American in some of the views we have taken. I will not take second place to any member of this House in being accused of being pro-American. I am not ashamed of it. I have always had the greatest respect and admiration for our great neighbour to the south. The Americans are hard bargainers when looking after their own interests, and I do not blame them one bit for that. That does not mean we should not express our interest and views.

A great many conclusions have been drawn from the strange attitude of the government. The government is adopting a sort of Uriah Heep posture toward the United States. Canada is so humble; the government is saying, "We do not want to interfere with you." I do not go along with the government when it says it is ever so humble. I do not think the United States has any respect for us in adopting that kind of attitude.

I heard another strange argument from a government member this afternoon, the hon. member of the legal profession. He was inquiring why the government should assert its sovereignty over the Arctic at this time. Other members must have been as stunned and astounded as I, in view of the background and training of the hon. member. I am sure the member must know that the doctrine of *laches* applies. If you do not assert your authority over certain territories and rights, they will lapse. In the same way, if you own a piece of property and allow people to cross the corner of it without objecting, you lose that portion of your property. This law, of course, applies internationally as well as nationally.

The Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) pointed out that in 1908 we asserted our right under the sector principle which extends to the North Pole over ice, water and land. This was again done in 1946. In view of the great interest in the Arctic at the present time because of oil and possible transportation outlets, we should once again reassert our authority. Approximately a year ago the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said in this House that he was in favour of the assertion of our rights in the Arctic. This is why I find it so difficult to understand why the government is so bashful about now reasserting its rights over the Arctic. I understand this is also the feeling of many government members.

There have been many editorials, news items and remarks about this subject. There is only one conclusion any reasonable person could come to, that is, that the government has some doubts about whether we in fact have sovereignty over the Arctic areas and whether we should enforce this sovereignty. It seems that our sovereignty over the Arctic areas has become a negotiable matter. This has never happened with any previous government of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Orange: That's your view.

Mr. Nesbitt: I only hope, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Orange: Face up to it.

Mr. Nesbitt: I wish the hon. member for Northwest Territories would control his temper. He might be frightening the people in the galleries. He is frightening me. I wish he would control himself.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs intimated this evening that he will in the near future give us concrete assurance in the form of legislation or perhaps an announcement of government policy. If we assert our sovereignty over the Arctic areas in unequivocal terms, I am sure the fears and misgivings of many of us will be removed. I hope the minister will do as he intimated this evening. I hope it does not mean what the government usually means when it says "in the near future", that is, next year or the year after. I hope the assurance will be given in the next couple of weeks.

Mr. Sharp: I hope we will have some co-operation from the opposition.

Mr. Nesbitt: I have heard many amusing remarks this evening, Mr. Speaker, but the latest interjection by the Secretary of State for External Affairs really takes the cake.

Mr. Orange: You made a few, too.

Mr. Nesbitt: I will conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, because I know many members are waiting with bated breath to hear the words of the hon. member for Northwest Territories, who is just itching to speak. We would love to hear what he is going to say.

Mr. Orange: You have taken 20 minutes. Why don't you let me have a chance?

Mr. Nesbitt: The hon. member is concerned there will not be time for him to speak. We are each allowed 40 minutes to speak in this debate. I am sure in the next hour the hon. member will be able to give us his views on the matter.

In conclusion I wish to pose some questions to the government. If in fact the government approves the general principle—and I say again that is all there is in this committee report—why is there all the fuss? Why has the report not been concurred in in the usual manner and allowed to go through? Why take the time of this House? What has the government to hide? What does it not like about this report? That is all we want to know.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nesbitt: I hope other government members will reassure us there is nothing in fact to hide. We are waiting to be convinced of that.

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the contents of this report, which I hope at least in principle will have the support of every member of this House, I wish to place on record some of the background of the report.

The Arctic sovereignty question was raised and pursued in this House at the beginning of 1969 by the hon. member for Coast-Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre). As a result of that hon. member's opportune action, the Indian Affairs and Northern Development Committee took up the subject and last April heard expert testimony from Dean Cohen of the McGill University faculty of law.

In August, 1969, when the timetable for the *Manhattan* became fixed, the committee indicated its wish to welcome the *Manhattan* to the Canadian north. This fact is significant, Mr. Speaker: the committee was in consequence furnished with a Canadian Armed Forces' aircraft for that purpose. The committee's primary concern was that our Arctic environment and ecology could be protected only by rules and regulations formulated and enforced by Canada.

The implementation of controls and regulations for the use of these waters is, of necessity, an exercise of sovereignty. The nature of the *Manhattan's* voyage, with no formal request for permission for its passage having been addressed to the Canadian government, at least in the minds of the committee members presented a challenge to Canadian sovereignty, a sovereignty which I regard as being solidly based historically, geographically and geologically.

We felt a strong gesture was essential to meet what seemed to be a deliberate attempt by the United States government to skate around the sovereignty issue. A subcommittee of 10 members of the Standing Committee went north on September 3, 1969, fully aware of the significance of the gesture they were about to make.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Soon after the committee arrived in Resolute on the evening of September 3, the ten members sat down together and in the course of the most completely non-partisan discussion I have ever witnessed between members of an all-party committee thrashed out not only the wording but the tone of the message of greeting we were to send to the *Manhattan* as she entered the waters of the archipelago. A condition of agreement on the wording of the message was that there would be unanimous support for the message after it had been delivered, and I am happy to say there was. The clearest possible language was used

to express the Canadian position: "Welcome to Canadian waters—Bienvenue dans ces eaux canadiennes".

Mr. Speaker, I am not an extreme nationalist, nor am I a flag-waver, nor do I believe in sovereignty for sovereignty's sake. However, I am totally convinced, as I know were the other nine members of the committee and as I believe are most hon. members of this House, that in order to regulate and control pollution dangers to our Arctic environment we must exercise the full sovereign powers of Canada.

Our report alludes to possible international control. We rejected a reliance on international regulations for protection because up to now, at least, their laxness has been such as to cause concern. Oil spillages, deliberate or accidental, have already reached an intolerable level in some of the temperate waters of the world, and these are the waters in which crude oil is dissipated most readily.

It is becoming increasingly clear to scientists that permissible levels of oil spillage under the present IMCO agreements may be much too high. The IMCO, as I am sure the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) found out during his voyage to Europe a short time ago, is dominated by countries whose shipping lobbies are very powerful. These shipping lobbies are in turn subservient to their most important clients, the international oil interests.

International agreement on stricter control of oil and chemical pollution by international marine traffic remains a highly desirable objective, and it is in the interest of Canada to use maximum diplomatic pressure to achieve these goals. But can we take a chance on the adequacy of international regulation when thousands of miles of Canadian Arctic coastline are menaced, and when an ecology and an environment which are probably the most delicately balanced on this planet may be irreparably damaged? The answer must, of course, be no.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has already indicated that the government of Canada will take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Arctic environment in this regard. The committee has made clear what it feels these steps should be. It states that vessels, surface and submarine, passing through Canada's Archipelago are, and shall be, subject to the sovereign control and regulation of Canada.

The urgency which is stressed in the committee's report is not exaggerated. A few days ago General Dynamics Corporation announced it had offered to build six 175,000-ton submarine tankers for oil companies with interests in the Prudhoe Bay area. The offer was made complete with prices and delivery dates. I asked in the House the day after it was announced, and I ask now, whether this company has consulted with anyone in the Canadian government on the subject. I suspect the answer is no. Canada, and Canada alone, must determine whether surface or submarine maritime traffic can be safely tolerated in the Arctic Archipelago. All of us hope it can, but it is Canada's sovereign prerogative to decide whether the answer shall be yes or no, to declare one design satisfactory and another unsatisfactory.

I should like to ask the minister responsible for the National Research Council just what assessment and evaluation capacity we possess in Canada which would enable us to decide independently which surface or submarine vessel design is acceptable or unacceptable. I can assure the minister responsible for the NRC that some time within the next few months our committee will want to hear from the NRC just how Canada is prepared to evaluate the safety of these proposed gigantic surface and submarine oil tankers.

Returning briefly to the report, I should like to comment on two points which apart from the sovereignty recommendations I deem to be the most important. The committee believes that innocent passage for ships of all nations should not be interfered with. It states clearly:

> The committee believes that innocent passage for ships of all nations through the waters of the Canadian Archipelago is compatible with the protection of fundamental and essential Canadian interests in her Arctic waters. However, the committee takes the position that any passage which poses a danger to Canada whether this danger takes the form of a threat of pollution or otherwise, is not innocent.

We have here simply taken the realistic position that any ship from any nation can use this passage as long as it does not threaten Canada. If an unsafe ship is using the passage, it is threatening Canada and Canada has an absolute right to control it.

The second point I want to stress is this: the committee urged the government to take whatever steps might be necessary, compatible with international law, to deal with this problem in the Arctic. It is significant that the committee used the phrase "compatible with international law", and I draw the attention of the House to this.

I should also like to place on record my position with regard to the motion presently before us. I, of course, support the motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Watson: Why then, Mr. Speaker, did I not move concurrence as chairman? The opposition knows, as does everyone else here, that I was not so instructed by the committee and that the practice, until the ruling of Mr. Speaker on Tuesday, was that a committee chairman did not move concurrence without an explicit direction from the committee.

I do not think I am breaking any rule if I say that during the three committee meetings which were held in camera, the members of all parties represented in the House and present at the meeting held to consider this question stressed again and again the delicacy of the sovereignty issue and the importance of avoiding phraseology which might lend itself to deliberate misinterpretation on the part of various interests opposed to the assertion and exercise of Canadian sovereignty over the water of our Arctic Archipelago.

Its objective was to put on record, not only for the government of Canada but for foreign governments, a unanimous, all-party expression of concern with regard to the imminent oil-pollution danger facing Canada's Arctic environment. There was an equally unanimous conviction and recommendation that the government of Canada should act urgently to indicate to the world—and I am repeating what the recommendation said—that shipping, surface and submarine, passing through these waters is subject to the sovereign control and regulation of Canada.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker's ruling of Tuesday last was a dramatic procedural development and one which I on balance support, although in this particular case it presents some very special difficulties for the government. Normally, if the government had any reservation about any part of a report it would vote against it. In this instance the government really does not have that opportunity, because a vote against this report would conceivably open the way for a foreign power to use this as proof that there exists some doubt in the government's mind as to whether we actually have sovereignty in that area. It is inconceivable that the government could vote against this report. In this particular case the government is more restricted than it otherwise would be.

[Mr. Watson.]

I did not receive any instructions from the committee to move for concurrence and the question was not even raised in the committee by members of either the government or opposition parties. The progress which is implicit in the committees' system and which will be the result of the ruling on Tuesday augers well for the rights of backbenchers. We can only hope that the Committee on Procedure and Organization will heed the Speaker's recommendation that immediate consideration be given to developing—I do not think the Speaker used these precise words—guidelines for committee reports. From now on chairmen will move for concurrence in their reports as soon as they are presented; they will not wait around for opposition members to move concurrence. This is very obvious. However, we will be faced with new problems in respect of time allocation. I strongly urge the committee on Procedure and Organization to heed the Speaker's recommendation in this regard.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member would permit a question. I listened with great interest and approval to what he just said. Since this report has been moved and has been recommended to the government, particularly to the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), is it the government's intention that this matter come to a vote and be unanimously approved? No doubt the hon. member approves the terms of reference of the committee and the recommendations of the report.

Mr. Watson: In response to that question, Mr. Speaker, I am in support of the motion, and if it does come to a vote I will vote in favour of it. That is my answer to the question.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the northern affairs committee I considered we were asked to make recommendations affecting 40 per cent of Canada's land mass comprised of the Yukon and Northwest Territories. Because many members of the committee had never been there, we decided to fly to Resolute and at least look at part of this area. This land is so vast that many rivers and lakes are nameless. It is a land of muskeg, permafrost and in some areas perpetual ice.

Along the fringes of the Arctic icecap marine life abounds. There is plankton, tiny crustacea, fish, seals and polar bear. On land the caribou and muskox in their thousands

feed on the Arctic moss. Lemmings, the Arctic fox and hare are part of the scene. It is a land where winter holds sway for nine months of the year and where men fear the bone-snapping cold.

For centuries men have tried to force the Northwest Passage or otherwise explore the Arctic. It was necessary to await the technology of the 20th century to properly assess this vast area. With the advent of the aeroplane, helicopter, Bombardier and huge icebreakers, transportation in the north has become a reality. Even yet, however, it is fabulously expensive.

Geologists suggest that there is more of the sedimentary-type rock in the Arctic than there is in Alberta and Saskatchewan. This includes the tarsands discovery on Melville Island. Rich deposits of iron on Baffin Island await development. I saw with my own eyes samples of ore with free gold and silver showing in them. The key to this storehouse of natural resource is transportation.

The trip of the *Manhattan* is now history, but history will not stop here. There is more to come. I should like to read a short item from a newspaper quoting Yellowknife as the source. It states:

> Prime Minister Trudeau should declare Canadian sovereignty over the waters surrounding the Arctic islands, the Northwest Territories council agreed yesterday.
>
> The council also expressed concern over Arctic pollution, and requested Territorial Commission Stuart Hodgson to seek a means of having representation at any pollution talks between Canada and the United States.
>
> "Occupancy is nine-tenths of the law," said Duncan Pryde, sponsor of the resolution asking the council to support a federal standing committee on Indian affairs and northern development recommendation for Canadian sovereignty in the Arctic.

We have the approval of the commission in the Northwest Territories, or at least part of that group, in this regard. We have at least caught the eyes of some of the people responsible for government in that area. This is a voice to which we should listen. The article then states:

> Mr. Pryde, elected member for the Western Arctic, said Canadian Eskimos have occupied sea ice between the Islands for centuries.
>
> "These are Canadian Eskimos, not American Eskimos or international Eskimos," he said.

I suggest that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made a political mistake when he did not speak out firmly on this issue when it first came up. Had he done so, the argument we have heard several times in the last few months would not have been made. I think, too, that the Prime Minister made a political mistake in the sense that this is one issue in respect of which he might have the support of all Canadians. The fact that the members of the committee from all parts of Canada were unanimous in agreement on this subject indicates that there is unanimity among Canadians on this subject. The Prime Minister missed the boat on this matter.

It would appear that the United States is challenging us on this issue. Why does it not challenge the Russians about the Russian sector of the Arctic? Why does the United States not ask the Russians whether that sector of the Arctic waters is open to international transportation? I suggest the answer is that they know it is not, and dare not ask.

I do not want to belabour the point about the continental shelf because it has already been made today, but I have an item from which I would like to read briefly. This is to be found in *The Canadian Forum* in an article on Arctic sovereignty. It states in part:

> The first principle is the concept of the continental shelf. The second is the utilization of straight "baselines" to designate the limits of the domestic or internal waters of a state. The continental shelf doctrine achieved prominence in 1945 when President Truman proclaimed that the resources of the subsoil and seabed of the continental shelf adjacent to a country's shore belong to that nation.

• (9:20 p.m.)

> This principle was incorporated in an international convention at the United Nations Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958.

I shall leave it at that. The reason I mention this matter is that it is one the United States authorities have promoted. They have promoted this idea, and that is one reason for claiming this area for Canada. I suggest it is not enough for the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development or the Prime Minister to declare that these waters are ours. This should be demonstrated by a more visible Canadian presence in the area.

Duncan Pride of the Northwest Territories Commission suggested that occupancy is nine-tenths of the law. I suggest this is the way the United States authorities consider the issue. If we were to look at Oregon in an historical sense, one might argue that it should be part of British America. The Americans moved into this area and because of the right of occupancy it became part of the United States. A similar thing happened in respect of California and New Mexico.

If the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) believes the United States people are

always fair in dealing with their good neighbour to the north, he should read Bruce Hutchison's book "Struggle for the Border". In that book he would see what Mr. Hutchison has to say concerning the argument about the Alaska panhandle. I do not think the hon. member would then be so happy about this situation. I suggest the Canadian presence could take the form of Canadian icebreakers, merchant ships and naval ships using these waters. Accurate charts of water depths, currents and ice movements should be made. Navigational aids should be installed and kept operational. Bases should be enlarged and expanded. The larger ones should be converted to family-type communities with houses, schools, and so on. In this way we would in effect be saying: We are here now, to stay.

For the immediate present the armed forces might demonstrate a visible presence. Troops returning from NATO exercises could profitably learn how to navigate and manœuvre in Canada's conditions of ice, tundra, muskeg, mosquitoes, mountains, and so on. The navy could learn how to navigate in Arctic ice and winter conditions.

I feel it is regrettable that the government with the northern vision in 1958 decided to stop naval patrol of the Arctic. I think that had we had continuous naval patrols in the Arctic we might now be more operational in respect of safeguards for the ships we have there. We might also have completed our study of the area, for which there is need. I think it is regrettable that we do not have a constant naval program there now.

I did not hear the interjection of the hon. member for the Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange), but I would ask him what our navy is doing patrolling the Caribbean when it does not know how to manoeuvre in Canadian waters. I would suggest, in dealing with Arctic sovereignty, that perhaps our Air Force transport services should be updated. The army engineers might be used to build temporary wharf facilities, airports, and so on. I recall ships being unloaded at Resolute Point. They were 200 or 300 yards out in the harbour and barges were being used to transfer supplies to shore. I wonder whether the army might have provided a more reasonable type of wharf facility in this area. Perhaps it would be of a temporary type, but it would be more effective than the facilities there at the time of our visit.

These are our suggestions. Perhaps there is some argument about their effectiveness. At any rate, they are my opinions. I believe the facilities would be useful and that the army would pick up some useful experience in northern conditions. Armed forces reserve units might spend some time in the Arctic on a rotating basis, perhaps taking the Arctic survival course as part of their training. These bases, communities, mines, oil companies, and so on, are in a particularly exposed position in respect of supplies in the event of international turmoil. Therefore, I believe these waters should be treated as inland waters and that freight should be restricted to Canadian shipping only.

Freighters for this service should be equipped for navigating and plowing through ice. They should also have rapid unloading facilities and equipment for cold weather. Much of the cold weather equipment is inadequate. Clothing, weapons, lubricating oil, engines, metals, ships, and so on, could be improved. Therefore, the Department of National Defence in co-operation with the Department of Northern Affairs, the National Research Council and industries concerned should be encouraged to continue research into improved services in these areas.

I should like to stress one point which I believe was made by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) this evening. I refer to the fact that we do not need to hesitate standing up for ourselves regarding shipping in these waters, because ships of other countries cannot use them without our support services. The land around these waters is ours. If there should be any pollution there, our land would be polluted. For this reason, also, we should take firm action. If there are military ships in this area, whether of a friendly or less friendly nation, Canada either directly or indirectly should exert all its authority to make certain nothing untoward happens and then, whether we like it or not, we will be involved.

I realize there are other members who wish to speak. I do not wish to labour my points, and therefore I shall yield the floor.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I hear from the other side of the House some voices in the wilderness saying "question". Two or three minutes ago the official critic of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition suggested that the hon. member for the Northwest Territories might have a word to say about this whole matter of Arctic sovereignty.

Now confusion is reigning supreme on the other side. In the beginning, as a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development—

Mr. Woolliams: As it is now and ever shall be.

Mr. Dinsdale: World without end, amen.

Mr. Orange: The prayer boys are at work. As a member of the committee and having visited Resolute Bay as well as having participated in the *Manhattan* expedition recently, and having had some considerate interest in the north in the past 15 years, I believe the committee report makes a great deal of sense. As a member of the government and the Liberal Party I support the committee report.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Orange: During the course of the debate this afternoon and evening I could not help being impressed, as a northerner living in the south at the moment, by the sincerity with which Canadians and Members of Parliament who represent many other people in this country expressed concern about northern Canada. Probably there is no issue today in the minds of the Canadian people that reflects more greatly the true feelings of nationhood in this country than the question of Arctic sovereignty.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I believe we have finally recognized that this is a nation which does not stretch from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but from the Atlantic to the Arctic and on to the Pacific. Less than 20 years ago the islands of the Arctic Archipelago were a mysterious and forbidding land which concerned Canadians not at all and interested them even less.

Following the start of the Dew Line, the Distant Early Warning System, somewhere around 1953, and with the changes which governments have brought about since then, including the establishment of the Department of Northern Affairs, this massive land mass in the north and the people who live there are now truly a part of the Canadian conscience.

This year we in the north are celebrating our 100th year in the Canadian Confederation. In 1870 the government of Canada bought back Ruperts Land from Britain, an area which included the present provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and all of the Northwest Territories. For 80 years the northern part of that land continued to lie dormant. But in the last 20 years the people of Canada, through their government, have participated in the life of the north to make it truly part of our nation. In the north there is a feeling that the Canadian Confederation is the most important thing to us as Canadians. It is finally apparent to northerners that the people who live in southern Canada are concerned about the north.

This is demonstrated by the manner in which Members of Parliament talk about the north and ask that more emphasis be placed on northern development. This area north of the 60th parallel comprises more than 40 per cent of our land mass, but has a very small population. Hopefully, it holds those resources that will make this country truly Canadian in the years to come.

Today we are spending some time debating the question of Arctic sovereignty. What do we do about it? What do we do about the passage through Lancaster Sound, Barrow Strait, and the Prince of Wales Strait to make sure that we as Canadians have a right to say which ships can pass, and can control them so they will not destroy the tender but vital life of the Arctic?

As members of Parliament we face a dilemma. We could unilaterally say—emotionally I believe we should, although intellectually I am not too sure—that these are Canadian waters. We could display our jingoism and all the other things which make headlines. But how do we do it effectively? Do we suddenly stand up and say that all these waters belong to Canada?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Orange: The people across there say yes, but how are we to stop other nations bringing their ships through? This is the dilemma.

Mr. Crouse: You tell them that these waters belong to Canada.

Mr. Orange: We tell them?

Mr. Crouse: Yes.

Mr. Orange: More jingoism from the other side. Can we go to the World Court and say these waters belong to us? We can. Maybe we will win, and maybe we won't. How can we enforce this? What gunboats do we have? The *Bonaventure* is now for sale. Can we break off diplomatic relations with the major nations which insist on pushing their vessels through there? We can stand up, shout and scream, but can we stop them? This is the

dilemma we face. Somehow we as Canadians must take the necessary steps.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Orange: At the end of my speech.

Mr. Lewis: It is related to what the hon. member has just said.

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker, I think our coast-guard, our Department of Transport and our science research facilities should start to look at ice dynamics, the processes of ice, and what happens to ships in ice waters. We know very little about this subject. We know very little about the effect of ice dynamics on a ship of 250,000 tons, or even on a ship of 10,000 tons. We do not know what happens to such ships caught in the Arctic ice during the long Arctic night, and during Arctic storms.

An hon. Member: What has this to do with sovereignty?

Mr. Orange: I believe in the sovereignty of this country. We have established our sovereignty on the islands. We have established sovereignty on the polar shelf. We also control the only Northwest Passage there is, between Banks Island and Victoria Island through the Prince of Wales Strait because of the two islands known as the Princess Royal Islands, which lie in this area and which are Canadian territory. To try and sail any other way is impossible. If a ship goes beyond Banks Island it hits the polar ice pack, and there is no way the *Manhattan* or even a bigger ship can get through the polar ice pack.

As Canadians we control the Northwest Passage. It is ours. We can say which ships can pass through it. We can set the standards. We can ask the Department of Transport, the Science Council and other groups to make recommendations whereby we can control possible pollution and preserve the ecology of the region, compatible with the principles we have set down.

Mr. MacInnis: You are going against your own principles now.

Mr. Orange: One of the problems we face is with respect to our neighbour to the south. Like most Canadians, I have relatives and friends down there. I have started to wonder about some of the reactions coming from our powerful neighbour and I cannot help but be concerned about their lack of recognition that there is a sovereign Canadian nation which has interest in the Arctic islands, and which has an interest in protecting those things which are part of this sovereign nation.

In recent months I have read editorials in American newspapers concerning the transportation of oil through these Arctic waters, waters which may be in dispute internationally so far as our sovereignty is concerned.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: But does anybody dispute it? That is what I would like to ask.

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker, I should like to read into the record, in support of my concern about the United States approach to this whole matter, a document written by Mr. Howard W. Pollock, Congressman for the State of Alaska, to the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Edward A. Garmatz, Member of the House of Representatives. This document is a matter of public record and it is a report of Mr. Pollock's trip on the *Manhattan*. I think it is an indication of the lack of recognition on the part of our neighbours to the south of the use, control and ownership of these waters. I think it is a matter that should concern all Canadians. I shall not read the entire letter, which is rather long. The first paragraph deals with the trip into Alaskan waters and the second paragraph reads as follows:

> Unquestionably the s.s. *Manhattan* is the largest, most powerful icebreaker in the world, and it performed spectacularly under most rigorous ice conditions. It sliced through enormous ice pressure ridges up to an estimated forty to sixty feet in height with no roll, no sway, and no shudder. The powerful ship outperformed the escorting Canadian and United States Coast Guard icebreakers. The performance exceeded all expectations. First and second year ice proved to be no problem whatever to negotiate; however, the dense, hardpacked, older multiyear polar ice floes periodically created massive side pressures that would impede forward motion and temporarily imprison the worthy vessel in the ever-changing ice pack.

Going to another paragraph, it continues:

> In my considered opinion, Humble Oil will ultimately make the management decision to build a fleet of supertanker icebreakers in the 250,000 deadweight ton class, with a very substantial relative increase in horsepower—perhaps a magnitude of 85,000 to 100,000 horsepower. Today no shipyard in the U.S. is capable of doing this.

Then further on it reads:

> Ultimately, 30 or so 250,000 ton supertanker icebreakers could be built by industry for the com-

mercial trade of the Arctic, with 35 day round trips programmed (including a 3-day buffer for delays due to ice conditions), with 48 hours programmed at each end for total turnaround time loading and unloading.

He then goes on to point out the limitation of the U.S. icebreaker *Northwind*. He acknowledges that a little old Canadian ship under Captain Fournier, the *Sir John A. Macdonald* did perform a very useful service for the *Manhattan*, and I believe this is the heart of the letter. He continues:

In light of our strategic, scientific and economic goals in the polar regions, it is obvious that we have insufficient icebreakers available to carry out our national requirements. The U.S. icebreakers in these polar regions have long outlived their usefulness. Icebreaking, with its repeated shocks, stresses and strains, causes metal fatigue and heavy engine wear, the combination of which aggravates deterioration and hastens breakdown.

With the immediate potential of increased commercial activity, it is necessary that serious consideration be given now to providing modern, powerful icebreakers to meet our polar objectives. With ship transportation feasible for exploitation of mineral resources, a national commitment must be made which will establish a very high priority for building and commissioning the finest icebreakers in the world.

Mr. Speaker, when I first read this letter I was a little shocked. When I looked at it the second time I was a little frightened that a Congressman of the United States—

An hon. Member: Look at it again.

Mr. Orange: —would produce this kind of letter without recognition that these waterways do not belong to United States of America. I have other quotes including some from the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce in an address delivered in Halifax last summer, when he virtually warned Canadians not to be concerned about the Northwest Passage. The whole import of the speech was, "You know, we can get along. We can be friends. We can work something out." I do not believe that this is good enough; it is not what Canadians want.

When the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) announces the approach that this government will take, I hope it will be the type of approach that will make Canadians recognize that these waters, be they not Canadian at the moment—

Mr. Dinsdale: They are.

Mr. Woolliams: They are Canadian.

Mr. Burton: Resign, if that is all you can say.

Mr. Woolliams: How can you say that and be the member for Northwest Territories?

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker, the voice in the wilderness once again asks how can I say that and be the member for Northwest Territories.

Mr. Dinsdale: Physician, heal thyself.

Mr. Orange: I would ask him to look at the map. Look where these waters run. We are talking about total control over all these waters. There is no way in international law, no international precedent by which we can say all these waters are ours. I am talking about the mouth of Lancaster Sound to the McClure Strait.

An hon. Member: A sell-out.

Mr. Orange: Oh, a sell-out! Just look at the map.

Mr. Woolliams: You should see the face of the minister now.

Mr. Orange: In the past few days the Council of the Northwest Territories, which is presently meeting in Yellowknife, has taken a very substantial look at the question of Arctic sovereignty. They have expressed concern on this matter and put together a resolution which was unanimously carried. The resolution reads:

Now therefore, moved that this Council add their support to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development in their recommendation to the Prime Minister of Canada that the waters around and between the Arctic Islands be confirmed to be under Canadian sovereignty.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I should like to quote a statement that Mr. Michael Simonie made. He is an elected representative on the Northwest Territories Council and represents the eastern Arctic. I wish to read his words because they have a bearing on what we are talking about, and particularly on the Eskimo people. On that occasion a motion pertaining to Arctic sovereignty was before the Council. Mr. Simonie said:

Mr. Commissioner, I support this motion. I am the seconder of this motion. In the night-time you see in the Arctic the northern lights up in the sky. Also, you see phosphorous in the Arctic water in the night-time. I feel the Arctic water should stay right where it is in order to have the animals live in the water. I am the seconder of the motion because I like to hear what has been said on the motion so in particular we live in Canada as northerners and we should have the full right to all of northern Canada and therefore I support this motion, on behalf of my people living off the animals. We don't grow anything up

there as people do down south in Canada. We only live on the animals year around. I support this motion.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Harding: Sit down and let us vote unanimously in favour of the motion.

Mr. Orange: I believe that as we look at the question of Arctic sovereignty we must also consider, after the Northwest Passage has been thoroughly opened, matters pertaining to extraction of the resources of the area, be they oil from Prudhoe Bay or the Panarctic, iron ore from the Milne Inlet or copper deposits of Strathcona ND. Whatever we do, we must make sure that the Eskimo people who wish to do so can continue living off the animals of the area, and that ships plying the passage will obey rules and regulations designed to protect the ecology of the area. We do not want that ecology disturbed unnecessarily. If we do these things, I think we will be doing what is best for the north. It is not beyond the ability of science, aided by modern technology, to clean up any spillage that may occur, in a way that will not harm the ecology of the area. I believe that the people of the area must be able to retain, if they want to, their way of life.

Before I resume my seat I think it would be well for us to acknowledge our debt to the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre). If it had not been for the work of that backbench Member of Parliament this issue may not have assumed the proportions it has. I am delighted that he has been instrumental in bringing it before us, as are hon. members on all sides of the House. Because of the hon. member's work we have been made aware of the meaning of Arctic sovereignty. Having an understanding of the matter—

An hon. Member: Let us vote.

Mr. Orange: —the hon. member took it upon himself to convince his colleagues in the House that we have a responsibility in determining the question of Arctic sovereignty. If it had not been for the chairman of the committee and the advice of some members of the opposition, in particular that of the former minister of northern affairs (Mr. Dinsdale) and the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson), the committee would not have gone north to meet the *Manhattan.*

Mr. Woolliams: Only a few minutes more.

Mr. Orange: Many editorial writers in this country sneered at us last August and September; they looked down their noses at the parliamentary committee which was flying into the Arctic. Hon. members need only look at what has been printed.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Orange: However, the committee believed in what it was doing and I believe we established our point.

Mr. Nesbitt: The hon. member is talking the motion out.

Mr. Orange: We went north with a specific purpose. We as a parliamentary group were concerned about our Arctic sovereignty, and for that reason among others we went north to meet the *Manhattan.*

Mr. Harding: Why does the hon. member not permit the House to vote?

Mr. Orange: We as a committee accomplished something which has been seldom accomplished in the House of Commons.

An hon. Member: One more minute.

Mr. Orange: Opposition members seem to be pretty anxious.

Mr. Harding: Let us vote for Canada. Sit down and let us vote.

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to speak and, hopefully, I intend to finish my remarks. I think that when we went to Resolute Bay to visit the *Manhattan,* what we did was pretty important for Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean) rising on a point of order?

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that since the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) has almost completed his speech, we might continue the debate a little longer. We should be most agreeable to not seeing the clock for a few minutes, if thereby we might reach a decision.

An hon. Member: Let us have the vote.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 40, a motion to adjourn the House is deemed to have been put.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, you have not asked the House to make its decision.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Monteith) is suggesting that I inquire

whether there is unanimous consent on the part of hon. members for the debate to continue. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Borrie: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the matter comes to a vote I should like to have the opportunity of making some remarks. I was a member of the committee which brought down the report.

Mr. Speaker: There must be unanimous consent for continuing and there does not appear to be such unanimity.

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that an objection came from the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp)?

Mr. Woolliams: It did.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is after ten o'clock—

Mr. Dinsdale: What price Canadian sovereignty!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is after ten o'clock and it is the duty of the Chair to inform hon. members that under the provisions of Standing Order 40, a motion for the adjournment of this House is deemed to have been put. According to the standing order, the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) now has the floor.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ALLEGED MISLEADING ADVERTISING BY IMPERIAL TOBACCO COMPANY

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I hoped that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) would be in his place this evening because I wish to bring before this House a matter of concern to all Canadians and of particular interest to the minister and his department. I hope his absence does not indicate a lack of concern, because I am sure the minister is well aware of the issue being debated this evening; I am certain that he was given notice of it.

The problem I wish to raise is posed by certain forms of advertising and sales promotion which tend to mislead consumers. The majority of these advertisements and promotional stunts may be so carefully phrased as to be within the limits of legality. However, regardless of how they are worded and presented to the public, the end result is to mislead the consumer in varying degrees.

I first raised this matter in the form of a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs on January 15. The question was in reference to recent events which occurred in Alberta. These events evolved from the promotion of a new brand of cigarette, Casino, by the manufacturers, the Imperial Tobacco Company of Canada Limited. By means of advertising, consumers were invited to buy Casino cigarettes and thereby have a chance of winning cash prizes by playing a game called Casino, details of which were enclosed in each package.

It is not my intention this evening to go into detail about the rules and method of play. It will suffice to say that a number of consumers who bought the product and played the game according to company rules are still waiting for the promised prize payment. In some cases these claims for payment amount to as much at $20,000 or $30,000. It is not my intention to make a charge that the advertising was either false or misleading in its origin and early application. However, I do say that it becomes both false and misleading the moment the manufacturer fails to honour claims for prizes won in accordance with the rules as advertised.

Furthermore, I submit that it becomes very questionable when an organization spends huge sums of money on advertising and promoting not only the cigarette but the game, through television, radio and newspaper and then finds itself in a position of having to withdraw from the game and does so simply by placing a small and insignificant advertisement on the back pages of the daily newspapers.

This may not constitute misleading advertising, but I strongly suggest that it constitutes a deprivation of information to the public and consumer, particularly to those who bought these cigarettes in good faith on the strength of the company's advertising and adhered to the rules and regulations that were stated on the package. The rules which

were quoted stated that prize claims must be postmarked no later than July 31, 1970, in one series and in another series indicated that the deadline for claiming a prize was December 31, 1971.

I submit that actions of this sort do very little to dispel the anxieties and apprehensions of *caveat emptor*. This is clearly a matter within the jurisdiction of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

My understanding is that some time after the new brand was launched in the Alberta market, the company discovered a flaw in the game of Casino that made it possible for buyers to win more easily and to win greater amounts of money than had been anticipated. I believe that on December 4 the product was withdrawn from the market and all promotion ceased. On December 13, Alberta newspapers carried advertisements announcing this and stating that the company would honour no applications for prize money if they were dated after December 12.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the fact that the company announced withdrawal of the product from the market, it was still available in retail outlets in Smoky Lake, Alberta, as late as January 9, 1970.

It is my understanding that one or more of these claims will shortly be contested in the courts. In any event, many consumers in Alberta believe they have just claims for prize money which have not been satisfied. I cite this as an example of the type of thing that is happening in many fields involving consumer affairs. It is my firm conviction that this aspect of consumer affairs should be of prime interest to the minister and to his department whose chief job, we have been told, it is the protection of the interests of the Canadian consumer.

Far be it from me to say that the company in this case is necessarily at fault. I do say, however, that the circumstances are such as to fully warrant a thorough and complete investigation by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. If this department is not prepared to initiate an investigation, it might well be a matter for the Department of Justice to deal with. I understand from the questions and answers in the House yesterday that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the officials of his department are familiar with this matter.

Advertising is the chief method of promoting sales to consumers and moving consumer goods. It is obvious, to me at least, that it should therefore be one of the main areas of interest to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I believe the question I raise tonight clearly falls within the department's jurisdiction, and I urge the minister to meet the challenge by examining this and similar matters at once.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the officials of the Combines Investigation Act Administration are aware of the question raised by the hon. member and his remarks will be referred to them.

[*English*]

SPORTS—FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR OLYMPIC GAMES BIDS

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): May I at the outset, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro), and indeed his entire staff, on their positive and constructive approach to Canadian sports development and physical fitness.

Assigned these responsibilities a relatively short time ago, the minister and his staff have established an excellent record. My question relates to the amount of aid which has, in fact, been pledged by the federal government to the sponsors of Canada's Winter Olympic Games application and the amount of aid, if any, pledged by the government to the sponsors of the Montreal Summer Olympic Games application. I suggest that some urgency exists and we must have the facts. The picture is confused, and contradictory statements have been made which do nothing to assist either application.

As hon. members know, both in the Vancouver-Garibaldi winter games bid and the bid by Montreal for the summer games relate to events scheduled for 1976. However, right now, this very day, representatives of the International Olympics Commission are, I am advised, examining the bids within their national organizations in preparation for the critical vote which will take place in Amsterdam on May 13.

It is no secret that only extraordinary circumstances permit a country to bid successfully for both the winter and the summer Olympic Games. Canada has established an outstanding reputation for winter sports facilities. The mountains of western Canada

were built-to-order for the winter Olympics competition. The Vancouver-Garibaldi Olympics Commission has worked tirelessly since its establishment in 1960 to bring the winter games to the west.

• (10:10 p.m.)

There have been keen disappointments along the way. Their 1961 bid was rejected because of lack of road facilities. In 1966 the provincial government opened a paved access road. The obstacles have been cleared away and Garibaldi is ready.

A remarkable amount of co-operation has been realized. Together with the enthusiastic support of the sports community there has been widespread citizen support as well as pledges of financial support from both federal and provincial governments. Until recently all indicators pointed to a successful Vancouver-Garibaldi bid. All Canada was convinced that this nation had a good chance to win the winter Olympic Games and that the games would be held at Whistler Mountain in the Garibaldi area.

However, Mayor Drapeau of Montreal elected to enlist the support of public opinion for the summer Olympic Games in Montreal in 1976 by making statements to the public through the media—statements, Mr. Speaker, which I suggest may not represent the facts and indeed could be very damaging to Canada's bid for the winter games.

I respect the enthusiasm and energy of Mayor Drapeau, but the eyes of the sports world are on Canada and it is vitally important to Canada's prestige as a winter wonderland that the Vancouver-Garibaldi Olympic Committee receive the support of all Canada—the kind of overwhelming support that all Canada gave to Expo '67 in Montreal.

In the Montreal *Gazette* dated January 15, 1970, on the front page a full-column story appears, part of which reads as follows:

> Mr. Drapeau appeared both confident Montreal will win the games and convinced the city is fully capable of hosting them.

The impression left with readers clearly was that he had the blessing and support of the federal government. I am advised that the same gentleman also spoke to members of the Olympic Games officials in terms which left little doubt he had been assured of federal government support. In competitions of this kind support usually means financial grants. It is therefore vital to Canada's success in its bid for the winter games that the record be put straight, without delay.

Because of the excellent facilities already available at the Whistler Mountain area, the Vancouver-Garibaldi competition will have a net cost of $25 million and I am advised that the federal government has graciously agreed to pay a portion of this cost. I am advised that the Olympic Summer Games in Montreal could cost a minimum of $200 million, and possibly up to $300 million. There may be a time in the future when an expenditure of this magnitude could be justified. If such is the case, I am confident that I can assure Mayor Drapeau he will receive the wholehearted support of Canadians. But, Mr. Speaker, there can surely be no justification for making a commitment at this time.

The Vancouver-Garibaldi Olympic Committee's bid for the Winter Olympic Games in 1976 is a "first" for Canada. It will provide a meeting place for young people from all over the world generally and from all over Canada in particular. People from the Canadian east will visit the west in droves, as those from the west visited the east in Montreal during Expo '67.

In closing, may I express to the federal government the sincere gratitude of Canadian winter sportsmen from coast to coast for its support in assuring a successful bid being made by the Vancouver-Garibaldi Olympic Committee.

Mr. Paul Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Fraser Valley East (Mr. Pringle) on January 15 concerning federal financial commitments for Montreal and Garibaldi in support of their bids for the 1976 Olympic Games, I would like to say that Montreal did not request direct financial assistance and therefore no commitment has been given to them. It is understood, however, that Montreal will be seeking indirect financial support under either existing legislation or legislation that might exist in the future concerning urban renewal and public housing. It is understood that any cost-sharing program applied for would have to be justified in its own right without consideration of its association with the Olympic Games.

In the case of the Vancouver-Garibaldi bid, the federal government was asked to participate financially and the federal government has agreed to a grant of $75,000 to help defray their promotional expenses in further-

ing the bid. That represents one-third of the total promotional money. The other two-thirds have been supplied by the province of British Columbia and the city of Vancouver.

The federal government has further agreed to provide a fixed grant of $10 million toward the deficit of a non-profit corporation to be established for the staging and operation of the games. This grant is conditional upon the corporation obtaining from the government of British Columbia and the city of Vancouver an undertaking in terms acceptable to the federal government that either or both the government of British Columbia and the city of Vancouver will pay the balance of the deficit of the corporation, and that the federal government be satisfied that adequate provision has been made for the recognition of its role in the promotion and staging of the games and in the ceremonials and elements of publicity employed in connection with them.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the city of Montreal did not initially apply for and has not received from the federal government a grant for the purposes of staging the Olympic Games; nor has the city of Montreal to date applied for funds from any other government cost-sharing program in relationship to the Olympic Games. The city of Vancouver applied for assistance, and if the aforementioned conditions are met, will receive an outright grant of $10 million for the purposes of staging the 1976 Olympic Games.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON ROLE

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, on December 17 I directed a question to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) in which I asked whether he would make a statement concerning the future role and status of the National Film Board. The National Film Board is an agency of which all Canadians can be proud. It has an international reputation and has an essential role to play in continuing educational programs. Concern has developed all across Canada—and I can cite many examples in my province of Saskatchewan—concerning the future of the National Film Board. This concern has resulted from the lay-off of employees, particularly in the production staff, and the announcement concerning user charges which range from $3 for a 24-hour period to $12 for a 24-hour period.

Prior to the Christmas recess, Mr. Saumier was appointed to investigate the situation in respect of the National Film Board. This report was tabled today and the minister made a statement. He indicated there had been lay-offs in the English production staff and that the figure should be 32 rather than 37 as previously planned. As my children would say, "Big deal". To compare the performance and plan today with the 1964 situation is not adequate. The minister also lauded other film work growth, namely in the CBC and in the Canadian Film Development Corporation. We want to know about the Fiim Board. Why does the minister not clear up doubts in this area and utilize this established agency to the full, because it is an agency which has done so well?

The report which was tabled today shows there is reason for concern. It observed in part that there does not exist at present a comprehensive federal government policy with regard to information or cultural affairs. It states that federal government agencies with responsibilities in these fields—the National Film Board among them—accordingly feel somewhat at a loss when faced with problems that cannot be solved logically or effectively without making fundamental choices which would normally proceed from a known order of objectives and priorities. Later on in this report we read the following:

• (10:20 p.m.)

It should be emphasized here that the senior management of the board, located moreover far from the capital, had scant knowledge of the mysterious workings of government in Ottawa.

Further on it states:

This largely unseasoned team immediately found itself confronted by the expected but none the less acute crisis of identity and growth which faced the board at that time.

That was in mid-1967. The report goes on to emphasize this fact:

It was all the more critical because of the fact that the board was left without a chairman from March 1966 until early July 1967—

Still later on the report points out:

It was in these circumstances that the board's management was suddenly confronted by budget directives that were as depressing as they were unexpected, and was forced into decisions that were dramatic in terms both of their scope and of the speed with which they had to be reached.

The report then makes some further observations and notes:

The production side (English and French) has been hit very hard... This may seriously affect the future of the board.

Then it says:

At the same time, any objective analysis of the dismissals for this group is rendered impossible by

the absence of a long-term policy respecting the board, the vagueness of the profitability requirements which some would like to apply to this sector, the inadequacies of procedures for assessing creative personnel, and the absence of an adequate financial information system.

In conclusion, Mr. Saumier said:

It therefore appears that the National Film Board management, confronted by a situation which they could not resolve objectively or subjectively, were led to make a series of decisions which, although inevitably arbitrary, are none the less convergent. It appears, once again, that an underlying policy is implied in any major body of decisions—

He goes on to discuss this subject and then says the solution must be found—

—in the co-ordinated and conscious definition of objectives and priorities from which the board, as a whole, will be able subsequently to derive a consistent and intentional, rather than accidental, set of decisional rules.

The Commissioner of the Film Board in his comments goes on to state that the very future of the board is at stake. Subsequently, user charges were announced. There was no word from the minister today regarding this particular feature. It is of much concern in my province of Saskatchewan where this program has been used extensively. These user charges will mean a reduction in the use of the films which the board produces.

I have received representations from the Catholic Family Services in the city of Regina in which they say that the films have been very important to their organization, and that the films on family life education had been particularly useful as resource material. I have also received a letter from the supervisor of a local church boys group which says they make extensive use of National Film Board films, but that if these user charges are instituted they will no longer be able to use the films.

The council of the city of Regina has protested. The Wheatland regional library, which serves central Saskatchewan, has protested. This library used 723 films in its branches in the first 11 months of 1969, in spite of the difficulty it had in obtaining Film Board catalogues. Other agencies have also protested. I recommend to the government that it reconsider the imposition of these user charges.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I regret to tell the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton) that due to unforeseen circumstances the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) is unable to be here this evening. I will take it upon myself to make sure he receives the hon. member's representations and give them all the consideration they deserve.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.26 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, January 23, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CRIMINAL CODE

AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT PHOSPHATE COMPOUNDS IN DETERGENTS

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-180, to amend the Criminal Code (phosphate compound in detergents).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to prevent further pollution of Canadian lakes, rivers and other waterways by banning the manufacture, distribution and sale of detergents containing phosphate compounds, this legislation to take effect from January 1, 1972.

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

DIVORCE ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING ORDERS FOR CUSTODY AND COROLLARY RELIEF

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-181, to amend the Divorce Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, the bill sets forth two amendments to the Divorce Act. The first amendment is so technical that I shall not trespass upon the time of the House. It cannot be explained briefly but the explanatory note with the bill puts the argument totally and fairly.

The second amendment would allow courts in provinces to which a successful party has moved to examine orders. If a person has obtained in Newfoundland an order for corollary relief and has moved to British Columbia, instead of putting those concerned to the expense of going back to the court in Newfoundland the order could be reviewed in the courts of British Columbia.

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INCREASE IN TRUCKING RATES BY QUEBEC TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Finance relating to the policy of restraint and arising from the decision by the Quebec Transportation Board authorizing substantial increases in Quebec-Ontario trucking rates. Is it government policy that the increases in rates made under this order of the Quebec Transportation Board might well violate the government's restraint program or is it the policy that such increases would not violate any such program because they are authorized by a duly constituted authority?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in these cases, and there was another case yesterday, I believe, with respect to telephone rates, the regulatory body itself generally only authorizes increases in rates that are based on increases in costs. With respect to the instance to which my hon. friend refers, I have asked for additional information about the increases, what they are based on and so on, and officials are trying to obtain this information for me.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister of Transport or any representative of the government of Canada make any representations to the Quebec Transportation Board seeking a postponement of any authorized increases in view of the efforts the government of Canada is making with regard to restraint?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, the increases did not come to my attention until they were announced. As I said to my hon. friend, I have asked that further information be requested from the Quebec Transportation

Board in order that we may know whether the increases are based purely on increases of costs involved.

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. During the talks that the Minister of Transport and the president of the CTC had with the various provincial transport authorities, did the Quebec Transportation Board indicate that this increase was going to be requested? If so, what did the chairman of the CTC say, and what was the minister's position with respect to that request?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, no reference was made at all to any prospective or likely increase during those meetings.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Finance actively considering a program of attempting to persuade the trucking companies which have been authorized to charge these increased rates to defer any such increases at least until after the meeting next month proposed by the Prices and Incomes Commission?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, that decision has not been made, pending the receipt of information as to the basis on which such increases were authorized.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TRANSFER OF NERVE GAS FROM OKINAWA TO UNITED STATES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister about the decision of the United States government to have five ships transfer nerve gas from Okinawa to Bangore, there to be transferred to 700 boxcars for transport to Hermiston army base. Since these five ships will pass through Juan de Fuca Strait and be unloaded only 60 miles south of Vancouver Island, may I ask whether the United States government has advised the Canadian government of this transfer and whether any representation has been made by the Canadian government with respect to this matter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any request has been made, but I shall make inquiries.

[Mr. Benson.]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as Governor McCall of Oregon and Senator Hatfield have both appealed to the President of the United States to have this nerve gas, which has already injured some 24 people who were handling it in Okinawa, detoxicized before it is shipped, will the government of Canada consider making similar representations to the government of the United States?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if any aspect of this matter falls within our jurisdiction, I will consider the suggestion.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

POSSIBLE CLOSING OF CERTAIN RADAR STATIONS

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

Would he tell the House whether his department is considering making important changes to Canada's radar system or closing certain radar stations?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

POTASH—CONVENING OF MEETING OF WORLD PRODUCERS

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Is the federal government actively assisting the Saskatchewan government in the convening of a meeting of potash producers of the world this summer in order to bring some order to this depressed industry?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have been asked, in this particular instance, to co-operate in the negotiations that Premier Thatcher is now conducting.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—SUGGESTED MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER AND LABOUR LEADERS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I wish to direct my question to the Prime Minister. In view of the most recent

reiteration of their position by Canada's top labour leaders that they have no intention of complying with the request and urgent suggestion of the department and the Prices and Incomes Commission to hold wage increases within agreed guide-lines, is the Prime Minister now giving serious consideration to meeting personally with these top labour leaders to try to convince them of the great necessity of agreeing to this action so that inflation control in Canada can have a chance of being realized?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): That is a very constructive suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I will take it into consideration if it becomes apparent that a meeting would be useful. However, at this stage I believe it wise to let the Prices and Incomes Commission continue its negotiations in that area as it has with the business area of the community.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR INQUIRY INTO CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Will the Minister of Transport say whether he intends accepting and acting, and if so, when, on the unanimous recommendation of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications of December 11 for the establishment of a one-man inquiry to consider the claims of the Great Slave Lake contractors?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I am prepared to accept the recommendation in principle that some inquiry should be held. Some doubts and problems have been raised about the nomination of a single person to do this job. I am looking for alternative ways of carrying out the same objective and recommendation of the committee.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFF OF RAILWAY PERSONNEL RESULTING FROM MASTER AGENCY PLAN

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In light of the widespread concern of hundreds of agents and other railway workers in western Canada because of the proposed lay-off of many personnel as a result of the master agency plan, can the minister say if this matter has been brought to his attention and will he review this serious situation with his colleague the Minister of Labour with a view to preventing these widespread lay-offs?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I will be glad to do what I can, Mr. Speaker.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS FROM ALBERTA INDIAN CHIEFS RESPECTING POLICY

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): My question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Has the minister received any representations in the last day or so from the assembly of all the Indian chiefs of Alberta?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have received no letter or communication recently from the Indian Association of Alberta.

[*English*]

Mr. Nesbitt: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the position just taken by the assembly of all Indian chiefs of Alberta, will the minister immediately suspend any further implementation of the government's new Indian policy until genuine meetings and consultations take place with the leaders of the Indian people of Canada? Also, will the minister take immediate steps to arrange such consultations?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, since June I have had the opportunity of meeting almost all the Indian leaders in Canada to discuss our Indian policy, and I am always ready to meet them.

I had occasion to visit Alberta three or four times since June and I have always made myself available for discussions with the Indians. Unfortunately, the leader of the Indians of Alberta has not deemed fit to meet me.

[*English*]

RESEARCH

PARTICIPATION WITH UNITED STATES IN SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): My question is to the President of the Treasury Board. Given the current concern of scientists in Canada about the direction of Canadian science policy, can the minister indicate to the House whether the United States government has requested the Canadian

government to participate in a $10 billion space research program? If so, what has been the response of the Canadian government?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I also read that newspaper article. I think the indication there is rather that it is speculated that the United States will invite Canada. It has not as yet and no such invitation has been received.

Mr. Broadbent: Will the minister assure the House that if such an invitation is extended the government will bring the issue before the House prior to reaching a decision?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the hon. member's supplementary is purely hypothetical.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question. Is it the policy of the government to consider actively the advisability of Canada seeking a role to play in a joint space program with the United States?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, an interdepartmental committee has recently been formed to study this particular question.

NATURAL GAS

POLICY RESPECTING REGULATION OF WELL-HEAD PRICE

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): My question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Speaker, and it arises out of the prolonged hearings, now in their third month, being held by the National Energy Board concerning the future policy of the board governing the export of natural gas. With a view to shortening these hearings and resolving the present uncertainty in this important national industry, would the minister make a statement concerning the government's policy with respect to the regulation of the well-head price of natural gas?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The board, in holding these hearings, is acting in its quasi-judicial capacity and I do not think it would be proper for me to interfere with it in any way. Certainly the evidence coming out before the Board is extremely useful, and I am sure it will be taken into consideration by the government in the formulation of policy.

[Mr. Broadbent.]

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

ADMISSION OF WOMEN TO MEMBERSHIP—SUGGESTED CHANGE IN PLACE OF MEETING

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council in his capacity as Leader of the House. In view of the fact that the National Press Club is to hold a meeting tomorrow for the purpose of discussing the constitutional question of the right of women to be known as persons, will the Leader of the House see whether arrangements can be made for the meeting to be held in this chamber? Will he also see whether arrangements can be made for Members of Parliament to take their places in the Press Gallery so this important meeting can be given full coverage by press, radio and television?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. It sounds as though there has been an attack of nerve gas on the National Press Club. I will consider that suggestion and also the probability that there would be a much higher standard of reporting under those circumstances.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

TRANSPORT

ARGENTIA-NORTH SYDNEY FERRY—INCLUSION OF ST. PIERRE AS PORT OF CALL

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): I have a question for the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to inform the House whether a decision has been made on the application by Canadian National Railways to include the French island port of St. Pierre as a port of call for the Argentia-North Sydney ferry?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No such application has been made, Mr. Speaker.

HARBOURS

PROPOSALS FOR CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATION OF PORTS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Can the minister say when the proposals for changes in administration of the national ports will be ready? Will the minister assure hon. members affect-

ed that they will have an opportunity to see these proposals, preferably in the Transport Committee, before anything is finally done?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): As to the first part of the question, it will be within a month at the outside. As to the second part, definitely yes, and in addition to the members of the Transport Committee, any other groups that may have a related interest in the matter.

WATER RESOURCES

SURVEY IN NORTHERN ONTARIO BY U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): My question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has he made inquiries as to why the United States Army Corps of Engineers is hiring Canadian citizens in northern Ontario to record statistical data concerning stream flow rates, the thickness of ice on lakes and rivers, and so on?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I keep getting information from the hon. member about these elusive and mysterious engineers who are prowling around in the north. As I have told him before, the only study being done in the area is a joint study by Ontario and ourselves to co-ordinate information, and work together. My instructions are that at our end there is no Corps of Army Engineers. If the province of Ontario has retained any, I am not aware of the fact.

Mr. Penner: Will the minister undertake to investigate and report to the House as soon as possible as to the reasons for the activity of the Army Corps of Engineers in northern Ontario and under whose authority they are acting?

Mr. Greene: It may be I can put my colleague the Solicitor General and his minions to work in this regard.

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Is the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources aware of the fact that this type of investigation is being carried out by the American Corps of Engineers by letter and that the citizens of northerwestern Ontario who are taking these measurements are not engineers? Would the minister undertake to get in touch with his colleagues in the provincial department in Ontario to co-operate with them in finding out the purpose of this type of investigation?

Mr. Greene: I will be glad to do that. I am glad to hear it is being done by letter because I know that the information will be delivered promptly.

NATIONAL PARKS

KEJIMKUJIK—PLANS FOR COASTAL SATELLITE PARK

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of the minister's statement that 12 public hearings will be held on national parks plans, with details to be revealed in Halifax on January 27, can the minister indicate whether plans have yet been finalized for the construction of a coastal satellite park for Kejimkujik?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that the question might be placed on the Order Paper. If the matter is one of urgency, it can be considered at the time of adjournment.

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—STATEMENT ON PROPOSED SITE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Does the minister propose to make a statement to the House on the plans for the location of a large new airport in the Toronto area, a matter which has greatly disturbed a number of people in that area?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had intended to do it some time ago but in the interest of getting as much involvement as possible at both the municipal and provincial level in Ontario there have been subsequent meetings among various groups. I am awaiting reports from them, and I hope that as a result of these meetings it will be possible for us to get agreement at all levels of government to obtain the maximum amount of disclosure, which is my desire in any event.

[*Translation*]

STE-SCHOLASTIQUE—DISCUSSION BETWEEN OTTAWA AND QUEBEC

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Transport whether he is in a position this morning to give the House a progress report on his discussions with the Quebec Department of Municipal Affairs with regard to the Sainte-Scholastique airport?

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): There have been preliminary meetings between myself and the Minister of Municipal Affairs of the province of Quebec. These have led to meetings of officials which have been going on during the past week, and I can report happily that they are going very well, amiably and most productively.

Mr. Valade: I have a supplementary question which I should like to put to the Minister of Transport. Is there any question of changing the site or will the site chosen stay as it is?

Mr. Jamieson: The site has been chosen and will stay precisely where it is.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

LENNOX ISLAND RESERVE—
ACCESS TO MAINLAND

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): My question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. It relates to a question I asked him on December 5 with regard to inadequate transportation facilities between the Lennox Island Indian reserve and Prince Edward Island. Unhappily, since that time there has been another death involving a young married mother as a result of poor transportation facilities. Since the minister promised to look into the matter at that time, can he inform us as to what immediate steps are being taken for this winter season when there is still a likelihood of further accidents and the dreaded possibility of drownings because of the very unsafe transportation link to the mainland?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the lack of communications between Prince Edward Island and the island where the Indians in question are living. I know that the means of transportation are inadequate, and officials of my department have begun discussions with representatives of the Prince Edward Island government in order to determine whether some improvement would not be possible through the construction of a small causeway or of a bridge, but to date no decision has been reached.

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the minister has indicated the right action toward reaching a permanent solution to this problem and I am glad to hear him indicate it to the House. But in view of the fact that it will take at least one year or perhaps two to complete a solid link to the island—and I hope that the causeway will be more successful than the previous one—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon member kindly ask his supplementary question.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was getting to it. What steps are envisaged by the minister's department for this winter season, and will there be some kind of vehicle provided, which would be better than nothing, as the boat is not able to operate until there is full clearance of ice?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Evidently, Mr. Speaker, this is a very thorny problem and we are endeavouring to make available to the Indians the best means of transportation between that island and Prince Edward Island. However, navigation has always involved certain risks, but I deeply regret the recent drowning. The department officials are doing the best they can to provide the inhabitants of that island with the best possible means of transportation.

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

GOLD MINING—POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources whether his department has completed its investigation into gold mining operations and is now prepared to make a statement as to the intention of the government in relation to the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act?

Mr. Speaker: I would expect this kind of statement to be made on motions. Perhaps the minister might indicate whether such a statement will be made in due course.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the study is not complete and we are not yet prepared to make such a statement on motions.

HOUSING

CONFERENCE ON USE OF WOOD PRODUCTS IN CONSTRUCTION

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry whether, in connection with the international conference to be held on the west coast having to do with the use of wood products in house building, and because of the very special interest in some cases, it is his intention to invite provincial governments to contribute some members to the Canadian delegation or at least to have them attend as observers?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): The answer, Mr. Speaker, is definitely yes.

POLLUTION

WATER—ANNOUNCEMENT BY U.S. PRESIDENT—INQUIRY AS TO SIMILAR ACTION

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources whether in relation to the water bill now being considered the minister will soon announce the government's commitment for combating pollution, similar to the action taken by the President of the United States yesterday?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): We do not have a presidential form of government here, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure the announcement will not be made in that way but in the normal parliamentary fashion.

[*Later:*]

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, in view of President Nixon's statement in his State of the Union message yesterday that he intends to put teeth into the U.S. anti-pollution drive by putting up $10 billion to finance it, does the government intend at the appropriate time, as the minister indicated it might do some time, to announce a comparable provision of money to put teeth into the Canadian bill?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I think there are teeth in the bill.

An hon. Member: False, though.

Mr. Greene: I think there are teeth in the government's anti-pollution and water management policy. I will be very pleased to send the hon. member my speech in closing the debate on second reading. I think he will then be assured—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the minister but I suggest he should not revive the debate which ended yesterday regarding legislation that is before the House at the present time.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Has the minister noticed that these teeth he talks about are nothing but gums and are not working very effectively?

Mr. Greene: I can assure my hon. friend they are not store teeth; they are real teeth.

GRAIN

UTILIZATION OF LAKEHEAD TERMINAL SPACE

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board but in his absence I will direct it to the acting minister or to the Minister of Transport. In view of the concern expressed by the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool that the Lakehead terminals will not be filled by the opening of navigation and there may not be sufficient stocks of clean grain in a shippable position to take advantage of possible boat loadings, will shipping plans in respect of western grain be reviewed in order to ensure that this situation will not develop?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the premise in the first place. I recall the Minister without Portfolio saying exactly the opposite. I will nevertheless bring the question to his attention when he comes back from the west next week.

TRANSPORT

ATLANTIC REGION—REFUSAL OF CERTAIN TRUCKERS TO REDUCE RATES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether he can indicate to the House what action he is taking with regard to the refusal of trucking firms, other than Day and Ross, to reduce their rates and pass them on to the users of such services in line with the Atlantic Regional Freight Assistance Act?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): In the first instance, Mr. Speaker, the subsidies were paid to the trucking firms because this was the fastest way to get the

project in operation. In answer to my hon. friend I would suggest that the trucking firms will get the message that if they do not take action which results in lower costs to users we will quickly find a technique to put the money directly in the hands of the shippers.

JURISDICTION OF PROVINCES IN RESPECT OF RAIL AND TRUCK RATES

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I failed before to ask the Minister of Transport whether he will take an opportunity now or later to clarify the constitutional uncertainty about the capacity of the provinces to act in respect of both trucking and rail rates, and to indicate whether the government intends as a result of meetings to move into these fields?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member is inviting the minister to make this kind of information available to the House by way of a statement. I assume that statement would not be made now.

Mr. Bell: I appreciate your admonition, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister merely indicate that the government may be moving into these fields as a result of these meetings?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker; I expect that we will proclaim part III of the National Transportation Act within a matter of weeks.

POLLUTION

HALIFAX HARBOUR—SOURCE, REMEDY AND COMPENSATION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether his officials have been able to determine the cause of the most recent pollution of Halifax harbour, particularly the eastern side? Have they determined the cause and have there been any penalties imposed on the guilty parties?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, as a result of earlier representations by the hon. member I have asked departmental officials to send me a full report on the investigation. I have not received it yet, but as soon as I do I will be glad to pass it on to him.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Government House Leader, on behalf of those of us who have a special interest, whether he would indicate the business of the House for today?

[Mr. Jamieson.]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the business will be as announced last Thursday, namely, the four financial institution bills. While I am referring to this matter perhaps I should also indicate that on Monday and Tuesday of next week we will have the debate which has already been referred to on the motion to set up a joint parliamentary committee on the constitution of which notice will be given later today. On Wednesday of next week it is intended to call the three fisheries bills, the bill to repeal the Deep Sea Fisheries Act, the bill to amend the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act and also the Saltfish Corporation bill, for the purpose of dealing with them on second reading.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, if the House makes sufficient progress today on the financial bills and there is time, will the House leader bring in the fisheries bills, especially Bill C-175?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker. My colleague the Minister of Fisheries will be ready to bring on the package if we do make progress on the financial bills.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, do I gather from listening to the House Leader that the question of Arctic sovereignty has been permanently shelved and talked out by this government?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): No, Mr. Speaker. We will be bringing forward the legislation referred to in speeches yesterday, and perhaps the question can then be discussed in a more effective way.

TRADE

PRODUCTS DISPLAYED AT FLOATING FAIR ABOARD "SUNRIVER"

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, since the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is sponsoring a seagoing food fair in the Caribbean, which is called a floating fair in the department's press release, on board a ship named the *Sunriver,* and in view of the fact it contains many samples of Canadian foods and also wines, liquors and tobacco but has apparently very little emphasis on cereal grain products, will he undertake to review the list of products in order to ensure that all possibilities for developing markets for cereal grains will be explored?

[*Translation*]

INCOME TAX

REBATE TO ASSIST MUNICIPAL TAXPAYERS

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance a question.

Will he give favourable consideration to the suggestion of the chairman of the Executive Committee of Montreal, Mr. Saulnier, about granting taxpayers a federal tax rebate in proportion to the municipal taxes they pay, to help them as well as the municipalities?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker, not at the present time. Any changes in taxation proposed by the government would be brought forth during the budget in the normal way.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, my question was whether the minister was going to consider a possible rebate in his future budget?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, in preparing a budget one considers a great many possibilities.

Mr. Valade: But not this one.

PENSIONS

RETIRED CIVIL SERVANTS—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION RESPECTING INCREASE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether he can tell us that we may expect fairly soon the introduction of the legislation forecast in his welcome announcement of December 19?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think the House Leader will shortly be discussing with his counterparts the legislative program for the balance of the session.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ACQUISITION OF CANADIAN COACHWAYS BY GREYHOUND LINES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, on January 14 I directed a question to the Minister of Transport regarding approval by the Canadian Transport Commission of the takeover of Canadian Coachways Limited by Greyhound Corporation of Chicago. The minister said he would be prepared to read the transcript and decide whether or not the government should exercise the authority it has under legislation to stop the takeover. Has the minister had an opportunity to look into the matter and has any decision been reached?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Not so far as a decision is concerned. Yesterday I obtained a copy of the judgment from the CTC and I will undertake to read it quickly and give an answer probably next week.

GRAIN

MOVEMENT BY RAILWAYS

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Would the minister also pass on to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board the information that many western farmers have no confidence in the ability or willingness of the railroads to move the required amounts of grain in the balance of this crop year?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GREECE—PROTEST RESPECTING TORTURE OF PRISONERS

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Shortly before the Christmas recess I asked the Prime Minister if the government would look into reports by an impartial committee in Europe which indicated there has been systematic torture of political prisoners in Greek prisons, and if this were found to be the case would he consider issuing a protest from the government of Canada. At that time he said he would look into the matter. I wonder whether he has done so.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I did look into the matter and I discussed it with the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is my impression he commented on it in the House since the last time it was raised. If not, I will check to see whether something can be done.

POLLUTION

DUMPING OF OIL AND OTHER WASTE IN GREAT LAKES

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport when the statement he prom-

ised on December 5 he would make on the matter of waste and oil pollution caused by freighters in the Great Lakes will be given in the House?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I do not recall having made such a promise. I believe I was speaking of the Brussels conference. I referred to such a statement yesterday. I will make a copy available to the hon. member. He can study it and then if there is some further information he requires he can ask me.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, would the minister be agreeable, with unanimous consent, to table the statement to which he referred yesterday?

Mr. Jamieson: I would be agreeable.

Mr. Speaker: A suggestion has been made that a document referred to by the hon. member for St. John's East mentioned yesterday by the Minister of Transport should be tabled. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Harding: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if the minister will look at *Hansard* for December 5 he will find that he gave such a commitment to a member from Ontario.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

TRUST COMPANIES ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING INCORPORATION, OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The House resumed from Friday, December 12, consideration of the motion of Mr. Gray (for the Minister of Finance) that Bill S-8, to amend the Trust Companies Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, four such bills have been taken off the list of private members' bills and have been transferred to government orders with the result that these companies will be brought under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance. This raises a number of points which should be seriously considered by hon. members of the House. Most hon. members did not seriously consider the implications of many bills passed during private members' hour, but I believe there is a considerable role to be played by our financial institutions other than banks or near-banks. I believe the trust companies, small loan companies and insurance companies fall into that category because a large amount of money is held in trust by these various agencies which operate for the Canadian public.

A great deal of this money is never returned to the people whom we feel should obtain the benefits of it. These are mainly the people who have to issue debentures for municipal, provincial or large social capital expenditures. This money in the main has not been available. For this reason we believe the proliferation of trust companies, insurance companies and small loan companies really cuts into the role which I think all Canadians believe should be played by the banking institutions. The role of these companies has not been supervised to the degree certain other financial institutions have been. These companies have had difficulty in getting their bills passed and the government has taken the easy way out and has now provided for their incorporation by letters patent. Therefore the Superintendent of Insurance will have a great deal more responsibility than he had before.

These trust companies have operated under a certain set of regulations. They have been supervised in the past, but when we establish such new companies by letters patent I believe we should give some consideration to the operations of the existing companies and consider whether or not new companies are needed. Nowhere in this bill do I see any power given to the Superintendent of Insurance that would allow him to make such a decision. It is a fact that a small, private trust company is set up it will come back to the Superintendent of Insurance in a year or two asking for an increase in its capitalization. In two or three years it might even be able to afford a $5 million capitalization.

These trust companies have grown at an alarming rate over the years. So whether or not we should incorporate other trust companies becomes very important, considering the role they play in the financial structure of Canada, the role they play in relation to lending institutions and the role they should play in respect of lending money for long-term social capital purposes such as the building of private homes, hospitals and schools. This role has been limited so far as the trust companies are concerned. It is obviously limited as far as the interest return rate is concerned. But there are many fields in which the trust

companies have jurisdiction over administration, such as with respect to estates, bankruptcies and business operations run by a third party, where they would be able to invest the large sums of money they have in stable investments.

• (11:50 a.m.)

I am very pleased to note that under the terms of the new legislation we will allow the trust companies to invest in such things as the Industrial Development Bank. We are allowing them to make loans under the terms of the small loans legislation. We are allowing them to make loans to farmers under farm credit legislation. In general we are allowing them to make loans in those fields in which the government assumes some responsibility for the repayment of loans. In this way we are broadening the role of the trust companies.

I am sure there are many Members of Parliament who do not really care one way or another what a particular trust company does. Many of us are not too interested either in what a particular insurance company does. But, Mr. Speaker, we should be concerned about what these companies do in the aggregate. As Members of Parliament we have not been pleased about some things that have happened in individual trust companies and insurance companies. For instance, in my experience Allstate is about as close to being crooked as it could be. People who submit claims to Allstate sometimes find they have to wait four or five years to have their claims settled. This is not generally true of insurance companies. While I am interested in this particular insurance company for that reason, I am more interested in the broad spectrum of insurance companies. The same is true with respect to a trust company which may have mismanaged a bankruptcy. It attracts our attention.

Insurance companies, trust companies and loan companies are playing an increasing role in our society. They affect many people who are not at all involved with estates, the administration of estates, bankruptcies, and the administration of bankruptcies. The difficulty the individual has is in arriving at a reasonable personal role in his relationship with these institutions.

I have mentioned one particular insurance company. I do not think the House should be concerned with the actual methods that insurance companies use, but when a complaint about one company comes to the attention of a Member of Parliament he must wonder if this situation applies to all insurance companies and whether it is not the tip of an iceberg, the tip of one huge problem about which something should be done. I would like to see Members of Parliament become much more interested in the over-all operations of trust companies and in the role they play in the daily life of our communities.

It seems to me that the House is being asked to pass these four bills in order to end a problem that I helped to create. I make no apology for that, Mr. Speaker, even though on a number of occasions we used incorporation bills, and in some cases may have abused them, for a definite purpose. I think our purpose has been accomplished. However, I would not like to see this bill pass without saying that we had no intention of chasing all the financial institutions into the department of the Superintendent of Insurance.

Over the past ten years we have had close relations with the Superintendent of Insurance. I have known very well both of the gentlemen who in recent years have occupied that position and have found them to be very capable people. However, I am well aware of their limitations with respect to staff and organization which may prevent that department from carrying on the type of supervision that, hopefully, people thought would be done when incorporation bills were being examined by Parliament. I know that most members of the House never looked at incorporation bills. In fact the Senate did a heck of a lot more work than the House in supervising incorporations, even though in many cases it did so for the wrong reason, because Senators were to be on the boards of directors of the companies seeking incorporation. Anyway, at least the Senate took a look at incorporation bills, but most members of the House did not stay in the chamber when such bills were being discussed.

I am scared that we are giving the Superintendent of Insurance a responsibility which I think he cannot exercise, a responsibility which I think he does not want, and a responsibility which I do not think we should make him exercise. He will now have to look at these bills in the light of the public good. That is a loose form of wording. We used to have it in most union constitutions. At the end of our meetings when there was nothing else to discuss we wound up discussing the good of the union, found out who were the sick people in hospital, sent them flowers and arranged for somebody to visit them. Maybe

we should do that now in terms of some of the financial institutions that will be incorporated through letters patent.

We may quite easily find that another 100 or 200 trust companies will be incorporated. If this happens we will find 100 new offices on Sparks Street. Such companies always seem to have a great deal of money for elaborate offices. You see them giving away little cars or silverware in order to attract new depositors who agree to leave their money on deposit over a long period of time. Each time this happens it means that that much money is not available in the form of normal savings subject to the control of the Bank of Canada.

That money will be spread out over many companies, as is the case now with insurance companies, so that in the end it will be difficult to consider it as savings of the public. It will not be a viable resource which one can spend or borrow against, as can be done in the banks. I wonder who will look after that. In its wisdom both Houses of Parliament used to scrutinize proposed incorporations bills on their merits. Now we are turning them over to the Superintendent of Insurance and giving up our responsibility, and I do not see that this bill provides any protection through powers given to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) or to other ministers who are concerned with financial institutions.

• (12 noon)

If we say to the Superintendent of Insurance, "It is now your job, you have to supervise this," I think he will be hard pressed to do so, and I think he will be very unhappy trying to do it, although I am sure he will do the best job he can. I think the government should be prepared to write in some protection for the public and provide guidelines for the Superintendent of Insurance by which he can make the decisions that we will now be asking him to make. I have read the bill and I know there are a number of worth-while changes in it. However, I think the philosophic problems of our financial institutions should not become a pawn in my objections to some of the bills submitted in Private Members' hour. I suggest that the minister may find us very sympathetic if he is willing to provide the type of protection that we had hoped for, and were working towards in the Private Members' hour, for trust companies and the public from abuses apparent in the past and that in the future will be multiplied tenfold.

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, I understand the previous speaker, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) was speaking primarily to item No. 44 on the order paper, resuming debate on Bill S-8. My comments, which will be very brief will be dealing with items 42, 43, 44 and 45, the four financial bills concerning insurance companies, trust companies and loan companies.

In making a general statement which will be applicable to all four items, I might say that these bills are significant and important pieces of legislation. The role of the insurance companies, trust companies and loan companies in the financial and commercial life of Canada is such as to affect every Canadian in his lifetime and is a most important part of the private sector of the Canadian economy. In another sense, however, they are housekeeping bills. The changes that have occurred in the corporate structure, in the organization and in the function of the various kinds of financial houses in recent years, require that we review, revise and up-date our legislation on such companies in the light of these changes and in the light of the relationships between these companies and the citizens.

Basically, therefore, the only principle at issue here is the need for modernization of the laws defining these corporations. The same principle that was applicable to our loan companies and chartered banks is applicable to our general laws on corporations.

All these bills can best be considered in committee where the highly technical changes can be examined with the help of public service officials and private citizens. Generally, these changes can be said to broaden the power of these companies and also the power of government to control the affairs of the companies. It is in this area that we intend to scrutinize these bills thoroughly in committee to ensure that in granting such powers to private industry and government, and in balancing these powers one against the other, the over-all balance is struck in the public interest.

I have one other observation to make, Mr. Speaker, which is irrelevant in the immediate sense I admit, but very relevant to the business of the House. All these bills went through the other place in the last session and at least two of them then appeared on the Order Paper in this House. All of them died before being passed at the close of the last session and this session they had to be reintroduced. It seems to me that some thought might be given to changing our rules to provide that within the life of a Parliament a bill

might go over from one session to another, maintaining the place on the order paper in the new session that it had on the prorogation of the previous session.

That is all I have to say at this moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

LOAN COMPANIES ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING INCORPORATION, OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio) moved that Bill S-9, to amend the Loan Companies Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to make clear that I did not make use of my right of reply at the end of debate on second reading of the previous matter, and with the accord of the members of the House with respect to the second reading of this bill and the two that follow, I propose to forgo my forthcoming right of reply in order to expedite the business of the House. However, I wish it to be understood that it is my intention to deal with points raised by hon. members when these bills are before the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs for study. At this time, I wish to put on record an outline of the amendments to the Loan Companies Act intended by the bill now before us.

The Loan Companies Act is an act that applies to companies that might be more accurately described as mortgage loan companies. Their essential characteristic is the making of mortgage loans on real estate or the investment in such mortgage loans. The funds for this purpose are raised by the sale of debentures to the public or by the acceptance of deposits. At the present time, there are 12 such companies active in Canada having total assets of about $1.5 billion and liabilities to the public of about $1.3 billion. The extent of their involvement in real estate mortgages is illustrated by the fact that more than 80 per cent of their assets are of this type.

The principal amendments contemplated by this bill fall into four categories. Firstly, the amendments would effect certain changes in the investment powers of loan companies generally in the direction of expanding such powers and bringing them closely into line with powers of life insurance companies. One of the most significance perhaps would be an amendment to enable companies to make investments and loans within their own discretion up to a maximum limit of 7 per cent of the total assets of the company. This corresponds to the so-called basket provision that has been in effect for life insurance companies for some years. There has been a basket provision provided in the legislation for mortgage loan companies but this was limited to 15 per cent of the company's capital and surplus.

Companies would be empowered to invest in real estate for the production of income, not only where the real estate is leased to a company whose stocks are eligible investments, but also real estate that qualifies on an earnings test. Also, the size of individual parcels of real estate that might be purchased would be increased from 1 per cent to 2 per cent of a company's assets. These changes would bring the powers of loan companies into line with those for insurance companies with respect to investments in real estate for the production of income.

The requirement for a minimum statutory margin with respect to collateral loans would be removed and companies could determine their own margin, subject, however, to their having sufficient collateral to cover the amount of the loan on a market value basis.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Companies may now make mortgages subject to the limitation that the amount of the mortgage is not to exceed 75 per cent of the value of the real estate. They may lend in excess of this amount, however, where the excess is guaranteed or insured by a governmental agency. An amendment is proposed that would permit excess mortgages to be made if the excess is insured under a policy of mortgage insurance issued by a registered insurance company.

The power to make investments and loans in corporate securities would be expanded to enable a company to invest in such securities outside Canada in any country in which the company is doing business. A company would be required however to maintain assets in Canada at all times at least equal to its liabilities in Canada. The power of companies to own subsidiaries would be expanded to enable a loan company to operate a loan com-

pany subsidiary in a foreign jurisdiction and to incorporate a subsidiary investment company for the purpose of selling mutual fund shares. It would also be able to own subsidiary companies for the purpose of carrying on any business reasonably ancillary to that of a loan company. The power to own subsidiaries would be subject to terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council.

The existing prohibition against loan companies making loans on the security of promissory notes would be repealed, thus enabling companies to make consumer loans within the limitation prescribed by the basket provision should they so desire. There has been some interest in this possibility by some loan companies, particularly those in the business of accepting deposits from customers, many of whom have been asking if this kind of loan could be made to them.

The second principal amendment, somewhat related to investment powers, is one that would expand the existing prohibition against loans to directors or officers to prohibit loans to or investments in any major shareholder. Also, loans to or investments in other corporations would be prohibited if a director, officer or major shareholder had a significant interest in that other corporation. These amendments are for the purpose of expanding the existing prohibitions against investment transactions that may involve a conflict of interest on the part of persons who are in a position to control or direct the investment decisions of the loan company.

The third main category relates to changes in the system of supervision and control, particularly with respects to companies that may find themselves in financial difficulties. At present, the minister has power to insert conditions or limitations in a company's licence when it is renewed, from year to year, and he may also withdraw the licence if the superintendent reports that, in his opinion, the assets of the company are insufficient to enable it to continue in business. There is, however, no intermediate step between inserting conditions in the licence and withdrawing it.

The amendments propose that the superintendent be required to report to the minister in any case where he thinks that a company is getting into financial difficulties or where it has exceeded its borrowing limits. The minister would then be empowered to take one or more of three steps. He could impose conditions in the company's licence; he could prescribe a time within which the company would be required to remedy the defect or he could direct the superintendent to take control of the company's assets.

In any case where the superintendent has control of the assets of a company, the minister could request the Attorney General to apply to a court to direct the superintendent to take control of the company for the purpose of its rehabilitation or he could request the Attorney General to apply to a court for an order winding up the company under the Winding-up Act.

Where the superintendent has control of a company for rehabilitation or has control of the assets of a company he would be empowered to assess expenses incurred by him in this connection against other loan companies.

The superintendent would be empowered to take control of a company's assets temporarily in any case where he found there had been an improper accounting of the assets. This could be maintained only for a period of seven days at the discretion of the superintendent. Any longer period would require ministerial authorization.

These changes are proposed with a view to providing a more flexible system of supervision and control in cases where companies are in financial difficulties and where action requires to be taken to protect the interests of depositors and debenture holders.

The fourth category of amendments deals with changes in the system of incorporating companies and amending existing charters. At present, mortgage loan companies may be incorporated federally only by special act of Parliament. Amendments to existing charters may also be made only by special act. The proposed amendments would adopt a letters patent system for incorporating new companies and for amending existing charters. It is also proposed to enable provincial companies to change to the status of federally incorporated companies by a letters patent procedure subject to concurrence of the home province. As in the case of the proposed amendments to the Insurance Companies Act and the Trust Companies Act, the letters patent would be issued by the Corporations Branch of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, subject however to the concurrence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). Investigation would be made by the Superintendent of Insurance in the manner now followed in respect of private bills and public notice would be required in the Canada *Gazette* for application for incorporation.

The letters patent would be in standard form as provided in the bill, but enough flexibility would be permitted to enable the letters patent to be adjusted to meet special circumstances. In particular, if the persons proposing the incorporation so desired, letters patent could contain restrictions on voting rights or on share ownership. Similar restrictions could be put in the charters of existing companies if the application were approved at a special general meeting of the company and if the Minister of Finance concurs.

The amendments would provide that before a new company can be authorized to transact business it must have a minimum capital of at least $500,000. At present, the minimum initial capital is set in each private bill and thus considered on a case-by-case basis by Parliament.

Apart from the four main categories just described, there are a number of other amendments of significance. I shall touch upon the principal points.

A proposed amendment would require notice to the superintendent in case of a major transfer of shares. This proposes that no transfer of a block of stock in excess of 10 per cent would be permitted until after 30 days' notice to the superintendent including information as to beneficial ownership. Such notice would also be required in cases of transfer of lesser blocks where the result was change of control. This would not grant a veto power to the superintendent or the government but would ensure that supervisory authorities have adequate notice of significant changes in share ownership.

The Governor in Council would be authorized to adopt regulations dealing with the safekeeping of securities and the bonding of directors, officers and employees. It would be intended under this provision to establish procedures designed to improve the care and custody of assets of companies.

At present, companies are limited in the amount of money they can accept on deposit and borrow on the issuance of debentures to a maximum of 15 times their capital and surplus. The amendments would raise this limit to 20 times subject to approval by the Minister of Finance on specific application by the company.

To use words similar to those I used in opening debate on the amendments to the Trust Companies Act, this amendment would make it possible for these companies to make more money available for mortgage lending. An important part of the lending business, as I said with respect to the Trust Companies Act, is in the field of lending for housing purposes. As I indicated with respect to the trust companies, the minister responsible for housing has told me that companies of this type have been contacting him and stressing the importance of approval of these amendments if their mortgage lending is not to be curtailed and if they are to be able to respond to the minister's requests that they allocate more funds for lending for housing.

The present liquidity test would be revised to require companies to maintain a reserve of at least 20 per cent of their demand deposits and debentures falling due within 100 days in the form of federal or provincial securities or cash.

Quarterly reports would be required from companies showing their assets and liabilities in order to enable the supervisory authorities to keep a close check on liquidity and semi-annual reports would be required showing the changes in investments and loans.

It is proposed to insert an age limit of 75 on eligibility to be elected as a director. This would take effect from January 1, 1972 and is similar to a change made in the Bank Act a few years ago.

• (12:20 p.m.)

A number of changes are proposed in the auditing requirements, principally for the purpose of specifying the qualification of auditors. This is made the same as in the Bank Act. The act presently contains a provision permitting companies to issue share warrants, that is warrants enabling the holder to convert the warrant into a registered share if he so wishes. These are not the same as share purchase warrants, since the warrant concept here is one that enables the bearer to have the share delivered to him on presentation of this warrant. This is not used by any company at the present time and would create certain difficulties with respect to the control of transfer of shares to non-residents. It is proposed, therefore, that this be deleted from the act.

Certain changes are proposed in the provisions restricting non-resident ownership with a view to clarifying the wording and providing for the preservation of voting rights of non-residents where these rights were acquired while a company was exempt from the restrictions. The requirements for issuance of preferred stock would be somewhat simplified as would the requirements having to do with the adoption of by-laws. At least three-quarters of the directors would be

required to be Canadian citizens resident in Canada rather than only 50 per cent as at present. This change would follow a similar change for the Bank Act and one proposed for the Trust Companies Act.

A number of other amendments are proposed for the purpose of modifying wording and correcting a few administrative procedures. A number of changes would be made transferring certain other discretionary authority from the Treasury Board to the minister as a consequence of some of the reorganization changes within government departments.

Part II of the Loan Companies Act refers to the licensing of British loan companies to transact business in Canada. There are in fact no such companies and this part has not been used for a great many years. It is proposed, therefore, to repeal the part.

I will be pleased to attempt to respond to more detailed questions when the bill is before the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. It is considered that approval of this bill, like approval of the bill to amend the Trust Companies Act, will assist in widening the supply of funds available for mortgage lending and will widen the ability of federally incorporated loan companies to provide services to the public as well as widening the degree of protection available to depositors and others who lend money to these companies under federal incorporation and supervision. I ask for the support of the House at this second reading stage of the debate on this bill.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the minister? How does he come to the conclusion, as he did in the last remark he made, that this bill will increase the capitalization available and the rate of expansion?

Mr. Gray: The law provides that companies can seek deposits from the public only up to a certain proportion of their net assets and the volume of loans they make are linked with the deposits they are able to attract. They are loans by way of mortgage. Obviously, when they are as at present approaching or at the ceiling on borrowing from the public, the power that they have to make loans to the public by way of mortgages is thereby limited. If the authority they have under the act to seek deposits is increased, then to the extent they attract deposits, it will follow that their opportunity to make loans to the public by way of mortgage, which is their principal business, will be increased.

[Mr. Gray.]

Mr. Saltsman: I have a couple of questions I want to ask the minister. Is it not equally true that they could increase the amount of money they attract by increasing their capitalization, even under the present legislation? Second, if they are going to attract this extra money to put into mortgages, where is it anticipated this money will come from? Will it be new money that is being created or money drawn from sources now in use?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I think that detailed questions of this type might be better discussed when the bill is before the Finance Committee. I will attempt to respond to them by saying it would appear preferable to follow the pattern that has been used in the past, that is to use the formula whereby the amount of money that they can seek in deposits is linked to a certain number of times their net capital and certain other assets. This provides a greater measure of control by the Minister of Finance because the formula provides a minimum ceiling that can be increased at the discretion and authorization of the Minister of Finance. It is proposed the ceiling be increased from the present discretionary limit of some 15 times up to 20 times.

With respect to attracting funds, these institutions are basically competing with other financial institutions which may not be directing or investing their funds toward quite the same mix of investments. I think if they are better able to compete with other institutions and generally better able to attract savings from the public because of the present pattern of lending by these institutions, it would follow that the funds likely would be put into investments by way of mortgage loans following the presently existing pattern.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, we do not wish to prolong this debate because, as the minister has pointed out, there will be an opportunity of raising some of these questions in committee. The purpose of our questions and interventions has been to point out that there are some very great difficulties involved in this whole matter. To the present, there have not been any satisfactory answers from the government side.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government has placed a great deal of stress on the need for priorities in carrying on public affairs and in the programs that it presents to Parliament. It has attempted to make a considerable show of its own sense of priorities and to create the

image which portrays this sense of priorities. It has also tried to impress upon the public, and other members when they try to get their own way in Parliament, the necessity of making sound rational choices when dealing with public business and public affairs. That is all very fine. Of course, it is like motherhood.

Let us put these particular assertions to the test. Where is the government's sense of priorities in relation to the amending of the Loan Companies Act which is now before us? I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the government has placed this bill ahead of many other far more urgent measures on the Order Paper or which have been announced by the government for introduction at this session. Originally this bill was placed ahead of the Canada water bill for consideration, but that was changed after some opposition interventions in the debate on the four finance company bills. Therefore, the Canada water bill has now passed second reading.

The government has placed this bill ahead of measures to bring about a measure of economic stabilization and in order to ensure that we would not have a considerable unemployment problem this winter. It has placed it ahead of measures to help pensioners, to help veterans and to help distressed groups throughout Canada. I refer to western agriculture, problems of the Maritimes, problems of the cities, unemployment which I already mentioned, and the problems of the Indians and Metis. There are other problems I could also mention.

The government placed this bill ahead of the Canada Development Corporation bill which, of course, is a measure that could be used very effectively, if the government so chose, to deal with some of the problems involved in the large degree of foreign ownership of the Canadian economy. This bill is being placed ahead of the Combines Investigation Act revision which has been announced; the motor vehicle safety bill; the labour code amendments which were supposed to come before us, and other labour legislation. It has been placed ahead of the marketing agencies bill which is important to the agricultural industry as a whole; it has been placed ahead of the revisions to the Canada Grain Act, so badly needed to improve our basic marketing situation, one which has caused a great deal of frustration to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) during the past year. The hon. gentleman seems to be experiencing a sense of frustration at this very moment during my recital of all these items which have been placed lower on the list of priorities—

• (12:30 p.m.)

Mr. Pepin: Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Burton: This bill has been placed ahead of the co-operatives bill which has been promised by the federal government for years. None of these things has been dealt with during this session so far, but the government has insisted that this bill be dealt with. The loan and trust companies legislation had to go forward. The government felt obliged to satisfy the needs of its friends first; it had to make certain that the financial institutions, who already possess a great deal of power in the economy, obtain even more power and privileges.

There are some curious contradictions in government policy at the moment. On one hand, the government is making a great show of its anti-inflation drive and the need to curb unnecessary spending. It is attempting to set a good example—without any great success, I might say—by following a program of restraint. In the process it is restraining some worth-while and necessary programs. On the other hand, through this legislation, it is increasing the power of loan companies to accumulate funds for further investment; it is giving this extra power to the loan companies whose decisions will be based on considerations of commercial profitability and the corporate well-being of the firms concerned rather than the public good. There is no need to tell members of this House that these two things do not necessarily coincide; it is obvious that the direction of private investment decisions does, in many instances, ignore the public interest in addition to ignoring the government's pleas for restraint. This does not deter the government from proceeding blindly with a bill which will further increase the economic power of these financial institutions. It will certainly have an inflationary effect in present circumstances; it will certainly contribute to the inflationary psychology which government spokesmen have referred to so often as being a major obstacle to be overcome.

These trust and loan companies play an important role in the development of Canada within the framework of our present economy. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics noted recently that in the second quarter of 1969 trust companies increased their investment in

mortgages by $125 million to bring their total investments in mortgages at mid-1969 to $2.9 billion. Mortgage companies invested an additional $75 million in mortgages during the same period to bring total mortgage holdings at mid-year to $2.3 billion. It is reported that deposits in credit unions, which are also involved on the total picture of the financial institutions, increased in the second quarter of 1969 by a modest amount. Sales finance companies increased their sales finance paper by $172 million during the quarter bringing total holdings of sales finance paper to $4.7 billion. Mutual funds showed sales of shares to investors amounting to $64 million during the quarter.

As the minister indicated when introducing the bill before us, there are some 12 companies operating under the provisions of this legislation at the present time, and, of course, the Superintendent of Insurance has to report on the activities and financial position of these companies in his annual report. I was interested to learn from the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Insurance for the year 1968 that, as the minister pointed out in his remarks, the total admitted assets at book value of the loan companies in Canada incorporated under federal legislation was slightly more than $1.5 billion in 1968, an increase over 1967 amounting to almost exactly 10 per cent, which is certainly an appreciable one. I was interested to learn also that the two largest corporations which make up the bulk of the total figure are the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation, with total assets of some $629 million, and the Huron and Erie Mortgage Corporation, with total assets of some $536 million. There are only two other companies whose assets amount to more than $100 million; the others are relatively small in size, the smallest having assets of only $392,000.

What interested me particularly, looking at the operation of the loan companies, was a table in which an attempt was made to classify mortgage lending on real estate on the basis of provincial distribution. Of a total outstanding at the end of 1968 amounting to some $1,235,000,000, more than $588 million—almost half—was invested in the Province of Ontario. This should be noted in the light of the Prime Minister's criticism of the government of Ontario for failing to take adequate steps to deal with inflation. Perhaps some of that criticism was justified. At the same time, here are these loan companies carrying on their operations in a completely unrestricted way and, of course, we cannot fail to see that there is an extremely high concentration of their mortgage lending in Ontario, the province in which it has been suggested by the federal government that there is the greatest degree of inflationary pressure.

These companies, as we have seen, are able to carry on their operations completely free from the need to pay any regard to considerations of the public interest when making decisions concerning capital investment and spending across Canada. We know very well that much of Ontario has developed into what might be called the industrial heartland of Canada, and, of course, there is a tendency, when there is no restriction on private investment, for an increasingly large proportion of capital investment, particularly private capital investment, to become concentrated within such an area.

Then again, an extremely complex structure develops in time among these corporations and the financial institutions with which they are related. There are many links between these corporations and companies. Looking at the lists of directors of the two largest corporations to which I referred a few moments ago I find that many of these people are businessmen, well-known Canadian industrialists and financial leaders, who have close interests in many other corporations and areas of economic activity centred in Ontario.

• (12:40 p.m.)

There are regulations, now concerning the investments of loan companies. Loan companies may lend money on certain types of security, such as their assets, up to a total of 20 per cent of the value of securities issued by the company. The borrowing powers of the company are also subject to certain regulations. Up to the present time, the company could obtain money for lending purposes by issuing bonds and debentures and certain other securities or by receiving deposits up to an aggregate of the capital stock of the company and the cash on hand.

I was very interested to take note of some of the remarks of the minister who introduced this bill with respect to the expanded investment powers to be granted to loan companies. Again, it seems to me that the unrestricted expansion of these investment powers comes into direct conflict with some of the other enunciated objectives of the federal government in dealing with our present economic situation. The loan companies are to be given the power to invest in real estate. Their

borrowing powers are to be extended, and, in addition, amendments are proposed that would facilitate the amalgamation and purchase of similar companies. This of course can lead to a further concentration of economic power in Canada. We also note that the capacity of the company to borrow or to accept guaranteed trust funds is to be expanded from 15 times the excess of assets over liabilities to 20 times that amount. Again, it seems to me that the unrestricted expansion of these powers comes into direct conflict with the federal government's policies and objectives at the present time.

One other item of which careful note should be taken is the matter of interest rates. This matter of course has been the subject of extensive study by the Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee of the House. It is likely that they will be bringing their report before the House in the near future. But it seems to me that this legislation should also be considered in the light of interest rates as they affect the Canadian economy. The fact is that there are many businesses throughout Canada which are finding it difficult to finance with the present rate of interest rates, and those people who are in a weaker economic position find the present situation most trying and difficult. The fact is that large corporations, when they find it necessary to go beyond their own internal sources of funds, when they find that the funds that they can generate internally are now inadequate for their purposes and they have to go to the market in order to borrow money, have a very much easier time in many respects in dealing with their problems and in carrying out the necessary financing than people who do not have a large degree of economic power.

The minister gave an outline of some of the changes that are to be made in the legislation, and one of the items to which he made reference was the change to be made in the incorporation of loan companies. This item has already been commented upon in the debate on the trust companies bill, but I think the point should be emphasized again in dealing with loan companies. I think it is inconceivable that we should have, on the one hand, legislation that gives these companies even more powers than they have at the present time while, on the other hand, we take away from Parliament the power to examine their operations and to examine the proposed corporate structures before giving them the authority to carry on their operations within the Canadian economy. As a matter of fact, before letters patent are granted, if I understand the sections of the bill correctly, there is no requirement to disclose who is involved in establishing a new loan company with the exception of listing the five provisional directors. No doubt other information will be elicited when the company attempts to apply for incorporation, but it seems to me that we need to have a great deal more information, we need to have many more checks and controls, before this power of incorporation is taken away from Parliament.

We also find that there are to be changes with respect to the election of directors. We find now that directors can be elected at the annual meeting rather than by ballot of shareholders. This, of course, will further enable certain people and shareholders with large blocks of shares to obtain even greater power within the scope of these companies' operations. One of the provisions that the government will no doubt try to underline in some discussions is that three quarters of the directors must be Canadian residents and citizens. I think this is certainly a very feeble attempt to deal with the storm of protest that is arising concerning the problem of the foreign ownership of many sectors of the Canadian economy. Certainly, it will not deal with the problem adequately.

If I understand the provisions of the bill correctly, the powers of these companies are to be extended with respect to their ability to make investments in foreign loan companies. It seems to me that this is a point of some concern, because in dealing with the problem of foreign ownership in the Canadian economy one of the problems with which we have had to contend has been the considerable leakage of Canadian capital into other countries and away from Canada. Of course, this increases our need to resort to foreign sources of capital in order to bring about an acceptable level of economic development in Canada. Here we are giving these companies more powers to spend Canadian money and Canadian savings abroad than they possessed previously.

Other restrictions are also being removed. I already noted that the lending ratio is to be increased from 15 to 20 based on the excess of assets over liabilities.

There are a few other technical changes which are also proposed in the bill, but it seems to me that this bill, as it is presented by the government, is totally inadequate within the framework of the situation facing

the economy at present. I suggest that there are five areas of amendments that apply to this bill, and which I think should be considered by the government, before we can consider this legislation to be acceptable and to be anywhere near adequate to deal with our present problems.

The first requirement is that all financial institutions must be brought under the jurisdiction of the Bank of Canada. Second, we also need to give the Bank of Canada authority to alter the lending ratio of companies. Third, we need to ensure that the public interest is considered adequately by having a government appointee on each board of directors of these companies. Fourth, we should ensure that a certain percentage—possibly 15 per cent, which is one figure to which reference has been made—of the lending and investment funds of these companies be under public policy direction. Fifth, the Bank of Canada should have the power to regulate the rate of return and interest rates.

With respect to the rate of return, I was interested to note in the report of the Superintendent of Insurance that while the paid up capital stock of the loan companies at the end of 1968 amounted to slightly under $45 million, their gross profit during the year—that is before income taxes—amounted to $16,856,000, and that the dividends declared for the year amounted to $7,149,000.

• (12:50 p.m.)

It certainly seems to me that this is a handsome rate of return on the investments shareholders have made in these companies. It seems to me that we need to consider this legislation within the over-all framework of the needs and the problems faced by the Canadian economy at the present time. I have already taken note of the curious set of priorities exhibited by the Liberal government in introducing this piece of legislation ahead of many other items. It seems to me there are certainly some very serious contradictions involved. This represents a great change from the image the Liberal government tried to portray at one time.

Just recently a correspondent in my constituency sent me an advertisement that had been placed in the *Country Guide* in June of 1944. This advertisement was placed in the *Country Guide* by the government of Canada. It is entitled in very large letters, "I Had a Nightmare". The text of it reads:

I dreamed that I paid $5.00 for a haircut and $50.00 for a pair of cardboard shoes. I dreamed that we had no wartime controls on prices, profits or wages, and that we hadn't had the sense to organize the distribution of supplies all the way down the line—

I dreamed that because everyone was making more money and spending it, prices were skyrocketing.

—all the stores looked like "fire" sales—with people scrambling to buy before prices went still higher—

—panicky people were buying things they didn't need, and hoarding everything they could get their hands on—

I dreamed that everybody had to fight to get more money—and that in this mad race, wages and salaries were falling behind.

I dreamed the hand of everyone was against his neighbour, with each of us blaming the other fellow for his troubles.

—with everybody for himself—no matter what it cost in the long run—and no matter how it hurt the war effort.

Of course, each one of these statements was accompanied by a very suitable and appropriate cartoon. Then, in large letters again, his advertisement read, "Then—thank goodness—I woke up!" The text went on:

—to realize with relief that I live in a country where things are sane and stable—where the cost of living has been kept within bounds.

—to realize that prices and wages—production costs and selling prices—are inseparably linked together.

—to realize that without the safeguards that have headed off inflation, my nightmare might have become a reality!

—to remind myself that the danger is still pressing and that we must continue to hold firm—and that means everybody must play fair and do his part by not trying to get some temporary, fancied advantage at the expense of his fellow Canadians.

That is the conclusion of the text. Then, at the bottom we find this:

This advertisement is one of a series being issued by the Government of Canada to emphasize the importance of preventing further increases in the cost of living now and deflation later.

The Liberal government has come a long way since that time. I do not think, in many respects, that this has been to the advantage of people in Canada, but that is the type of image the government tried to portray at that time. I am sure some of the ministers opposite must blush now when remembering this type of ad that their own government inserted in newspapers and publications across Canada.

I could go on to discuss some of the very serious problems that face Canada in respect of foreign ownership. Just recently Professor Abraham Rotstein of the University of Toronto, Department of Political Economy, appeared before a committee of this House.

Let me quote from the *Globe and Mail* of January 21, 1970 as follows:

> Prof. Rotstein noted in testimony before the Commons Committee on External Affairs and National Defence that by 1968, U.S.-based, multi-national corporations had amassed $40-billion in long-term investment in the Canadian economy—80 per cent of the over-all foreign investment.

He went on to state:

> "The volume of U.S. investment is growing at a rapid rate and we can no longer allow the issue to be decided by default on our side."

He goes on to give an even fuller outline of some of the problems faced by Canada in dealing with the problem of foreign ownership and the fact that such a large proportion of Canada's industry, Canada's economy and Canadian resources are owned and controlled not by Canadian people, either publicly or privately, but by foreign interests.

Of course, there is no necessary criticism of foreigners, whether they be from the United States or some other country, for having come into Canada to invest their money, if we allow them to do so and place no restrictions or conditions on their entry to this country or on the manner in which they carry on their operations. We are the ones who are at fault. We are the ones who made the mistake. And we are the ones now who are going to have to correct some of the errors of the past.

It is quite evident in the legislation before us that the government is not prepared to take even the first small step necessary to regain control of our economy. It has been stated by many people from time to time that in the long run Canada will only be an outpost of the United States economic empire if this trend continues. This is a matter that should give us serious cause for concern within the structure and framework of the operations of the United States industrial empire. We will be somewhat comparable to some sections of the United States mid-west or far west. We will be in a situation comparable to some of the New England States where in fact they are falling behind the over-all rate of U.S. economic development.

Of course, if we allow this trend to continue, we will simply be one of the smaller hinterlands; one of the small outposts bound within the framework of this vast industrial structure. Thus, we do have to give serious consideration to this problem. We do have to reverse the trend. I suggest the only way to reverse this trend is through public action and through government action and intervention. The fact is that today it is necessary to take stronger action to deal with this problem and to bring it under control than would have been necessary during the past decade.

I have a few more comments I should like to make on this particular matter. Therefore, I should like to call it one o'clock.

Mr. McGrath: Take all the time you want.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until two o'clock this afternoon.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, prior to the adjournment at one o'clock I had spent some time discussing some of the provisions in the bill. I am in accord with the remarks of the minister when he stated that some of the details could be discussed at the committee stage. Of course, there are a number of housekeeping provisions in the bill which can be considered quite adequately at that time. Basically, these are provisions in respect of which we have no objection. Our basic objection to this bill is in respect of the context and framework within which it was introduced. This is the reason I want to place before Parliament our point of view. I am the only member of the New Democratic Party who will take part in this debate on this bill at this time. I believe it is necessary that we place our stand on the record. However, I have no wish to prolong the debate. I understand there is a desire in some quarters of the House to proceed with the debate on the proposed Salt Water Fish Corporation. This, of course, is a measure with which the members of our party are in full accord.

This is one example of orderly planning of our economy and our economic activities. It is very much parallel to the type of thing I have been talking about in respect of this bill; that is, the need for a basic change in the direction of our economy. This is the way we must move. When representatives of the various financial institutions appeared before the committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, I found it interesting that they were unanimous in saying they do not want any controls or any further controls. Why not? From their point of view and the point of view of the profitability of their operations I can understand their saying this, but when they urge this course of action upon the

House and the public I become suspicious. It is up to us to decide whether the people of Canada and members of Parliament are to be suckers and follow the line they advocate. I suggest the government is blind to the implication of the policies it is following and which are implied in the legislation before us. No attempt is made to exert any brakes on the growing corporate control of our economy and the growing foreign control of our economy which will affect Canada's future existence. In general, the economy of Canada cannot survive if we do not change our direction.

The economy in the world today is different from the past. A market economy approach is inadequate. The question now is who will manage and control the economy, and is there an alternative to the private corporate control. Is there to be a large measure of foreign control or will influence and control be exerted through government and a variety of other institutions? It is already pretty late in the day. The Barber commission report noted a number of implications in respect of farm implement costs and the control exercised over the farm machinery market. A relentless pressure results from advancing technology which makes it even more easy for larger corporations to obtain an even greater stranglehold on the economy. The government has the power to influence the situation if it has the guts. This bill leads members of this party to the conclusion that the government has no guts when it comes to safeguarding Canada's future welfare. The government is abdicating its responsibilities and the people of Canada will hold it to account for failing to live up to the responsibilities with which it has been entrusted.

Motion agreed, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, before the next item of government business is called I wonder if there might be a general disposition on the part of the House to bring on government order No. 56, which is Bill C-175, an act to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation?

• (2:10 p.m.)

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that there was a disposition to bring on this item after the four bills dealing with the amendment of legislation governing trust and loan companies, as well as insurance companies under federal supervision, have received second reading. I thought the idea was that the measure the hon. member referred to would come forward once this group of four bills had been dealt with by the House.

Perhaps I am in error, but in any event I do not see the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) in his seat as yet. If it is the disposition of the House to proceed with second reading of the bill to amend the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act and the companion bill to amend the Foreign Insurance Companies Act, and hon. members are interested in continuing to restrain their desire to debate to the extent that they have already, I am sure we will this afternoon get to the item in which the hon. member is interested.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADIAN AND BRITISH INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING INCORPORATION, OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill S-6, to amend the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act and other statutory provisions related to the subject-matter of certain of those amendments, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put on the records of the House an outline of the amendments to the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act, which are intended to be considered through this bill, with a view to providing material which can be the basis for discussions in the Finance Committee. Again, let me say the fact that I am not responding in detail to points raised by hon. members in the course of second reading of this and the preceding bills should not be interpreted in any way as implying that there are not things I have to say to deal with these particular points.

The Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act governs the activities of federally incorporated Canadian insurance companies and of British insurance companies transacting business in Canada. The main part of the

act applies to Canadian companies, and most of the amendments in the bill before you relate to such companies. Where appropriate these amendments are also made applicable to British companies subject to the act.

At the end of 1968 there were 129 Canadian insurance companies subject to this act and 68 British insurance companies. In addition, the act applied to 14 fraternal benefit societies. The Canadian companies had assets amounting to about $14 billion at the end of the year, and the British companies had assets amounting to $1.4 billion in trust in Canada to cover their Canadian liabilities.

This bill deals with three principle matters, namely, a change in the system of incorporating new companies and amending existing charters, the establishment of a better and more flexible system of controlling companies that are in financial difficulty, and the expanding and broadening of existing prohibitions against investments and loans where there may be a conflict of interests.

Dealing with the first matter, it may be noted that at the present time insurance companies may be incorporated federally only by special act of Parliament, and as a consequence any change in existing charters must be made by amending the special act. It is noted that because of pressure on parliamentary time in recent years, this requirement has resulted in delays from time to time in the making of decisions with respect to applications for new charters and the amendment of existing charters.

The bill proposes the adoption of a letters patent system of incorporating companies and also a letters patent system for amending charters whether the charters are granted by letters patent or special act. The letters patent would be issued by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) under his seal and office, thereby making use of the existing machinery for this purpose. However, before this could be done, the concurrence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) would be required. This will enable the application to be investigated by the Superintendent of Insurance in the same manner as is followed now where a private bill for this purpose is presented to Parliament.

Companies so incorporated would be incorporated pursuant to the authority granted in this amendment, and would be subject to the Canadian and British insurance Companies Act. This means that although the letters patent would be issued by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs there would be no change in the existing position whereby insurance companies find all their governing legislation under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act rather than under the Corporations Act.

It is also proposed to establish a letters patent procedure whereby a provincially incorporated company can be continued as a federally incorporated company subject to the concurrence of the home province.

Generally letters patent will be in a standard form as described in the bill, but it is proposed to permit enough flexibility to enable the applicants for a charter to provide restrictions on voting rights and maximum limits on share ownership if they so desire.

At present, initial capital requirements for insurance companies are specified in their own acts of incorporation and thus are considered by parliament on a case by case basis. With the proposed letters patent system of incorporation it is also proposed that a minimum capital and surplus requirement be included in the act. The requirement for a new life insurance company would be $2 million, and for a new fire and casualty insurance company would be $1.5 million.

The second main amendments would establish a more extensive and more flexible system to control companies that are in financial difficulties. The present provisions permit conditions to be inserted by the minister in a certificate of registry on renewal, and also provide for withdrawal of a certificate in certain extreme circumstances. The proposed amendments would be more flexible in that they would permit the minister to impose conditions in defined circumstances without waiting for the expiration of an existing certificate. It is also proposed that the Superintendent be required to report to the minister in any case where he considers that a company is in financial difficulties or where its condition is rapidly deteriorating.

The minister, if he concurs in the Superintendent's report after giving the company a chance to be heard, would be able to take one or more of three steps. He could insert conditions in the company's certificate; he could grant the company a period of time to remedy the defect, or he could instruct the Superintendent to take control of the company's assets.

In any case where the Superintendent has control of the assets of a company the minister would be empowered to request the Attorney General to seek a court order requiring

the Superintendent to take control of the company for rehabilitation for winding up. In the event of control of the assets or control of a company by the Superintendent, the expenses incurred by him would be assessed against companies registered for classes of business similar to those transacted by the company in question.

In addition, the Superintendent would be empowered to take temporary control of a company's assets in any case where assets are missing or are not properly accounted for.

The third main amendment would bar investments and loans where there might be a conflict of interest on the part of those who are in a position to influence the decision of a company with respect to its investments. This amendment would prohibit investment in or loans to major shareholders in addition to existing prohibitions against loans to officers, directors, and their immediate families. Furthermore, investments in or loans to any corporation would be prohibited if an officer, director or a major shareholder has a significant interest in that other corporation.

• (2:20 p.m.)

This amendment is sought in order to give more protection to policyholders against the possibility of investment decisions being influenced by other interests of persons in control.

Another important amendment would expand the power of life insurance companies to own subsidiaries for the purpose of enabling them to establish mutual investment funds and corporations that might carry on business ancillary to that of the insurance business. This will enable the life insurance companies to expand their services and to establish a reasonable competitive position with certain other financial institutions.

The power of life insurance companies to operate segregated funds would be somewhat expanded to increase the flexibility of this power.

Other important amendments would provide for a modified market value method for valuing securities of fire and casualty companies and would grant authority to Governor in Council to pass regulations dealing with the safekeeping of securities. Provisions would be included requiring a formal audit by auditors having similar qualifications to those under the Bank Act. This has not previously been in the legislation but in practice all companies have followed audit procedures.

[Mr. Gray.]

An amendment is proposed that would require notice to the Superintendent of Insurance of the transfer of ownership of any block of stock of an insurance company in excess of 10 per cent of any transfer of stock that would effect a change in control. This requirement would not confer a veto power on the transfer but would require 30 days prior notice together with full details concerning beneficial ownership.

Mortgage loans with respect to those paid by insurance companies are now limited in any particular case to a maximum of 75 per cent of the value of the property on which the loan is made. This limit may be exceeded at present if the excess is insured through a government agency. An amendment is proposed to permit the limit to be exceeded if the excess is insured through a policy of mortgage insurance issued by an insurance company registered under the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act or the Foreign Insurance Companies Act.

Another amendment would effect a transfer from Treasury Board to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) of certain discretionary authority and also from the Minister of Finance to the Receiver General of responsibility for the custody of securities on deposit.

Another amendment would establish an age limit of 75 years on eligibility to become a director of an insurance company. This parallels a similar amendment inserted in the Bank Act a few years ago. An amendment is proposed concerning the restriction on non-resident ownership of shares which would preserve the voting rights of a non-resident if those rights were acquired while a company was exempt from the restrictions. An amendment would change the definition of actuary for purposes of the act to require fellowship in the Canadian Institute of Actuaries. A number of other amendments are proposed to effect changes in wording and changes in a number of administrative procedures.

With respect to British companies, such of the foregoing amendments as are appropriate in the case of non-resident companies doing business in Canada would also be made applicable. In addition, there is a special amendment applicable to British companies in connection with investments of the assets of segregated funds. Segregated funds are established by some companies in connection with the issuance of variable contracts, that is, contracts that provide for a variation in benefits in accordance with the value of the assets in a segregated fund. A proposed amendment

would give British companies broader investment powers than at present with respect to the investment of assets in such segregated funds in order to put them in an equal competitive position with Canadian companies. Specifically, they would be able to invest in foreign corporate securities as well as Canadian corporate securities.

In general, the proposed amendments will improve the system of control and supervision of insurance companies for the protection of policyholders. They will also give some expansion in the powers of insurance companies to enable them to better serve their customers in their particular fields. The amendment concerning incorporation of companies and changes in charters will hopefully save parliamentary time and provide a simpler and quicker system for dealing with these matters but one which will continue to require the investigation and recommendation of the Superintendent of Insurance.

The bill also proposes amendments to three other acts. These are, in some respects, consequential upon some amendments that had been proposed to the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act. The first deals with the Canada Student Loans Act. It is proposed in the bill to enable insurance companies to make loans that are guaranteed by the government pursuant to the Canada Student Loans Act, the Farm Improvement Loans Act, and the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. Amendments were introduced at the current session to the last two of these acts to enable insurance companies, trust companies and loan companies to be designated as organizations that could make such guaranteed loans. It had been proposed to effect a similar amendment to the Canada Student Loans Act through this bill. However, the House will recall that an amendment for this purpose is also contained in the bill to amend the Canada Student Loans Act which was considered before Christmas, and which is now awaiting further consideration here after the committee hearings on it. This bill covers the same area, so when the Finance committee considers it the Committee may wish to make an appropriate change to avoid overlapping.

Amendments are also proposed that would affect the powers of banks subject to the Bank Act and Quebec savings banks subject to the Quebec Savings Banks Act. At present, both chartered and Quebec savings banks may make mortgage loans, but mortgages are limited to a maximum of 75 per cent of the value of the real estate where the mortgages are other than the National Housing Act mortgages. An amendment is proposed in this bill that would enable chartered banks and Quebec savings banks to make mortgage loans in excess of the 75 per cent maximum where the excess is insured under a policy of mortgage insurance by a registered insurance company.

I, therefore, ask the support of this House for this Bill at this second reading stage.

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us in the form of Bill, S-6, concerns amendments to an act governing the British Insurance Companies Act. The amendments are both technical and detailed. It is my feeling that we can hardly deal with the details of this proposal without first taking a look at them.

I note that this bill has, among its many parts, reference to insurance against accident and death and it also deals with other than life insurance. But, Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak for a few moments today on a phase of insurance which presents the greatest problem and frustration to Canadians.

Car insurance has been well described elsewhere as a service with 120 million dissatisfied customers. Indeed, this very week in the House there have been proposals from members on this side that the government should investigate the continual increase in car insurance rates. A few days ago the hon. Leader of my party, the New Democratic Party, raised a question with the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) as to what consideration was being given to intervention in the car insurance field with the idea of setting up car insurance as a federally operated business.

I should like to put a few points on record now that we have this insurance legislation before us. In my opinion, car insurance is an integral part of the over-all national picture with regard to traffic safety. I say this because we have 150,000 traffic casualties a year in Canada, including no less than 5,000 fatalities. This means 100 Canadians are slain every week. The economic toll of highway traffic injuries and repairs amounts to about $1 billion every 12 months. Of this $1 billion, car insurance costs about $600 million. That is the amount Canadians spend every 12 months to protect themselves from the war on the highways.

Regarding car insurance premiums, of every dollar spent Canadians recover only

about 67 cents. I think that one of the first matters which the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs should investigate in the field of insurance is car insurance rates. In my mind there is no doubt at all that the importance of car insurance goes far beyond the realm of private profit and that it should, as are car licence and traffic regulations, be handled by the public for the benefit of drivers and pedestrians.

• (2:30 p.m.)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I quote briefly from a recent Canadian press story that deals with the insurance business in Saskatchewan. It says that the Saskatchewan government's insurance plan has never lost money since its inception in 1946. The plan was passed in the Saskatchewan Legislature by the CCF, predecessor of the NDP. In 1968 the surplus for that year was over $150,000. At any rate, a great surplus has been accumulated since the plan began in 1946. The present Minister of Highways in the Liberal government of Saskatchewan, Dave Boldt, is no supporter of the NDP, I am sure; but he stated recently that the insurance office pays its own taxes and grants and that private insurance firms in Saskatchewan have been asked but have never tried to submit a better plan. Before resuming my seat, I urge the government to examine all matters pertaining to car insurance rates and to see whether there is a possibility of operating the car insurance business under some sort of federally established agency.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, some comments I made on an earlier bill also apply to insurance companies. I was most interested in the changes the minister outlined, and I agree that most of those changes are worth while. But he has not touched on the major problem of ensuring that moneys accumulated by Canadian citizens in the form of insurance, and held by insurance companies, shall be used for the advantage and benefit of Canadian citizens. Insurance companies hold vast sums of money which has been contributed by Canadian citizens, and unless this money is used for the benefit of, and to the advantage of, Canadians we cannot really say that insurance companies in this country are acting as agents of the Canadian people or in their best interests.

There are incorporated in this country under federal or provincial charters probably between 1,000 and 3,000 insurance companies, many of them operating in exactly the same fields as other companies. I think the minister will agree when I say that there seems to be little competition in this field. Many different companies provide the same type of insurance. It seems that every time a new company is incorporated you see less rather than more competition in the insurance field. Why do I say that, Mr. Speaker? Let me explain.

If there were two insurance companies in the country, both offering the same kind of insurance, you could go to Company A or Company B, and their rates would be competitive. But when you see a proliferation of companies, all involved in the same basic field, it seems that those companies join together and set rates. There is nothing the insurance buyer can do about it. Their rates appear to be exactly the same. When I go to my insurance agent and want to buy fire insurance, he opens the drawer in which he keeps the files of 50-odd companies. He appears to have some kind of unwritten agreement with those companies under which he will work through his files from front to back and, when he has reached the back of the drawer, return to the file in front. Some buyers of insurance will be interested in what happens to their insurance premiums although most will not, being only interested in buying an insurance policy. Frankly, it does not matter to me with which company the agent may place my insurance because the rates are all the same, as are the benefits.

Insurance companies in this country do not insure us against all risks. By that I mean if you want to buy insurance to cover a unique risk, you will have to go to Lloyds of London. If you plan on holding a large outdoor barbeque and want to insure against the possibility of rain, you will have to go to Lloyds of London because no Canadian company will accept the risk. Our insurance companies may say that they are willing to provide coverage against all sorts of new risks that arise, but they do not do that.

The government also has the obligation of informing the Canadian public what insurance is really essential. It must to some extent help to change the public's attitude towards insurance. With the advent of social benefit programs, the Canada Pension Plan and other pension plans, certain types of insurance have become less and less valuable. The government must tell our people just what is the role of the insurance industry, and what the role of the private entrepreneur in this field is. I say that because in this country we seem to be working at cross purposes. Let me cite an example, Mr. Speaker.

A few years ago a man working in a northern mine died and left a widow who was either 46 or 47 years old and two children aged 13 and 14. He left her an insurance policy worth $5,000. What happened? She could not obtain mother's allowance because she had too much money; also, because she had too much in the bank she was not eligible for certain social security benefits. She was told to use up her $5,000. That is what she did; as a matter of fact, her money will run out this month. In the meantime, her kids have grown up. They are beyond the age at which she will be eligible for mother's allowance. That $5,000 did her no good. If she had not had it she would have been eligible to receive benefits under provincial and federal schemes; she would have received additional allowances for her children and, after her children were grown up, no doubt would have been eligible to receive further benefits under welfare schemes.

As things now stand, she will have to apply for municipal welfare. Clearly, that $5,000 has been subtracted from that family's standard of living. By that I mean, Mr. Speaker, that if the husband had not left this $5,000 insurance policy his wife and family would not have had to forgo forms of social assistance which would have been available to them. The wife therefore lost both ways; she lost while the husband was saving to pay the premiums on the policy, and she lost after he died because the $5,000 precluded her receiving the benefits I have mentioned. Clearly, the needs of our people in a changing society are different and I should think that any insurance agent who tries to sell endownment policies is not being quite fair.

• (2:40 p.m.)

While there is still a great need for term and other insurance, the government, having gone into this matter, has an obligation to relate what they do in that field to the whole field of insurance. The minister is very interested in protecting shareholders. He is also interested in protecting loans and in having them secured. If you have money that you can invest in an insurance company you do not have to worry because having stock in an insurance company is the same as being able to print money.

What about the people who have to be protected? My colleague mentioned the matter of automobile insurance. Is it not time this government looked into the field of automobile insurance, at least to the extent of taking a look at third party liability automobile insurance? If two cars are involved in an accident and a pedestrian is struck, it cannot be said that the pedestrian had anything to do with the accident. He was merely a third party. The government should make it mandatory for everyone to carry this third party liability insurance. They may not be interested in protecting the vehicles involved, but innocent third parties should be protected.

In many fields we have not given any consideration to these people, but have left this up to the insurance companies. Some automobile companies have been autocratic. I wish to refer to one. When I mentioned the name of Allstate Insurance this morning I was asked if I was being fair. I wish to refer to two letters and let members judge whether I am being fair. They raise a problem not dealt with by the minister in this bill. This is the problem. If an insurance decides it does not want to pay, it says to the customer, here is your money back; you are no longer insured with us and you were not insured at the time of the accident. However, there is legislation to the effect that the company has a partial liability if it cancels a policy.

Mr. Osler: Will the hon. member permit a question? I am not quite sure to what the hon. member is alluding, but is it not a fact that insurance companies have to give so many days statutory notice by registered letter before cancellation?

Mr. Peters: That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. I will read the letter because I think it explains the situation better than I can. If you have carried insurance with a company for a period of time it is true they must give you 30 days' notice of cancellation. It can be cancelled for many reasons. It can be cancelled on moral grounds.

Some hon. members will recall the famous cow case which was discussed at great length for a number of years. The government had a problem with a certain farmer. This farmer fought back in many ways, including threatening the health of the then Minister of Justice. After reading some of these reports, the insurance company decided to immediately cancel the insurance on the farmer's barn. The usual 30 days' notice was not given because the policy was being cancelled on moral grounds. The policy was eventually reinstated because the company did not have the right to do this.

The argument of the insurance company was that the farmer was going off his rocker

and, as a result, might burn his barn. This could have been a possibility. However, the barn could also have been struck by lightning or children could have set it on fire. The risk was no greater then than it had been the day previous. The Superintendent of Insurance eventually forced the company to reinstate the policy.

Mr. Osler: May I be permitted to ask another question? Why was the Superintendent of Insurance permitted to do so? It seems to me the only grounds he would have for action would be the statutory conditions in the policy to which both the company and the man who held the policy subscribed at the time the policy was issued. It is a formal contract. Those statutory conditions will vary from province to province, but in the cases of which I have heard relating to automobile insurance, which is what the hon. member is talking about at this time, there is a condition that a registered letter must be sent so many days prior to cancellation. If not, I suggest any province that has been so lax in its duty should be checked up on that subject.

Mr. Peters: This is probably true, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Osler: I know it is true. I was in the business for 30 years.

Mr. Peters: The member says he knows it is true because he was in the business for 30 years. I presume he represented somewhere between 1 to 50 companies. I am not referring to all insurance companies at this time because they do not all react in the same way. Most contracts are standard. The agent buys the form and goes into the insurance business, but they do not all act in the same way.

Mr. Osler: That is why you need a broker, not an agent.

Mr. Peters: That may be true. Possibly we should get rid of the agents. I am only dealing with the problem as I know it. I do not even know the name of the company with whom I have my fire insurance. I pay a premium once every three years, and that is all I know about it.

I own an old building on the highway, a former school. It has become an eyesore. It does not have much value, but it would be expensive to tear it down. When I purchased this school from the school board I felt I should insure it because I was of the opinion that if you owned something of value it should be insured. I spoke to my insurance agent about this. I suggested he decide the amount for which the building should be insured and the premium. He said he would not insure it because if it burned down, then people would say that I burned it down and there would be a lot of trouble. He advised me not to insure the building. I have had the building for ten years now and it still is not insured. Individual circumstances have a great deal to do with what happens.

I wish to quote from a letter written in 1969 to the Superintendent of Insurance in Toronto. I quote:

> In August 1953 I was involved in a two car accident on Highway 11, just south of Trout Creek, Ontario. The other car was driven by a Mr. Archie Haggerty of Aitikokan, Ont., and he had as a passenger his sister-in-law, Mrs. Nellie Haggerty of Kirkland Lake, Ontario. Some time after this the plaintiffs wrote to me through their lawyer, Mr. G. Wallace of North Bay, asking for an out of court settlement of $35,000. Allstate Insurance with whom I carried a P.L. and P.D. policy for $100,000 sent a "very friendly" man around to see me and get me to sign statements. Soon after this I received a cheque from Allstate Insurance for the full amount of the premium that I had paid, with a statement to the effect that they were not covering me since I had made a false statement when I applied for the insurance.
>
> I immediately contacted a lawyer, Mr. P. B. C. Pepper of 320 Bay St. Toronto. Mr. Pepper told me that I should have talked to him before talking to the adjuster. Mr. Pepper then told me that he would send the cheque back to Allstate and that as far as I was concerned there was no false statement. Also he said that the insurance company was bound by law to pay a basic $11,000, the amount that the Unsatisfied Judgment would otherwise have paid at that time, if I had carried no insurance.
>
> I had bought insurance from Allstate when they first came to Canada, with Simpson Sears. There was a front page news article in the *Toronto Star* telling of Allstate selling insurance at large discount prices. People were lined up in Simpson's basement and the salesmen were filling out the forms as quickly as possible. When asked if I had been involved in any accidents I mentioned them, they were minor accidents. In the rush I forgot to mention a small accident for which I was not to blame, but for which we had settled 50-50 on the advice of the insurance company with whom I was insured at the time. Since the accident occurred in Sudbury it would have been more expensive to pursue the case than to fix the car.
>
> Allstate then appointed a lawyer, Brendan O'Brien Q.C., 101 Richmond St. West, Toronto. They also had a Toronto doctor in Court in North Bay, where the action occurred in 1955, to testify that the injuries sustained by the plaintiffs would not leave any permanent disabilities. Before I took the stand in court Mr. O'Brien made a statement to the effect that I had no reason to conceal the truth in my evidence since I was fully insured with Allstate.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Incidentally, he was Allstate's lawyer.

The judgment was for $19,400 against me. I was sure that Allstate would pay that amount. Mr. Pepper did not attend this court hearing. He told me that it would not be necessary since he was sure the lawyer for Allstate would work as hard as possible to keep the amount of judgment as low as possible.

I do not remember hearing anything more of this case until 1957. At that time the plaintiffs sought to have me examined as a judgment debtor. Mr. Pepper appeared in court and refused to have me examined on the grounds that I was insured and that the insurers had paid a sum of money into court and that the plaintiffs accepted that sum of money. I found out through my present lawyer, Mr. Dalton Dean, Q.C. of Haileybury, Ont. that the plaintiffs sued Allstate some time after the court judgment case, and according to Mr. Dean were given some $11,800 as partial payment.

The next time I heard from Mr. Pepper was by letter about the end of 1958. He said 'it is almost a year now since I last heard from the plaintiffs' and he believed in letting sleeping dogs lie. He enclosed his account at that time. Mr. Dean has that letter.

The letter continues:

I heard nothing more about the matter. Actually I had forgotten the whole thing. But last August the sheriff from the Haileybury court came here to serve me with a paper to appear at a special examiners court as a judgment debtor. I was attending a teachers' course in Toronto at the time. My wife called me there and I attempted to see Mr. Pepper.

The letter goes on to describe how he was served with papers to appear for examination and so on. It ends:

I feel I was not fully informed of all facts and was misled. I also think I should have been a party to the court action taken against Allstate, since the judgment was against me. Now Mrs. Haggarty's lawyer says that the amount of money paid into court was accepted as partial payment. But according to Mr. Pepper's letter of January 6, 1958 they accepted moneys paid into court by the insurers—no mention of partial payment.

A friend who is an insurance adjuster suggested I write to you for advice. He could not believe such a case could develop until I mentioned the word Allstate. I am enclosing some of the correspondence concerning the case.

A considerable amount of correspondence was enclosed. I raise this matter now because it is typical of three or four cases of a similar nature which are brought to my attention every year. The Superintendent of Insurance can become involved—I agree he has some say—but these cases always raised problems after an accident had occurred. After an accident has occurred, a company will often say: We cancelled your insurance on moral grounds, or because of a false statement, or because of an omission to supply certain particulars; here is your money back; you are no longer insured. When this happens, of course, it is difficult, if not impossible, to be insured with anyone else.

I remember that when Allstate came to Canada I applied for insurance with them. They were inviting applications, but they sent them all back with the comment: We cannot accept your application for insurance because you live in northern Ontario. They were really saying that they did not intend to insure anyone in northern Ontario. The difficulty is that having received a letter of this kind from Allstate, it becomes much more difficult to get insurance from another company. We have been supervising this insurance field as well as we can, I suppose. It is, of course, essential that every driver should be insured. It is essential that everyone who drives a car should know that the other guy has satisfactory insurance. So, insurance will have to be compulsory. It may be that the federal government should enter the field of automobile insurance at least to the extent of reinsuring motorists. It might set up some agency which would make possible the balancing out of car insurance costs across the country. This is an essential service and members of Parliament should interest themselves in this idea in order that we might devise some sensible solution to a vexing problem.

The decision has been made to impose safety standards in connection with the manufacture of automobiles and it is my hope that this principle will be applied to snowmobiles as well. Since in so many cases the requirement to be adequately insured is mandatory, I believe arrangements should be made for insurance to be provided at a reasonable price to all.

It is my opinion that the committee should take a close look at some of the difficulties which have arisen in the insurance field, bearing in mind certain of the judgments which have been handed down. No doubt the difficulties to which I have drawn attention are capable of solution. Some companies do not create these difficulties. Others do, yet all these companies are covered by the same legislation. Changes could be made to eliminate the unfairness against the individual which is sometimes shown. I hope the minister will discuss with the Superintendent of Insurance some of the steps which could be taken to make the provision of insurance much more equitable. As I say, insurance is, in most cases, mandatory. Most of us cannot dispense with it. We should therefore be able

to carry satisfactory insurance at the lowest possible cost and with the least possibility of abuse.

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

FOREIGN INSURANCE COMPANIES ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING REGISTRATION, OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill S-7, to amend the Foreign Insurance Companies Act be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: This bill might be considered as a companion to Bill S-35. It is applicable to foreign insurance companies transacting business in Canada on a branch basis.

The effect of the act is to apply the same requirements to foreign companies as are made applicable to British companies pursuant to Part VIII of the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act. The amendments proposed in Bill S-7 are in every respect parallel to those made applicable to British companies pursuant to Bill S-6. They represent, therefore, appropriate adaptations of the amendments proposed in connection with Canadian companies, supplemented by an expansion of investment powers in connection with the operation of segregated funds in order to give foreign companies the same powers in this respect as Canadian companies.

The important amendments are those which expand the power to operate segregated funds and give greater and more flexible control to the Superintendent in the case of companies which are in financial difficulty. These would enable the Superintendent to take control of the company's assets in Canada on direction by the minister and would enable application to be made to a court for authority by the Superintendent to take control of the company's business in Canada for the purpose of its rehabilitation or winding up.

Changes in the investment powers of Canadian companies would be paralleled in this act by changes in the types of assets which may be held in Canada to cover Canadian liabilities.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

[Mr. Peters.]

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now proceed to government order No. 17, second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry of Bill C-133, an act to repeal the Deep Sea Fisheries Act.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. Would the House agree to proceed with government order No. 56, second reading of Bill C-175, an act to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation? I will tell you the reason for making this request, Mr. Speaker, before the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gray) jumps to his feet.

There is urgency in getting this bill on its legislative way, because it is now January 23 and the industry is almost in a state of suspended animation pending the consequences that would flow from this legislation. I can assure hon. members that there is urgency attached to getting this bill out of the way and I ask that the House consent to dealing with it now. Hon. members might also be willing to give unanimous consent to forgoing private members' hour, thus allowing us two full hours for debate of the bill.

Mr. Anderson: I oppose that suggestion, Mr. Speaker. There are three bills coming forward in a certain order. We certainly have time available this afternoon, and I hope it will be possible to pass all three before five o'clock. The other bills are of equal importance to some hon. members, and I object to changing their order.

Mr. McGrath: Where is the minister?

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

DEEP SEA FISHERIES ACT

PROVISION FOR REPEAL

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved that Bill C-133, to repeal the Deep Sea Fisheries Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now proceed to item No. 18 on the order paper, second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry of Bill C-134, an act to amend the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but you moved so fast on Bill C-133 that I did not have time to make some comments on it.

Mr. Monteith: Mr. Speaker, I think it is only logical that we should wait at least a moment or two until the minister gets here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not know whether I can do very much about what has happened, but I am certainly prepared to follow the wish of the House.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. A short time ago the minister was in the House until the luncheon adjournment at one o'clock. His parliamentary secretary was also here for most of the sitting. Both hon. gentlemen are absent from the House, notwithstanding the fact that these three important bills are up for discussion. I think the minister should be here.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The minister has just arrived. Bill C-134 has been called.

Mr. Crouse: No, Mr. Speaker, we have not yet had an explanation for bringing Bill C-133 before the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have followed the traditional procedure, long established in reading the title of the bill and calling for its approval or otherwise of this House. No hon. member rose at the time, and I am afraid the matter is disposed of.

Mr. Crouse: I then ask that the matter be not disposed of at this time, because to some 11,000 fishermen on the east coast it is a very important matter. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) was not in the House at the time and no explanation was given for introducing the bill in this manner. I submit that the House is entitled to an opportunity to comment on the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. There is, of course, an avenue open to the House at the moment. If all members of the House give unanimous consent, the House can revert to an earlier point in our proceedings. This matter is entirely up to the House. So far there has been nothing untoward with the procedure we have followed. On the suggestion of the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), I am prepared to put the question to the House to revert back to a previous item of business, but it would require the unanimous consent of the House. Is it so agreed?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Crouse: The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry cannot move the motion; he was not in the House to give an explanation of this particular measure.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Perhaps I can clarify the matter. Bill C-134 has been called as the next order of government business. I am about to put that motion, which is the standard practice. I will put the motion unless there are points of order, which I am prepared to hear points of order on this question. If it is a question of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) commenting on the bill, perhaps that matter can be raised when the motion has been put. That seems to me to be the correct procedure.

Mr. Monteith: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would have thought the minister would have comments to make on Bill C-133.

An hon. Member: It was passed by the House and has now gone to the committee.

Mr. Barnett: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, relating to the business of the House. Earlier today the government leader announced that three bills concerning fisheries matters were to be dealt with next Wednesday. Then, as I understood it, one of the members from Newfoundland raised the question that if the finance bills were dealt with today, we might proceed with Bill C-175.

I may have misunderstood him, but at that point agreement was indicated by the government House leader who said that if the finance bills were completed we could proceed with Bill C-175 today. No reference was made to dealing with the other fisheries bills. Perhaps this is the reason for the confusion which appears to have arisen. Apparently, just before I came into the House one of the three fisheries bills was dealt with and passed

without debate. Some of us were not aware that these bills were going to be passed and were caught off balance on this account.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on the point of order which has been raised by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett). As I recall the sequence of events, this morning a request was made by members of the opposition to take up the fisheries bills, and it was stated by the House leader that if the House were to dispose of the financial bills we would be in a position this afternoon to move on to the fisheries bills standing as items Nos. 17, 18 and 56 on the Order Paper. The financial bills were disposed of, and item No. 17 on the order paper was called. That bill was passed without debate. It was called while the minister was in the House and it was passed without debate and sent to the committee.

Mr. Peters: The minister was not in the House then.

Mr. Deachman: The House then moved to order No. 18, in logical sequence, and that is the bill we are taking up now. With regard to the protest against the passage of Bill C-133 without debate, there is nothing in our rules that calls upon us to debate a bill if the House agrees to carry it, which is what the House did.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have dealt with that matter and I do not think we can do other than what I attempted or do on behalf of the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), namely, seek the unanimous consent of the House to revert to where we were in respect of the business of the House. That request was rejected by the House, so there is no question of discussing Bill C-133 now. If there is any question about our order of business at this point, and there is discussion in which the House would like to engage, I am prepared to allow some latitude. But as hon. members know, the government has the prerogative of calling the order of business.

• (3:10 p.m.)

From time to time the order of business is negotiated between the House Leaders. As I understand it, unless a member of the government is prepared to say something to the contrary, the government has called Bill C-134. It seems to me that the only course of action available to the Chair at this point is to put the motion, and if there is discussion arising out of it that would be the normal procedure. I do not see that I am entitled to do anything other than put the motion. Does the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) wish to rise on a point of order?

Mr. McGrath: Just to set the record straight, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) was substantially correct in the point of order he raised. I did specify in my request that the House deal with government order No. 56. I went on to state that government order No. 56 was in fact in reference to Bill C-175. There was general agreement by the government to that proposal. The government is now trying to pull a fast one on us. That is substantially what has happened.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think at this point I must put the motion that has been called by the government.

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker—

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

Mr. Crouse: Yes, I am rising on the point of order that has been raised. The hon. member for Windsor West (Mr. Gray) in his earlier comments agreed that following the passage of the business for this afternoon we would deal with the Saltfish Corporation, Bill C-175.

I think if Your Honour will check the record he will find that this was the understanding given hon. members by the hon. member for Windsor West in reply to questions that we raised earlier in the day about the order of business.

The passing of Bill C-133 without debate was totally unexpected. I submit that Your Honour moved in a manner that did not give us an opportunity to comment on that bill.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Crouse: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking on the point of order. The minister of Fisheries was not in the House at the time; neither was his parliamentary secretary. There are 11,000 fishermen in Atlantic Canada who would like to know why this fishing bounty is being removed without just cause. Those of us who represent these fishermen would like to express on the floor of this House our views regarding the arbitrary manner in which this measure has been brought forward.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Crouse: There has been no explanation by the minister and no chance for us to debate the proposal.

An hon. Member: You got up too late.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: You were not listening.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Crouse: We were listening to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gray) who agreed to deal with Bill C-175.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gray) rising on the same point of order?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Newfoundland—

Mr. McGrath: For St. John's East, and it is pronounced "Newfoundland." It rhymes with "understand."

Mr. Gray: I am glad the hon. member has said that because I feel he will now be able to follow the point I am trying to make in what I hope is a conciliatory fashion. When I responded to the first point I was not aware that there was a series of three bills on the Order Paper, one after the other, dealing with fisheries matters. I was not aware of the exact sequence.

It was not my intention to suggest to the House that it necessarily proceed with order No. 56, a measure to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, before the other two. I regret that I may have given that impression, but it was not based on a complete recollection or understanding of the state of the Order Paper. Perhaps this is why there is some difficulty or misunderstanding. If I contributed to that misunderstanding, I certainly apologize.

With respect to these bills, I appreciate the desire of hon. members to say something about these two measures which precede the one on the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. On this, however, I can only refer hon. members to the consideration by my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis), and other hon. members of the House as well as the considerations raised by the Chair in respect of the rules.

Mr. Comeau: Mr. Speaker, every time we try to save time, we waste time. I wonder whether the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) would have any objection to our dealing with Bill C-175. Perhaps we could dispose of it this afternoon with co-operation from this side of the House. Perhaps we could waive private members' hour and deal with Bill C-134 next week, or this afternoon if there is time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is in a rather difficult position. All I can do is proceed with the item that has been called. That is the limit of my responsibility, and that is as far as I am prepared to go. If the government wants to change the order of business, that is its prerogative under the Standing Orders. Unless I am advised to the contrary or am given evidence to the contrary, I shall put the motion that has been called.

Mr. Davis: Perhaps I should say a word, Mr. Speaker. My understanding all along was that the bills would proceed in the order in which they appear on the Order Paper, namely, Bill C-133, Bill C-134 and Bill C-175. I see no reason for changing that order now. These matters will be going to a committee of the House of Commons, on which hon. members of all parties will be represented. The bills will then return to the House. If hon. members have any questions or want any further elaboration or modification of the bills in any way, they will have ample opportunity to express their views.

Mr. McGrath: Do without the House of Commons altogether; that is what you are asking.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Crouse: Are we on Bill C-134?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am about to put the motion called by the Table, Bill C-134.

Mr. Crouse: I wish to speak on Bill C-134.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When I put the motion I will recognize the hon. member.

Mr. Crouse: This is what happened in respect of Bill C-133; we did not get a chance to speak on it.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COASTAL FISHERIES PROTECTION ACT

INCLUSION OF SERVICE AND SUPPLY VESSELS

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved that Bill C-134, to amend the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, be read the

second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

He said: Mr. Speaker, like the preceding bill this measure involves a very minor change in our fisheries legislation. This act will include in the definition of fisheries vessels, supply vessels. The main concern here is to ensure that fisheries supply vessels, for example those supplying large Russian, Japanese or East German fishing fleets, will come under the same scrutiny as other fishing vessels when they come into our Canadian fishing ports.

I know there is real concern, in a number of our east coast ports, notably St. John's, Newfoundland and Halifax, Nova Scotia, that this amendment to the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act will limit the access that foreign fishing fleets have to our ports and cut off, therefore, that business in respect of supplying foreign fishing vessels on our east coast. This is not the case.

There is no intention, nor has there ever been, of cutting back on this important source of livelihood of many people, particularly those at our east coast fishing ports. We do have a problem, and the reason for this legislation relates to that problem on Canada's west coast. It is possible for supply vessels to come into the port of Vancouver, for example, and leave again without in any way coming under the provisions of our Coastal Fisheries Protection Act.

If we have the authority to exclude such vessels, and we may or may not exclude them, we will then have a bargaining lever we can use with Russia and other countries which operate large fishing fleets, much as the United States now has. The bargaining lever is this, "If we allow you to use our ports to obtain fresh water, fuel and food, we want you to stay off certain fishing banks which you have already overfished," and so on. We do not have this lever on the west coast at the moment, but we would like to have it.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I repeat that the bill is not designed to in any way reduce the service functions provided by many of our east coast communities, but is designed to give us some leverage in bargaining with foreign fishing fleets on the west coast. Were we to endeavour to limit our supply function on the east coast, we would be exposed to the danger of foreign fishing fleets moving on, for example, to St. Pierre and Miquelon. We would be vulnerable in that respect. We think the best thing is to leave our east ports open to perform this supply function. I hope hon. gentlemen on both sides will realize this is a relatively minor issue. We are proposing an amendment, a minor amendment to an important act which governs the action of large foreign fishing fleets off our west coast.

[Mr. Davis.]

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the explanation given by the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) in outlining the reasons for the introduction of Bill C-134, to amend the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act. Although the wording of the bill is very brief, its application will have a considerable effect on a large number of people and at the same time will establish a new concept in international relations.

In my view this action to amend the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act is nothing more than a government move without any principle. This is simply another piece of window-dressing, a piece of paper which is designed to confuse and delude the public into the belief that the government is doing something and is taking swift and stern action to protect the fisheries resources on both coasts. Nothing could be further from the truth.

This type of action is not new to this government. We heard the same thing away back in 1964 when the then Secretary of State for External Affairs was speaking on a bill to establish Canada's Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act. Upon the passage of that legislation the government promised the immediate establishment of geographical co-ordinates along our coasts and the drawing of base lines protecting our shores and sealing off the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy as conservation areas for the development of our fishery resources.

No one could make promises in more convincing tones than the Hon. Paul Martin, then Secretary of State for External Affairs. On May 20, 1964, as reported at page 3409 of *Hansard,* he said:

> First, the bill establishes the fishing zones of Canada at 12 miles from the coast line. When it is passed by parliament and proclaimed, Canada will have a fishing zone in the 3 to 12 mile area off our coast line. This, in the view of the government, is a fundamental achievement of the bill. It is not enabling legislation in this respect. On proclamation, the 12 mile fishing zone will be established. I must emphasize there is no doubt, and there can be no doubt, about this point.

There may not have been any doubt in the minister's mind when he made that statement, and now that he is resting comfortably in the other place we know that all his doubts

and fears have vanished and he could not care less about our depleted fishery resources. But I would point out to you, sir, that we are now in the year 1970 and the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy on the east coast, and Dixon entrance and Queen Charlotte Sound on the west coast are not yet closed to foreign fishing fleets.

In all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that our fishermen look with mistrust and suspicion at any proposals put forward for their benefit by this Liberal administration? The record of broken promises, hopes raised and destroyed, fishing resources depleted as a result of Liberal procrastination is there for everyone to see. The record of the Liberal administration since 1963 in relation to our fishermen and their problems is abominable.

What did the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) say as recently as November 2 when speaking in the Throne Speech debate? He warned this House, as recorded at page 414 of *Hansard,* that the North Atlantic fisheries resources of Canada are in grave danger of "overfishing" by foreign fishing fleets. He said:

> The total fishing effort, the international fishing effort in the North Atlantic, has more than doubled over the past decade.

He also told us that just beyond the 12-mile limit off the west coast of Vancouver Island he saw during the past summer a Russian fleet of 40 giant trawlers, every one of which was bigger than a British Columbia ferry. The minister painted a graphic wordpicture of the danger that the east and west coast fisheries resources might soon be completely destroyed by foreign fishing fleets.

This is a serious economic problem covering vast sections of our nation on both the east and west coasts; it is a problem which affects the livelihood of large numbers of our people, who by reason of their location and education are unable to move or qualify for any employment other than fishing. Faced with this serious situation, what does the government plan to do? It proposes to enact Bill C-134.

Let us look carefully at this proposal. Under the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act as it now stands, no foreign fishing vessel may enter Canadian fisheries waters unless authorized to do so by regulation under the act, by any other law of Canada, or by treaty. No person from a foreign fishing vessel may buy supplies in Canada unless similarly authorized.

In essence, the act has two methods of protecting Canadian fishing grounds. The first, or chief method is by preventing foreign fishing vessels from entering Canadian fishing grounds, or, alternatively, permitting them to enter but making them subject to Canadian fisheries laws or otherwise restricting their methods of operation. The second method is incidental to the main method, which is forbidding the foreign fishing vessels from coming into Canadian ports for the purpose of selling their catch or buying provisions or water.

In my view, the proposed amendment is an insipid and questionable attempt to strengthen the means of control. No one will deny that it is highly desirable to have the fishing operations of foreign fleets curtailed on both coasts. But there is a right way and a wrong way to do it, and in my opinion the method proposed will do nothing to alleviate the present situation and may well, in fact, compound the problem.

The government apparently interprets the wording of the act as meaning that a supply ship of a foreign fishing fleet is not and cannot be classed as a fishing vessel, and therefore it has the right, under maritime law, to come into a Canadian port and take on supplies for a foreign fishing fleet that is despoiling Canadian fishing grounds, without the necessity of getting a permit or being subject to being refused a permit.

The government now asks this House to amend the meaning of "fishing vessel" as defined in the act to include a supply ship of a foreign fishing fleet. By this action the government hopes to prevent or control the complete destruction of our fisheries resources by refusing to provision supply ships of foreign fishing vessels, or perhaps get them to agree to observe our conservation laws in return for provisioning them.

This measure can only be classified as a childish solution of what is in effect a man-sized problem. The proposed legislation reminds me of the actions of a disgruntled little boy who takes his bat and ball and walks out of the ball game when he does not get his own way. This type of action never has worked, and it will not work now because the ball game will still go on.

In my opinion, the government is using this amendment as an excuse for its inaction in establishing over-all base lines around our coast and as an excuse for its inaction in dealing with international fishing problems

which have a considerable bearing on the well-being of Canadian fishermen.

I believe the present wording of the act which defines "fishing vessel" is sufficiently wide to class a supply ship of a fishing fleet as also a fishing vessel. After all, the present definition is not exclusive or exhaustive. It says that a fishing vessel "includes"—not "is" or "means"—"any ship or boat or other description of vessel used in or equipped for fishing or processing or transporting fish or marine plants."

• (3:30 p.m.)

Surely, a supply ship of a fishing fleet is a vessel that is necessary and incidental to a number of fishing vessels, and can therefore be classed as a fishing vessel. After all, a supply vessel has merely more water-tanks and more storerooms than an ordinary fishing vessel.

The corresponding conclusion that could be drawn from the government's interpretation is that fishing vessels that are watered and provisioned by a supply ship are not really fishing vessels because they do not carry adequate water and provision facilities with which to complete their voyage. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker!

On its face, the amendment would mean that the present restriction as to the granting or the refusing of permits will apply to all supply and auxiliary vessels sailing with foreign fishing vessels off Canada's east and west coasts. But, Mr. Speaker, there has been a long tradition in east coast ports of supplying visiting fleets. Trade with these fleets is estimated to run as high as $10 million or $12 million in St. John's Newfoundland, and some $3 million in Halifax and Sydney, Nova Scotia.

This tradition is based on two facts. One historic fact is that the North Atlantic fisheries were fished for at least three centuries before confederation, by fishing vessels sailing out of Europe, and during this period eight nations have established recognized fishing rights in the North Atlantic fisheries. In fact, these eight nations are granted greater fishing rights than Canadian fishermen on our own shores. The fishermen of Spain, Portugal, Italy, France, Norway, Denmark, the United Kingdom and the United States have the right to fish up to three miles from our coastline, while Canadian fishermen must pursue their fishing operations 12 miles from shore.

This was one of the promises made by the former Secretary of State for External Affairs speaking on May 20, 1964, on Canada's Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act, when he said that the fishing operations of the eight countries I have mentioned would be phased out. More than half a decade has passed since this promise was made. The Liberal government stands today indicted and condemned by our fishermen for its inaction on their problems, because fleets from these eight countries have still not been phased out and they still operate up to three miles from our coast. Yet on November 3 last the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) stood in his place in this House and said that those who are familiar with fisheries laws—I am paraphrasing his words—now know that we in Canada have an exclusive 12-mile limit. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister, exclusive to whom? Certainly it is not exclusive to Canadians. It may be exclusive to the eight fishing nations I have mentioned—exclusive to the fleets of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, the United Kingdom, the United States, Norway and Denmark, but it is not exclusive to Canadians. Let that be put on the record now, and let us hear no more of this double-talk until the government takes action on this really important problem.

Second, Mr. Speaker, if Canada refuses to provision the fleets which are destroying our fishery resources we will not achieve our objective because alternative sources are awaiting the opportunity to supply them. At the present time the common market countries are building a huge supply base on the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon, and even without this gunboat policy the fleets of other countries will soon be getting the major portion of their supplies from St. Pierre.

This amendment, therefore, should not be applied to our east coast ports as a prohibition against the provisioning of foreign supply ships or fishing vessels, because it will only anger the countries concerned without limiting their fishing activity on our shores.

It is my understanding that on the west coast there are no such fishing traditions. However, if we refuse to supply the Russian and Japanese fleets with water, I do not believe we will seriously cripple their operations because they can readily turn to American ports to the south such as Seattle, Everett, Olympia and Bellingham. In fact, the Russian fleet must pass Bellingham in order to get to Vancouver. Alternatively, the Russian fleet could get water and supplies to the north of us at Ketchikan, Juneau in the American Panhandle, or at Petersburg and

Wrangell. Therefore, a prohibition on the supply of water, as stated in this amendment, for application to the west coast would have little meaning. According to my information, Russian ships take on only fresh water in Vancouver, but no provisions or fuel, and since fresh water is available elsewhere this amendment is pointless and futile.

As with the east coast situation, the west coast problem—toward which the minister said this amendment is administratively directed—will not be cured by small-boy scare tactics. Even more than the east coast, the west coast fisheries are in imminent danger. Unlike the east coast, the continental shelf on the west coast extends seaward only 11 to 46 miles, if the information is correct which was given to the Fisheries Committee when it met in that area. The fishing grounds, therefore, are tremendously concentrated and extremely susceptible to overfishing and destruction. Already there are fishing fleets there from Japan, Russia and South Korea, and there is no reason why they will not be joined soon by fleets from the Philippines and other nations of southeast Asia.

In my view, the tactic of striking at the supply ship is itself an admission that Canada agrees to the presence of these foreign fleets, that Canada intends to take no rational action to protect the fishing grounds off its shores but simply intends to harass these fleets—and by harassment anger the nations which send them.

This amendment is useless as a solution to the preservation of our fisheries resources. I say this because it attacks only the incidental problem, which actually is not a problem at all if the main problem is solved. In my opinion, this amendment will only annoy those nations that fish our resources on the east and west coasts and will in the final analysis prevent a proper approach to the problem. This approach must, and can only be made at the negotiating table. It must be made by Canadians talking common sense to their opposite numbers.

The common sense approach would be to point out to all concerned, at an international conference on the conservation of our fishing resources, that there are only so many fish on the fishing grounds of the North Atlantic and the west coast. These resources can be ruined for years or completely destroyed by overfishing or by the use of destructive fishing gear. It must be pointed out that these resources can be preserved for ourselves and for future generations only if we agree to conserve them in our time—and our time is now. In my opinion, it is mandatory that this action be taken through international negotiation and agreement.

I cannot help but wonder why this bill has been brought in by the Minister of Fisheries. Here we have a problem which concerns many of our European allies in NATO, some of our European trading partners and the great fleets of Russia and Japan; but instead of getting our External Affairs Department to cope with it, we see the Fisheries Department trying to implement a childish, gunboat policy which it is incapable of enforcing on the nations concerned.

We cannot help but wonder what is happening in our External Affairs Department. Have we no friends left in the world? Have we sacrificed all our integrity on the altar of recognition of Red China, to the exclusion of all our former friends and allies? I am beginning to wonder who stands up for Canada. And when the going gets tough and rough at some future date, I wonder who will stand by us.

Could it be, since we have backtracked on our word to the free Chinese on Taiwan, that no one trusts us any longer, that we are looked upon as fickle and inconsistent in the role we play in international affairs? Surely the amendment before us will not reduce the strength of the fishing fleets on our east and west coasts by one ship or one lifeboat. It certainly will not win us any friends at any future international bargaining table where ultimately the problem of our diminishing fishing resources will have to be discussed. What frightens me, Mr. Speaker, is that on its record the government seems incapable of talking common sense to other nations, and to some nations it cannot talk at all. It has scored debating points, but it has never arrived at agreements.

• (3:40 p.m.)

In my opinion, Bill C-134 may win the battle of the supply ship but it will cost us international agreement on measures to preserve our fisheries resources. Having stated our concern over this measure, it is not our intention to move any amendments at this time because there may be a movement for a particular province to take advantage of the bill in its present form. We therefore look forward, Mr. Speaker, to a more detailed explanation of the specific impact of this bill in certain areas when it comes before the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry for study.

Mr. Bell: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In order to help with our progress this afternoon, and in view of the fact that we will have to make a decision at four o'clock, I have spoken to some members on this side and some on the other side and hope this proposal may meet with Your Honour's approval.

There is a desire to get Bill C-175 through, and I appreciate there may be one or two more speeches on Bill C-134. However, if everybody shortened his speech we could pass Bill C-134 and get on to Bill C-175, and if there was agreement to dispense with private members' hour we could have half a dozen short speeches on Bill C-175 and agree to sit until it was finished which would probably be after five o'clock but certainly before six o'clock. The three bills would be through and everybody would be happy. However, if we give up private members' hour we would like the assurance that everyone will make an effort to co-operate.

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I would appreciate that very much indeed.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, as my private member's motion is likely to be forgone as a result of that suggestion, I agree it should be done provided we end discussion of this particular bill at four o'clock and decide at that time to carry on with Bill C-175. I think that would be agreeable to all sides of the House.

The Deputy Speaker: This is a multi-faceted proposal before the Chair but there seems to be one common thread to all proposals, namely, to dispense with private members' hour. Unless there is disagreement on that point, perhaps the refinements or extensions of the proposal could be agreed upon informally among members and we could have a second proposal later. Is it agreed that we shorten speeches and, more specifically, that we dispense with private members' hour?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I did not rise on the point of order, but I appreciate the effort of the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell) to bring some sort of order into our proceedings this afternoon. I rise in light of the fact that we have before us in Bill C-134 a proposed amendment to the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act. I wish this act included the protection of our coastal fisheries from the

Liberal government, and in particular the Liberal House leader.

I was somewhat annoyed earlier today when the government House leader lightly dismissed the idea of dealing with fisheries matters by suggesting that we pass three bills next Wednesday afternoon. I shall not enter into the procedural hassle we had earlier, except to say it is very awkward when one is preparing, in good faith and on the strength of the word of the government House leader, to deal with a certain bill only to find that we have passed one other bill and that the next order of business is another bill entirely.

I once rather annoyed a former Minister of Fisheries by stating in the House that the government tended to treat the Department of Fisheries as the Cinderella of government departments. The events that have taken place today seem to indicate that this is the disposition of the present Liberal administration. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I suppose I should proceed to make some comments on the substance of the amending bill that is before us.

In his few remarks the minister indicated that he did not consider this to be a bill which would end all the problems faced by our seacoast fisheries. I concur in his sentiments in this respect. This bill may be a step in the right direction, but I think it warrants further examination in committee because it is a little difficult to understand how it will act as a lever in regard to negotiations on operations of foreign fishing fleets off our coast.

I appreciate full well that the situation in regard to the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act and the operation of foreign fishing fleets off our coasts is not identical on the west coast and on the Atlantic coast of Canada. The approach that one takes in respect of the need for this amendment may, therefore, be slightly different depending on the point of view of the member who represents a coastal constituency.

The question that immediately comes to my mind is that of the operation of a large fleet of Soviet vessels offshore on the west coast and, in this last season, offshore of my own constituency at Vancouver Island. I think I can see some relationship between what is proposed in this bill and the operation of that fleet, although I am not sure that I understand how this measure will provide any protection from it.

If the minister makes any remarks in closing the debate on second reading, he should

clarify this matter; if not, it should be clarified in committee as it relates to certain remarks of the member who preceded me and referred to Russian vessels calling at American ports to take on water.

My impression has always been that they were not permitted to do that, and that this amendment would have the effect of precluding Soviet supply vessels coming into Canadian ports to take on water or other supplies to assist in the maintenance of their offshore fleet. If this is correct, then as far as it goes I can understand the minister's logic, and in principle at least I find myself ready to support the position he takes.

The minister is as aware as I of the mood of the fishermen of the west coast at the present time and in particular of the west coast trollers. Some of them may have remarked to him, as they have to me, that if they find Soviet vessels in their way in the future, as they have in the past, they will take potshots at the pilot-houses. I have suggested to them that this would not solve the problem and in fact, it might have the reverse effect.

If one relates this bill to the question which I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) a couple of days ago in regard to the plans of the government to provide protection against fleets such as the Soviet fleet of trawlers and, in particular, the government's views on a proposal placed on the Order Paper by a British Columbia member—that is, Bill C-91—one realizes that the bill is only calculated to deal in a very minor way with the problem faced by the fishermen of the west coast as a result of the activities of foreign fishing fleets.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I think the remarks made by the previous speaker concerning the traditional activities of foreign fishing fleets off our Atlantic coast, activities which pre-date the establishment of Canada as a nation, bear out what I put to the Secretary of State for External Affairs in the form of a question. I hope the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) or the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who is in the House, will clarify this point before the bill passes.

If the government is not of the view that Bill C-91 is a proposal which would solve this problem, I should like to know what the government has in mind as an alternative to Bill C-91 which would declare that we have jurisdiction over fishing resources to the edge of the continental shelf. The statement of the Minister of Fisheries in this connection indicates that he believes we should be able to manage our fisheries up to the edge of the continental shelf, but he has not said we should bring these areas within our own fishing zones.

This area needs to be clarified. It is not dealt with in the bill, and the minister's remarks bear out the fact that the bill does not solve the kind of problems that are involved in the present and future depletion of our fishing resources on the Pacific coast. We must keep in mind that in the North Atlantic there is an international agreement or convention to which Canada is a party together with most of the nations which fish in that area. While I suppose one could agree that that does not provide complete protection of fishing stocks in the North Atlantic, one could say that the legislative machinery working with regard to the continental shelf area of the Atlantic Coast is completely absent on the Pacific coast.

I am quite willing to go along with the suggestion that we give this bill and Bill C-175 second reading this afternoon and refer them to committee. For that reason I shall not prolong my remarks on this bill. I sum up by saying that my impression of the bill at second reading stage is that it is a minor effort in the right direction, and so far as it goes I am willing to support it.

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned, this bill is limited in scope. The remarks of the preceding speaker, the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett), I think indicated that it is designed mainly to permit the Canadian government and the Department of Fisheries to deal more effectively with Soviet and other fleets operating off the west coast of Canada. It will not solve all the problems which were enumerated by the previous speaker and the minister.

It is, none the less, a desirable piece of legislation. It is a first step, small though it may be, which I hope will be followed shortly by an announcement on the completion of the base lines system off the west coast of British Columbia and then, in a third and final stage, by the enactment of legislation along the lines of Bill C-91, to which the hon. member for Comox-Alberni was kind enough to refer. That bill would have the effect of extending exclusive Canadian fishing zones to the edge of the continental shelf.

I think that the measure in Bill C-134, in conjunction with the completed base lines system and such measures as are proposed in Bill C-91, will probably be adequate to protect the resource which at present is being very seriously depleted.

It is not generally known that perhaps the largest community on the west coast between Victoria and Prince Rupert is the Russian fishing fleet, a floating town of about 5,000 men at the height of the season. This is an indication of the extent of the exploitation of halibut, ocean perch and herring which is now taking place. The incidental catch of salmon in the area is also said to be considerable.

Reference has been made to the Pacific Trollermen's Association which is, I would say, in the best position to know what the situation is in these waters. Time and time again the association has brought to the attention of hon. members who represent west coast ridings, as well as to the minister, the tremendous depletion of groundfish resources and the large incidental take of salmon which is going on at present. I commend the association for its efforts, and hope it will not cease until there is satisfactory protection of fish stocks in this area of the Pacific.

I think the minister is correct in starting off by attempting to plug one small hole in the Coastal Fisheries Protection Act, but I hope that the present action will be followed up in the near future by legislation or Orders in Council which will assure that we complete the base lines system and extend the exclusive Canadian fishing zone well outside its present limits. Because I understand that the Saltfish Corporation bill is to be the final bill the House will deal with this afternoon, I shall conclude my remarks by asking hon. members from Newfoundland to be brief, as we expect a vote on that bill this afternoon.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

CANADIAN SALTFISH CORPORATION

PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHMENT—REGULATION OF INTERPROVINCIAL AND EXPORT TRADE

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry) moved that Bill C-175, to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and regulate interprovincial and export trade in saltfish, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill, secure in the knowledge that it will receive support from all corners of the House. I know there will be a few minor amendments proposed in committee. Some of them may be necessary to improve the act, but basically this is a sound piece of legislation—one which will be universally welcomed, particularly in the Atlantic provinces.

We have needed a Saltfish Corporation for more than a century. I am sure of this, because it has been recommended by numerous royal commissions and special committees set up over the years to look into the problems and prospects of the saltfish industry.

The saltfish industry, as everyone knows, was the first industry in Canada. It was the first industry on our shores and certainly the first industry the white man knew in North America. In some ways it is still an antiquated industry. Certainly it can stand a good deal of improvement.

The bill to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation in effect puts the credit of all the people of Canada behind the saltfish industry, which is now mainly concentrated in Newfoundland, along the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Quebec, and on the coast of Labrador. At one time it encompassed all the Atlantic region of Canada and much of the New England coast as well. It contracted in size as the fresh fish and frozen fish industries developed. It is now limited in great measure to small, remote communities along Canada's east coast.

• (4:00 p.m.)

It is served by inshore fishermen, with limited means and small boats, who often do not go out beyond the sight of land. These people live in modest circumstances. They are enterprising, God-fearing, hardworking people prepared to take great risks, including risking their lives. One hundred thousand of these people have very limited opportunities in their own local areas. They live in communities which range in size from a few houses to several hundred. There are approximately 1,000 communities in this category which depend almost exclusively on the production of saltfish, primarily the catching and manufacturing of salt cod which can be shipped anywhere in the world and will retain its quality for months, even in the hottest climate. This industry is being carried

on in small, remote communities and around those communities there is little opportunity for other gainful employment.

One thing that impressed me very much is that the opportunity for employment in the forest industry, particularly in Newfoundland, is more limited today than it was ten years ago. Approximately half as many people work in the forests of Newfoundland as worked there in the mid-fifties. More men are in fact engaged in the inshore salt fish industry in Newfoundland because there are half as many jobs in the woods. This situation calls for dramatic action by the federal government to help these fishermen gain not only a larger share of world markets but a better price for their product.

I am convinced we can add considerably to the income of these fishermen merely by bringing into being a fish development marketing organization. But we will do more than market fish. Through rationalization I am sure we will be able to improve the facilities available to these fishermen in order that they may improve their product, upgrade it for the markets of the world, tailor the qualities and grades to market requirements in order to improve their sales prospects and in turn improve their income. This is the main objective of the development corporation.

The corporation will be a single-desk selling agency selling on a worldwide basis. It will be selling in the Caribbean and Mediterranean countries principally. It will be selling in a market for saltfish which has been surprisingly stable for several decades its volume has remained almost constant. What has gone wrong from our point of view is that Canada has been left with a smaller and smaller share of that relatively constant world market. If we put the accent on quality, meeting market requirements and upgrading the product so that it is more acceptable to foreign buyers we will be able to considerably improve this fishery.

We have a parallel piece of legislation. Members are familiar with the establishment of the Freshwater Fish Market Corporation last year. This corporation will operate in much the same way. In May of this year I hope to announce the schedule of prices for saltfish so that fishermen will know at the beginning of the season what their product is worth. They will be paid as they deliver their fish, rather than having to wait until the end of the year to receive any income whatsoever. They will know what they are going to receive in terms of income and will be able to plan with some confidence for the future.

At the end of the year the corporation will take whatever surplus it obtains as a result of this selling exercise, and pay it out to the fishermen in proportion to their catch and sales. This corporation will be the sole buyer of saltfish throughout the Atlantic region. It will have that power because all the provincial governments have indicated that they are interested in our national legislation. They will provide the necessary provincial power to make the corporation function effectively.

I think most hon. members opposite and many on this side of the House are familiar with the problems of the saltfish industry and the inshore fishermen. I can think of no single factor that can contribute more to his income and feeling of accomplishment than the passing of this bill which, at long last, will make the saltfish industry the fisherman's industry as well.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the minister's statement concerning an act to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and regulate interprovincial and export trade in saltfish. I have a few comments to make on this legislation.

The marketing of saltfish and the regulating of interprovincial and export trade in this commodity is a problem that has for many years been troubling the industry in Atlantic Canada. We on this side therefore approve in principle the government's bill and will do everything within reason to expedite its progress through committee. However, there are some questions concerning the method of operation of the corporation which we would like answered. Hopefully, our doubts in this direction will be satisfied by the minister and his officials when they appear before the committee; if not, we have amendments which we are prepared to put forward in order to strengthen and improve the bill.

For almost 500 years fishermen of many countries have reaped the codfish harvest of our North Atlantic fisheries. In return, the North Atlantic has exacted its price in the lives of those fishermen, in the loneliness and widowhood of their wives and in the orphaning of their children. The history of the people of the Maritime provinces, Newfoundland and Quebec, is interwoven with the history of the fishing industry.

Treaties with foreign nations concerning the right of their nationals to land and dry

codfish on the shores of these provinces are part and parcel of Canada's constitution and inheritance. In fact, the trade of these provinces in salt cod with the West Indies, South America, Spain, France, Portugal and Greece has established ties of friendship and trade with these countries which are older than Canada.

For some years past the salt cod industry has been relatively unimportant in terms of gross national product because the fishermen who live by that industry have, despite their efforts, been unable to earn sufficient income to make a contribution to income tax revenues.

It would appear that the salt cod industry is a special craft industry of individuals and families which should now be collectivized and organized in the hope that this action will bring about its continued survival. I sincerely hope this bill represents the answer to the Canadian saltfisherman's problems. However, in my opinion this collectivization or organization should not be so ruthless or so intent upon efficiency that it forgets to take into consideration the human factors involved.

The dislocation of the lives of these fishermen and their families where it occurs—and it will occur—must be softened by a spirit of compromise and adjustment on the part of the government as well as by the compromise and adjustment that will be demanded of the fishermen. With this thought in mind, I believe that the chairman and president, as well as the directors of the corporation and the members of the advisory committee should in the best interests of this corporation be from those provinces which participate in the administration of the act, a fact which is not spelled out too clearly in this bill.

• (4:10 p.m.)

As I understand it, the purpose of this bill is to bring greater economic benefits to the primary saltfish producers in Atlantic Canada. This is a worthy objective, and in light of the low annual income recorded for this area it is a very necessary and worth while project. In fact, attempts to make the saltfish industry profitable have for many years occupied the attention of five provincial governments and the federal government.

Whatever remedies have been brought forward and tried, the salt-cure fishermen have, prior to this legislation, lacked a regional corporation with power to control the interprovincial and export trade in saltfish, a corporation with capital sufficient to acquire modern methods of assembling, curing, grading, processing, packaging, storing, selling and engaging in market promotion. The phasing-out of traditional but inefficient methods of curing, a reduction of duplication in costs which should bring increased returns to the fishermen, are ends which I hope will be realized under the proper management of the corporation proposed by this legislation.

The minister said the objective of the corporation at the outset is to increase the income and improve the living standards of producers. We hope that in pursuing this objective—and it is a proper one—the corporation will not lose sight of the fishermen of Labrador, of the Quebec Gulf and North Shore, of Prince Edward Island and of Nova Scotia who also are in vital need of assistance.

It is a regrettable but necessary provision of this bill that fishermen who fail to meet the terms and conditions imposed by the board will not be able to sell to the corporation. In effect, they will not be able to sell in the interprovincial or export markets. This will result in the unemployment of those unfitted by experience for any other employment. Processing plants which are dependent on the catches of these men will go out of business. However, it would appear this is the price which must be paid if the saltfish industry is to survive and if a proportion of the fishermen are to enjoy a reasonable standard of living.

In view of these facts, the corporation should not operate, in my opinion, strictly within the narrow confines of this bill. I believe the corporation has wider responsibilities. Once it is established it should alert, as early as possible, the various agencies of government, both federal and provincial, to these foreseeable disruptions. I say this in order that employment facilities, retaining facilities, pension and welfare facilities and financial aid by way of government loans to small businesses, be made known to unemployed fishermen, the employees of redundant fishing plants and to the small businessmen who operate these plants.

As I stated earlier, the five provincial governments of Atlantic Canada have in the past given much thought to the problems faced by the saltfish industry. In fact, on October 29, 1964, the Atlantic Salt Fish Commission, headed by Mr. Finn, tabled its report outlining a summary of its conclusions and recommendations after consultation with the pro-

ducers and processors in Atlantic Canada. This is a very interesting report, full of salty phrases and saltfish problems, and the commission's final conclusion was that the saltfish industry was not then ready for a saltfish marketing board.

According to the commission's report, the basic difficulty was the low productivity per unit of the fishermen involved. If that conclusion of the commission holds true today, the marketing corporation proposed in this bill may, in fact, do a good deal of damage. Indeed, the damage done might well offset the amount of aid provided unless the corporation proceeds with compassion, acting in close consultation with the rehabilitation and social agencies of the federal and provincial governments in the Maritimes, Newfoundland and Quebec. I say this knowing that the provinces I have mentioned already have the highest unemployment rates in Canada and the lowest standard of living. We must always be mindful of this situation and careful to do nothing by way of legislative action which would compound their problems.

These fishermen need help, and hopefully the corporation to be set up under the bill before us can give it to them. However, the problems which this new corporation will face are likely to differ entirely from those faced by the management of the Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation. I would remind hon. members that the latter corporation has a virtual monopoly of fresh fish and can therefore control its quality, its rate of delivery and its price in our major market, the United States.

This is not the situation which will face the saltfish corporation. When it is set up, this corporation will be in a position to control the export trade in saltfish as it relates to production in Canada, but when it comes to selling saltfish abroad it will not benefit from a monopoly because it will have to compete in world markets with other great saltfish-producing nations such as Iceland, Norway, Spain, Portugal and Denmark.

This presents a challenge to our Atlantic coast fishermen inasmuch as the success or failure of the corporation to be set up by this bill will depend in great measure upon the quality of the saltfish products which it can offer in world markets. This means the corporation must be headed by men who are knowledgeable with regard to the saltfish industry and its markets, men who are willing to work in closer co-operation with the fishermen, the primary producers, than has been the case in the past.

As I stated earlier, some salt codfish fishermen in Atlantic Canada may become unemployed as a result of the board's consolidation of effort. Although it may succeed in providing continuous employment and a higher standard of living to some, the board must always be conscious that it will have failed in its over-all objective if its operations raise over-all unemployment figures still higher, lowering further the present low standard of living.

In his speech of November 3, 1969, on fisheries matters, the Minister of Fisheries said many things with which I agree. He also expressed many anomalous views with which I disagree, though I shall not now debate them with the hon. gentleman. For example, he omitted to mention the tremendous build-up of the Canadian fishing fleet, with the resultant prosperity of our shipbuilding and processing plants brought about by the constructive programs initiated during the Conservative administration under my right hon. friend for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker).

The minister went on to mention the plans for the fishermen proposed by his own government and, as reported at page 411 of *Hansard,* he listed the various bills to be considered. He then stated that the government also proposed to change the Unemployment Insurance Act, commenting that the question of unemployment insurance was of great interest to our fishermen.

This, of course, was the understatement of the year. Unemployment insurance is a subject of great interest to the entire industry, including the processors. There is nothing in this bill to indicate the stand which the government plans to take with regard to this important matter. As the minister is aware, fishermen are now classed as being self-employed, as sharing in a joint venture. Will this classification still apply to fishermen landing fish for the Canadian Saltfish Corporation? If not, what changes is the government planning along the lines referred to in the minister's speech? The answer to this question would be very helpful. I hope the government gives an early indication of the changes it proposes to bring about in this important field.

• (4:20 p.m.)

In conclusion, I express the hope that once this corporation is established it will achieve all its objectives so that our primary produc-

ers, the men who must work in the saltfish trade under great hardship, with only faith at times to sustain them, will secure under this legislation more of the fruits of their labour.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, in his opening remarks the minister said that "at long last" this bill would bring to an end the system which meant that the salt codfish producers of Newfoundland were prisoners of the merchants and the storekeepers. It was a timely phrase and it brought to my mind my visit to the province of Newfoundland in 1955, at which time many people were telling me that they would like to see legislation of this kind brought about.

I may say that I found myself to be a member of what was then the marine and fisheries committee of this House, shortly after my first arrival here. As a result of that, and because I had personal knowledge only of the fisheries of the Pacific coast, I embarked upon a trip to Newfoundland one fall and spent four weeks in that province. It was one of the most delightful and interesting experiences of my life.

I spent most of that time visiting the people in the small fishing villages, or outports of what was then considered to be quite a new province of Canada. I was regarded very largely as a curiosity from the mainland. The fact that I was a Canadian made me somewhat different in the eyes of many people.

Mr. Lundrigan: That was an easy conclusion to draw.

Mr. Barnett: I came back to this House, and as a result of communications which I received from many of the friends I made there I found myself occasionally getting up on the opposition side of the House and asking questions about Newfoundland matters. That was a great novelty in the House at the time because there were no members on the opposition side who represented a riding in that province. This situation does not prevail at the present time. As I recall it, the information that was given to me at the time I visited Newfoundland was that the average cash income of an inshore Newfoundland fisherman was about $600 a year.

Mr. McGrath: It is now $800.

Mr. Barnett: I was going to refer to a publication which was issued by our Department of Fisheries and Forestry quite recently, Fisheries Reports No. 11, in which one of the footnotes points out that in a report made in 1964 a detailed study established the income of the fishermen at less than $1,000 per year, inclusive of transfer payments, which makes the interjected figure of $800 somewhere close to the mark.

I mention this to underline that when the minister said that this piece of legislation is being brought in "at long last," there is certainly no quarrel from this part of the House that the economic situation of most fishermen in Newfoundland leaves much to be desired. I noted that the minister emphasized this situation in his remarks on this bill, and for that reason there is perhaps relatively little controversy in the House in dealing with it.

If I understand it correctly, the genesis of this bill stems from the Federal-Provincial Fisheries Conference which was held in Ottawa in January of 1964. Certain events have flowed from that conference. The minister mentioned one of them, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, and suggested quite rightly that in some ways this is a companion piece of legislation dealing with another of Canada's fisheries.

I made some reference back to the presentations which were made to that conference in 1964 by the government of Newfoundland, in which they indicated that they were proposing something along the lines of the bill that we have before us. At page 32 of the presentation to the conference by the government of Newfoundland, dated January 20, 1964, the following statement appears:

> The programs necessary for the strengthening of the Newfoundland fishing industry can be divided under three general headings:
>
> 1. Marketing and price stabilization.
> 2. Inspection and quality control.
> 3. Rationalization and development measures.

The marketing of saltfish in Newfoundland has a long history. If I recall correctly the picture which was painted to me at the time I was in that province, it indicated that while there was a form of co-ordinated fish marketing at that time, the real control still rested in the hands of what were often referred to as the great merchants of St. John's. One of the things about which we require assurances—an assurance which is not found in the bill—is that the enactment of this legislation will in fact represent a transfer of power from those financial interests in St. John's, which have traditionally controlled the fisheries and kept the fishermen at a subsistence level, to the fishermen themselves.

The idea of a marketing board is one that all of us in this House can easily support. The

brief of the province of Newfoundland refers back to the days when the Canadian Wheat Board was established, as the first piece of legislation providing for the orderly marketing of a product. But one of the things this bill does not clarify is whether in fact the fishery of Newfoundland will be under public control and under the control of the producers, or whether it will be left in the hands of what in the terms of the wheat farmers would be called the Winnipeg Grain Exchange. This question is not clarified in the bill.

This board is set up as a Crown Corporation. The officers and the directors are to be appointed by the Governor in Council with one appointee from each of the participating provinces. There is to be an advisory council which says that two thirds of the members shall be connected with saltfish production. But whether in fact this legislation will at long last bring about a transfer of control into the hands of the producers of Newfoundland depends entirely upon the approach which the government takes to the administration, the approach which the government takes to the appointment of the people who are going to form the board of directors of this corporation.

• (4:30 p.m.)

In committee we will require an explanation as to the emphasis to be placed on having the Crown corporation become an agency for the processing of fresh fish, and the emphasis to be placed on maintaining the existing structures for the processing of fish. I recognize there is a complex pattern throughout the industry and that the existing machinery for marketing cannot be done away with overnight. However, I think this is the kind of assurance those of us in this party want. We want assurances that in fact the operation of this measure will be such as to ensure to the fishermen the maximum return possible for their product.

We know that, even at best, the return to the fishermen for saltfish will not be anything magnificent, given the present situation with respect to world markets and the price levels that prevail. Those of us in this part of the House insist that this should be made clear as far as the people in the Atlantic fisheries are concerned.

I was glad to hear the minister say, if I heard him correctly, that all the provinces involved in the production of saltfish have indicated their desire to participate in this program. I was glad to note that one of the things to be achieved is the solution of a problem of concern to many people in Newfoundland, and I presume indirectly to fishermen in some of the other provinces; that is, this body will operate as an interprovincial corporation and will bring to an end the unceasing warfare that existed in previous days regarding the marketing of fish through the authority of one province or another. This was a matter of concern to the fishermen of Newfoundland when the province entered confederation. It was a matter of concern in respect of the marketing of Newfoundland fish products during the early years Newfoundland operated within confederation.

This bill meets, in part, a concerted desire of the people of Newfoundland in particular, as expressed to the former leader of the Liberal party, as far as it parallels the kind of marketing board that has been developed for the marketing of Canadian farm products, particularly those from the three Prairie provinces. If the Minister of Fisheries has not already taken note of this, I should like to refer him to a letter which the Premier of Newfoundland wrote to the former Prime Minister on February 13, 1963, when he was Leader of the Opposition.

Parts of this letter were quoted not once but twice during the proceedings of the conference in 1964. The concluding sentence of the statement made to Mr. Smallwood by Mr. Pearson when he was speaking as Leader of the Opposition is that we should have the following:

> —a federal-provincial program for fishery development to be founded on the principle that national action for fisheries should parallel the action already being taken, and action to be taken, for agriculture.

Perhaps this bill is in part a fulfilment of that pledge. I am not suggesting it is the complete fulfilment. I mention this to the minister because he admits himself it has been a long time coming. I made a special trip to Ottawa before the opening of the session of Parliament in 1964, full of hope and optimism that out of that Federal-Provincial Fisheries Conference we would have introduced during that session of Parliament interprovincial marketing legislation. I suppose it is always better to have something late than never. In this respect I find myself echoing the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) when he comments on matters relating to pensions. It seems that it takes a long time for ideas to penetrate the heads of members of the Liberal government.

Mr. Lewis: And their hearts.

Mr. Barnett: One of my colleagues says it is their hearts.

Mr. Lewis: As well as their heads.

Mr. Barnett: I have never been able to decide whether human action is generated primarily from the heart or the head. I am inclined to think it is a combination of the two and that neither functions very well without the other. Whether the fact that Liberal ministers have been inclined to pride themselves on being hard-headed has in fact meant that they are also hard-hearted, I do not know; but perhaps this is the reason for the dilemma to which some of my colleagues have referred in their interjections.

I am glad the minister is taking action on matters of this kind. I hope that his heart is soft, while his head is hard, and that this measure when it is enacted will be administered in a manner which will fulfil the promises it contains. I hope it will in fact herald the beginning of a new day for the fishermen in the Atlantic region of Canada, and that those who sit in this House ten years from now will be prepared to admit that it was a wise and useful piece of legislation.

We will have questions to ask when the bill is before the committee. We may have some suggestions when we examine and discuss the measure in detail, in order that it might be improved and strengthened. Let me refer to one such suggestion. This measure is too ambiguous as to whether those who are clearly fishermen will have any voice in the policy development of this body. This is a matter that should be clarified before the committee. If necessary, amendments will be proposed to clarify the situation. This will enable the bill, when passed in its final form, to come closer to fulfilling the hopes I have expressed.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, in so far as many of us are concerned, is a milestone in the history of the ancient saltfish industry. I have waited for this legislation for a long time, like many other people in Newfoundland.

• (4:40 p.m.)

At long last we see in this bill what we hope will be the fulfilment of the expectations of the Newfoundland fishermen who have waited 20 years to see the fulfilment of the promise of Confederation with Canada. I could not help feeling a little disappointment today as I listened to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) when he spoke on second reading of this bill. I was disappointed the minister made light of the subject and missed the opportunity he had to sum up the historical factors leading up to and indeed directly influencing the legislation now before us.

I am also disappointed that the bill is before us at a time when members are getting ready to leave for the weekend and when it is obvious we have only a few hours at our disposal. If we had the time which this legislation warrants, I or others who may be able to do it much more adequately would be able to tell this House the heartbreaking story of Canada's most ancient industry, the saltfish industry. However, the minister did not choose to have this debate on another occasion. I am sure his motives were good. As a matter of fact, I feel he did not expect to have to deal with this legislation today.

The minister knows better than I do the importance of getting this legislation on its way. Until this bill receives royal assent he knows the industry, which is suffering the disastrous consequences of last year, is in a state of suspended animation. The longer the delay in the passage of this legislation which received first reading on December 19, the greater the opportunity, for those who are critical of the bill, to tear it down. Justice delayed is justice denied.

So we are prepared to get this bill on its way and before the committee. I may be forgiven, however, if I make a few brief observations. Other remarks I would have made at this time I shall save for the committee stage, the report stage or third reading of the bill. Before I do so I would make a suggestion to the minister. He may not think it is really relevant.

With the passage of this legislation and the setting up of this corporation, carrying with it as it does the final recognition of the importance of the role in our economy of the inshore fishery, we hope there will be the ancillary result of making the iniquitous and unjust centralization program redundant. This is a cruel, unjust and inhuman program of moving the people of Newfoundland from their ancient homes to centralized ghettos which will have as its only effect the facilitation of the administration of welfare.

We hope the passage of this legislation will carry with it a recognition of the importance of the industry in spite of what Mr. Finn in his report and others have said through the years about the inshore fishery having no

future and there being no future in saltfishing. As a result of this bill we hope that cruel program of centralization of which we have heard so much and about which the Canadian people have heard some disturbing reports will no longer be necessary. I say this notwithstanding the fact that the administration of the program has now passed from the minister of fisheries to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. We hope this bill will spell the end of that program.

There are in the bill a number of things which concern us. The minister referred to them as being minor amendments. We consider them to be major amendments. We consider, for example, the provision in the bill whereby the corporation will be empowered to make loans to fishermen to be a major item and one which in fact does not go far enough. If this bill in fact destroys the feudal system under which the saltfish industry is conducted in Newfoundland, it must by definite legislative steps eliminate the economically crippling credit system which is now the hallmark of the saltfish industry and which deprives the fisherman in many instances of a fair return for his labour.

We consider this to be a major item and hope the minister will heed the suggestions we will make in the committee in respect of the provision of a special fund which would be self-revolving to ensure that, regardless of whether the fishermen had a good or bad year, they would not have to suffer the consequences of the manipulation of interest rates and the imposition of a stricter credit regulation by the corporation. This corporation cannot, and indeed must not, function as an ordinary commercial corporation.

I make no apology, and I am sure no one from the province of Newfoundland would make any apology for saying that. We hope there will also be provision for the setting up of a fund of at least $1 million. I have not pulled this figure out of the hat. It is a figure suggested to me by those who should know what they are talking about. I believe $1 million or $2 million should be provided for this revolving fund to ensure that the fishermen at the beginning of each season have guaranteed, adequate funds with which to outfit themselves, and that there will be proper regulation and a fair and just rate of interest.

Only in this way can we ensure that there is and end to the feudal system whereby the fishermen in return for being outfitted in the spring of the year are obligated to give their entire catch to the merchant without knowing how much they might expect in return. This is what is known as the iniquitous open-receipt system of buying fish. We consider this a major item. Even though we consider this a good bill, and even though we commend the minister for introducing it and think he is a good minister, we are also sure he is anything but infallible.

• (4:50 p.m.)

We could have preferred if he had taken some of us into his confidence so that we could have given him our constructive suggestions in a more informal way, rather than having to make them in debate in this House or through the formal technique of amendments in committee.

We would also like to see an expression of intent spelled out in the bill, if for no other reason than to ensure that the corporation does not conduct itself as a purely commercial corporation. The philosophy of the bill should be spelled out in the preamble. It was quite adequately spelled out by the minister in a statement which he made at St. John's, and I quote his words:

> Immediate objectives of the proposed corporation are to improve and stabilize the earnings of primary producers of cured cod fish. This would be achieved by maximizing returns from the trade and minimizing costs in assembling, processing and marketing operations.

We would like to see that in the preamble of the bill. The minister may not occupy his portfolio in two years' time, and we should take steps now to make sure that those who follow know what was the intent of Parliament when this bill was passed.

The bill provides for the appointment of five directors. The appointments will be made by the Governor in Council, which in this case means the Minister of Fisheries. It could conceivably happen that the five directors could come from Bay Street, or the equivalent street in Vancouver. The president could come from the west coast and the chairman of the board from Montreal. Unless they knew what Parliament had in mind when it passed the bill, they could forget that its primary purpose is to maximize returns to the primary producer, the fisherman.

I would not want the impression to be created abroad that this bill is merely establishing a marketing board. If it is to fulfil our expectations, it must be much more than that. This is not to suggest that marketing is not one of the principal functions of the corporation.

Because of the ancient system of marketing in the trade, we have been losing our main markets to competitive countries such as Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Portugal and Spain. Exporters have failed to recognize the changes that are taking place in our principal markets for cured fish. Those markets are now more sophisticated than ever. Here I speak of our principal markets in Jamaica, Barbados, Trinidad and Puerto Rico. Salt codfish, which is their principal source of protein, is now sold in local supermarkets with the aid of attractive packaging. Our exporters have failed to compete in this manner. They have failed to take account of the fact that in many of our principal markets salt codfish is a political football. A marketing board will be in a better position to deal with governments than individual exporters.

We feel that the corporation must have a presence in our export markets; it must have representatives in those markets. Indeed, it may have to build cold-storage facilities close to those markets in order to ensure that the product is adequately safeguarded. Notwithstanding the minister's opening statement, it is a perishable product and on occasion has suffered the consequences of being left on wharves in the West Indies for long periods of time. For this reason it will be necessary for the corporation to enter into agreements with the governments of Jamaica and other West Indian countries to build cold-storage warehouses in which the product can be stored.

We must do a better job in our principal markets by the adoption of new marketing techniques, new packaging and the elimination of the middleman. In many cases these principal markets have become fragmented, to the detriment of the saltfish fishermen.

The corporation will also have to determine in advance market requirements so that fishermen in future will not produce and cure fish on a hit-and-miss basis. At the beginning of a season the corporation will have to determine the grade of fish the Jamaican market will require. Then, as the sole purchaser of fish, it will be able to go to the fishermen and say, "We will require so many quintals of such a cure of fish for this market." The fishermen will know exactly what they have to produce, and they will produce it. This will bring some order into the chaotic situation that now exists in the industry. Without exception, improvements can be made in every one of our markets. They have to be made if we are to eliminate the archaic thinking that has caused so much damage to the industry.

[Mr. McGrath.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I note that the bill calls for the setting up of the corporation's head office in St. John's, Newfoundland. I suggest that this is the obvious place for the corporation to have its headquarters because St. John's will be the principal centre of its operations.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I also suggest that the president of this corporation be a resident of the area in which the corporation is located, and somebody who has an active knowledge of the industry. Above all, Mr. Speaker, it should not be a political appointment. I leave that suggestion with the minister.

We look forward to studying this bill in committee. Many people have made representations to us and in committee we will be passing many of them on to the government. We hope the committee will get together very soon and deal with this legislation.

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues on this side of the House, I welcome this legislation. I commend the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) for the initiative he has shown in tackling it and, we hope, putting an end to the old feudal system that has for centuries been the curse of the fishing industry of Newfoundland.

Those of us from Atlantic Canada, and especially from Newfoundland, have been looking forward with great anticipation to the legislation which we are now debating. We realize how important this legislation is to the fishing industry in Newfoundland and, indeed, to the other Maritime provinces. We also appreciate the minister's willingness to pay attention to the suggestions and arguments we have advanced in favour of this board and the corporation as outlined in the bill.

The minister is well aware of the representations made to him and the government, and the consistency of our efforts to impress upon them the absolute need for greater government involvement in the saltfish industry of Atlantic Canada. He is also aware of the pressing need for an organized effort by the government to regulate the processing and marketing of our salted cod.

One does not need to be a prophet or to possess divine inspiration to predict what will happen to the saltfish industry of eastern Canada without this type of legislation, without active participation by the government in the processing and marketing of the product.

It is regrettable that it has taken so long to have this board established. As my colleague from St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) said a few moments ago, Newfoundland has been waiting for this opportunity since confederation, and we have lost 20 years. Let us hope that the board will function to the advantage of the people for whom it is intended, that is, the producer—the fisherman himself.

The average fisherman has been too long the victim of the old feudal system. The history of the fishing industry in my province has been one of exploitation, hardship, and in too many cases near-starvation for those engaged in it. For too long were we content to accept what always appeared to be inevitable as far as our fishermen were concerned, that is, they must learn to roll with the punches, take it on the chin and be satisfied to accept a standard of living far below the national average and one that would not be tolerated by people in any other part of this nation. A moment ago I said that our fishermen had been exploited for centuries. Of course, the reason is obvious—the system under which they have been compelled to operate lends itself to abuse and exploitation.

Can you imagine, sir, the people engaged in the fishing industry selling their catches on an open-receipt basis? Can you imagine any person today, engaged in any other industry in Canada, working all summer and not knowing what he will earn? But that situation has existed in Newfoundland for decades and, possibly, for centuries. Men fished all summer; they shipped or took their fish to the exporter and were given an open-receipt without knowing how much they would get. They took potluck, and come fall they hoped to obtain enough money to square their bills with the merchants and have a few dollars to spare.

If one were to compare the life of the average Canadian with that of the Newfoundland fishermen, it would be very interesting. The fisherman of Newfoundland has an average annual income of $900 or thereabouts. For that he must work during the fishing season from before daylight until after dark. He must constantly face the hazards of the seas, and is forced to run risks when battling the elements that would terrify the average Canadian. He must conquer his fears and overcome the fury of the Atlantic. Total dependence on his own ingenuity and resourcefulness has instilled in him a fierce sense of pride and independence. The average fisherman is by nature a rugged individualist who works hard for his living. He would much rather battle the elements than accept social welfare.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation will have the effect of improving the lot of the average fisherman of Atlantic Canada, and especially of Newfoundland. I am therefore delighted that it has been brought in. We have suggestions to make in committee which we hope will improve the bill.

There is one thing I must say, because it has a bearing on the success of the fisheries in my riding and in most other parts of Newfoundland. I hope that the government will go a step farther and not merely stop with the establishment of the Saltfish Corporation. I believe it will be necessary for the government to make sure that adequate facilities are provided whereby fishermen can land and process their fish under sanitary and proper conditions. If the fishermen are to take full advantage of this legislation, adequate facilities must be provided for them.

If our fishermen are to comply with regulations pertaining to quality and sanitation set out in the bill, facilities must be provided. Those facilities should include landing and processing facilities, community wharves and the like. When the bill comes before the committee I hope the minister will indicate that my suggestions will be incorporated in the government's program, which is designed to encourage the saltfish industry. We must make sure that our fishermen derive the fullest benefit from the proposed corporation.

I also think the minister should look at the herring fishery, especially in Newfoundland. People who are eminently qualified to speak on the subject have suggested to me that we should consider prohibiting the use of large herring seiners in our bays. These seiners move in like giant vacuum cleaners and sweep up everything that is there. Their large catches of herring are reduced to oil that I understand is used for industrial purposes.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I have been informed that an unlimited world market exists for this very high-protein food. I am told that 95 per cent of the herring caught are used for oil rather than human consumption. I think this industry would perform a much greater service to humanity if greater emphasis were put on the nutritional and protein value of herring as food for human consumption, rather than reducing an estimated 95 per cent of the catch to oil.

I hope the minister will give thought to providing facilities which the fishermen want, and that consideration will be given to a certain group of people in Newfoundland. The hon. member for St. John's East mentioned a moment ago that these people have been dealt a great injustice by having their way of life destroyed by the federal government and the government of Newfoundland. I refer to the people who have been relocated under the joint federal-provincial housing resettlement program. These people have been moved from their traditional fishing areas and properties and resettled, in many instances, in places completely unsuited to them and which lack even the barest facilities needed to successfully prosecute the fisheries.

I ask the minister to give serious thought to providing facilities in the areas where these people have been relocated. I know of two or three in my riding. I could refer to Placentia. The minister is well aware of the problems that exist there. More than 200 families were moved into that town from outlying areas where previously they had adequate fishing facilities. They now find themselves in the same position as the proverbial fish-out-of-water; they are in a settlement completely unsuited to their carrying on fishing.

I could refer to a number of other places in my riding where facilities are lacking, such as in St. Mary's Bay and St. Mary's itself. I repeat, that unless provision is made to provide adequate facilities for the fishermen, they will not receive the full benefits that could be derived from this legislation.

I know other hon. members want to speak on this measure, so I will conclude my remarks. I compliment the minister on his setting up the Saltfish Corporation. I hope he will accept our advice regarding fishing facilities. We look forward to discussing this bill further at the committee stage.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): I do not wish to take up too much time of the House, Mr. Speaker. I hope to make my remarks in five minutes. I have reservations about this bill, not because it is a bad bill but because I am opposed to the principle of Crown corporations generally. I can support it because I know it is of tremendous importance to the fishermen of Newfoundland. If in this way we can help that province, I am certainly in favour of the bill. These are the fishermen most affected by this legislation. I do not think too much benefit will be derived by the fishermen of Nova Scotia. I hope it will not be detrimental to the fishermen and industry of Nova Scotia.

When it comes to any type of measurement applied to the Atlantic provinces generally, I invariably notice that only the province having a Progressive Conservative government suffers. The other three provinces will benefit more from this proposal than will the province of Nova Scotia.

My objections to the bill stem from the fact that there are a number of plants, particularly in my riding, specializing in certain processes. For example, I can think of four or five plants specializing in pickled, boneless cod. There are the Smith people at Shag Harbour, the Sable Fish Packers at Clark Harbour, the Co-operative in East Pubnico, Hopkins in Wood Harbour and others involved in processing boneless cod process. The process has been developed through the drive and initiative of these people. They have experienced marketing problems in the past, and they may do so in the future, but I do not think the market is bleak at the moment. It does not seem to me that the bill will be of any benefit to a specialized industry of this type.

I hope the operations of this corporation will not create unemployment by putting some of our private enterprises out of business. It is important for any area that it should maintain small, local industries. If the establishment of a corporation means that some of these smaller fish plants will suffer, I hope the minister will proceed carefully and be prepared to amend the legislation later if necessary.

I ask the minister what is meant by clause 22 on page 10 of the bill. I hope it means that certain businesses in some areas will not be touched by the operations of the corporation if it is felt they would be detrimental to them. I have in mind the type of business I have just mentioned, or any other specialized parts of the industry. I do not wish to see the employees of these businesses laid off, particularly the women who have acquired a certain skill.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I wonder why the highly energetic Premier of Newfoundland has not introduced a provincial bill along these lines, especially as this measure affects Newfoundland fishermen for the most part. My colleague says he has. The reason it is not working may be that the federal government is involved in exports. If that is so, I wonder why the government does

not bring in a bill which would affect only a certain area, if this bill is detrimental to some parts of Canada. We will see how this legislation works. As I mentioned, I hope the minister will be able to amend the legislation if it does not work.

I understand, also, that provinces can opt in or out of this plan. I would like to caution the minister about the expense incurred by Crown corporations. As I stated at the beginning, I do not look favourably on Crown corporations, and I hope the minister will be cautious and will ensure that this board will be operated effectively and efficiently. I want to raise just these few points. I might have more to say when the legislation comes before the committee.

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my comments on Bill C-175 to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, not only because, as most of my colleagues have said, it is a good bill but because I feel it may be the answer to many of the problems which exist in the fishing industry in my district. I commend the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) for the positive approach he has taken since taking over the fisheries portfolio, and for the legislation he has already put forth since taking office. However, as is the case with most legislation, there are bound to arise many unforeseen human errors. I am sure the minister would agree that this is true with regards to some of the past programs which were instituted on behalf of the fishermen.

The bill to establish the Canadian Saltfish Corporation is a good one but I, along with others, have some reservations and I would like to point out some weaknesses, not to criticize for the sake of criticism but in order to offer positive suggestions which have arisen out of my assessment of the weaknesses in most of the past legislation and programs which were designed to cure the ills of the fishermen. There are peculiar problems in various parts of the Atlantic region, which necessitate a special appoach.

If I may make a general over-all criticism arising out of my short experience of politics, in assessing the fishing industry I believe it is a weakness in correlating and providing a system or plan whereby all the various programs support one another. If I may offer an example, I supported wholeheartedly the deficiency payment program. That was a good program but it seriously missed the boat in my district due to certain unforeseen factors. The deficiency payment program was an interim measure intended to compensate for the extraordinary situation which depressed the fishermen's income in 1968, and to avoid its recurrence in 1969. Payments will be made after February 1 on various grades of fish classified as to quality and character, such as light-salted, heavy-salted and split fish. I spent two weeks during the summer visiting many of the fishing villages in my riding, and in not one case where I inspected fish could I find any distinction made as to grade. Fish was purchased as one grade whether it was prime, maderia medium or small. Naturally, the fishermen lost out because they were paid according to the whims of the buyer. So again fishermen suffered because there was no grading or culling of fish. When they get the 50 per cent difference between the 1968 price and the target price, they will lose out on the greater difference which would exist if they had sold their fish by grade.

This emphasizes the fact that you can have all the programs you want, however good they appear on paper and however sincerely they are prepared—and I assure the minister that he has all my commendation for his sincerity—but what was the good of the deficiency payment program to the fishermen of the northwest coast of Newfoundland, when they were deprived of their livelihood because of the weak restrictions on fishing limits by the foreign draggers who appeared for many months in last year's fishing season?

As admirable as the deficiency payment program was, what is the point of deficiency payments when there are no fish to be caught? What good are deficiency payments if there is no culling and the fishermen are not given the advantage of trying to produce a better product, which the experts say should be done? We can have all the individual programs we want, and we can produce them on paper until they fill all the offices on Parliament hill, including the House of Commons, but we will never succeed unless we support the programs not only with money but by factors involved. This takes into account the fishing grounds, the facilities required and, most important of all, the guidance and leadership which we have not given the fishermen up to now. Equally important, we must have confidence in the fishermen who have the practical knowledge necessary and need our help.

Let me speak about some of the better programs which have been introduced through the initiative and good intentions of

the government. Let us look first at the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act, whereby an individual fisherman or a group of fishermen can get loans up to $25,000 at a preferred rate of interest in order to buy a boat or to purchase fishing gear or equipment. They have ten years to pay it back.

This is a good program because it gives the fisherman—on paper, mind you—the opportunity to get a loan at a bank or other lending institution, which he might not get under normal banking regulations, because it is guaranteed by the government. This program is designed to give fishermen with resourcefulness and initiative an opportunity to get themselves started in a competitive way in the fishing business. This is truly a wonderfully program, on paper. Just try to get a fisheries improvement loan in the province of Newfoundland! Just ask the many hundreds of fishermen in my district of Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe about this!

During my two years in politics I have found that only two fishermen in the whole province were granted loans under this program, and in order to find those two I had to take the word of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), after reading the list produced by his department. The staff of the office of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) is aware of the number of times I have asked for material on fisheries improvement loans to send to my constituents because of my faith in the program. Of the many hundreds I have sent out, only one man indicated he was able to get a loan from the bank in his area. He got the loan, but not through the plan under which he applied as laid down in the act. He was granted a loan which he could have obtained anywhere, and was charged 11.9 per cent interest instead of having the advantage of the preferred rate under the act. This is why I say we must have some confidence in the fishermen who are supposed to be encouraged. As far as Newfoundland is concerned, the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act is not worth the paper on which it is written.

Unless these matters are investigated and leadership is given to support the fishermen, we will never give them a decent start. Perhaps the loans offered under this legislation will overcome the serious lack of trust in those for whom its benefits are intended. I certainly hope that is the case.

The resettlement program is also good on paper but leaves much to be desired when put into practice. This emphasizes a lack of proper appreciation of its intention. The main weakness here is the lack of infrastructural logistics in providing the public facilities required in growth centres, in order to properly receive those who are relocated. We can designate growth centres for as long as we want, but they must be capable of providing the necessary facilities to allow a new resident to get the new start in life which the program is designed to give him. Again there is a lack of intersupport for the program.

I could give members many examples of frustration in this regard, but the one that sticks in my mind refers to a man who came to see me about welfare. He started out in one community with two motor boats, a horse, a truck, 23 sheep and his own garden in which he produced all the needs of his family. He enjoyed life.

• (5:30 p.m.)

After making three moves, he ended up a stone's throw from the community from which he started and is receiving $112 a month in welfare for himself and a family of five. Without dwelling on all the other good programs, provincial and federal, such as the Fisheries Act, the Coastal Fisheries Protection regulations, the fishing vessel indemnity regulations and the fisheries loan boards, I suggest there must be an interrelationship with other departments of federal jurisdiction such as Public Works and Regional Economic Expansion.

I become a little tired and frustrated when I receive the same stock answer to requests for breakwaters, community-stages and other facilities which the fishermen must have in order to derive any benefit from this new corporation. In answer to the many requests I make of the Department of Public Works, I receive a similar tale of woe. I am told that on investigation it was found that due to the fact that the number of fishermen is decreasing over the years, and that the fisherman's income is decreasing, it is found uneconomical to accede to my requests.

I ask the minister how he expects the number of fishermen to increase, or their income to increase, if in the first place they do not have the necessary facilities. Let me refer to one example in the community of Anchor Point. I quote from a letter received from the provincial member of the district, who is also the provincial Minister of Public Works:

> With reference to Anchor Point, this, as you know is one of the most prosperous settlements in St. Barbe North with some of the best fishermen on the whole northwest coast—

I have been endeavouring for the past few years to get a breakwater and combination community stage and freezer, as well as a haul-up and fish drying area ... I do hope you will do your utmost to try and secure these requirements during your term of office.

Well, I have tried. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing), the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), as well as the district directors, know that I have tried for the past 18 months. I receive fine answers of agreement but then I hear the familiar tale of woe. I am told that departmental investigations reveal that about 52 fishermen operate 44 boats and use the public wharf facility. They say they agree there is a need, but unfortunately funds are not available; or that it is the view of the department that a community-stage, a fresh fish holding unit or a bait-holding facility are not required. I ask when they will be required. Are we waiting for the fishermen to become so discouraged that they go on welfare?

I hope to have an opportunity to deal with my misgivings about the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and its responsibilities in relation to the fishing industry in Newfoundland. But in the desire to complete the debate today I shall leave this question until I have another opportunity. I hope the authority vested in the Saltfish Corporation will be a means of overcoming the problems regarding loans. I hope the attitude of the banks in denying fishermen with initiative and resourcefulness an opportunity to obtain a loan to improve their lot as fishermen will not be adopted by the corporation. If I might be so bold, I would suggest that the criteria used for granting these loans must not be on the basis of the fisherman's security, because he has not been given the opportunity to build up any security due to the failure of past legislation to protect him and his industry.

I should like to make one final comment in respect of liaison and communication. There has been a complete lack of communication, by officials below the level of district officer, with the fishermen. I hope when the advisory boards and advisory committees are appointed we will realize the extreme importance of consultation with individuals or groups in all areas. This must be done even if it is necessary to enlarge the committees. I hope there will be no skimping in respect of staff, and that the officials will go to the fishing communities to explain the benefits under the act and to give the guidance and leadership required in order to produce a better quality of fish and so improve the income of the fisherman. There is also great need for communication with the many development associations which have sprung up and are becoming involved in the problems of their communities and districts. They are there to help, and I hope we will listen to the grass-roots advice they offer for the good of all concerned.

I hope that every section of the province will be represented on the advisory committees, because of the peculiar problems that exist in their communities. Let us forget political appointments and screen-out the capable and the devoted rather than the patronized.

I join others on this side of the House in support of this bill, Mr. Speaker. I hope the minister will take the suggestions in the spirit in which they are intended, to produce the best legislation possible and to build a base out of the resources that have been staring us in the face for hundreds of years. Let us by co-operation and good will gain the respect and the confidence of the fisherman in the Atlantic region by showing him that he is deserving of equal opportunity with all other Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, this bill is of great interest to the fishermen of the Gaspé district and of the Quebec North Shore. As it is nearly six o'clock, I will be very brief as I would like the bill to be referred to the committee as soon as possible. Besides, I will have an opportunity to discuss the matter when third reading of the bill is moved.

[*English*]

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation to hon. members for their patience and courtesy in working overtime this afternoon, listening mainly to members from Newfoundland talking about fish. But it is Friday anyway, so it is appropriate.

I do not oppose the principle of Bill C-175, an act to establish a Saltfish Corporation and saltfish. I, along with my colleagues from Newfoundland, welcome it and we congratulate the Minister. We congratulate him for at least trying, which is more than many of his predecessors appeared to do.

This measure is being hailed in some quarters as the end of all the problems for the fishermen engaged in the saltfish industry, or to use the $5 word, the panacea for all their problems. I am afraid I do not share in this enthusiasm. I wish it were so, but it is just not so.

As a Newfoundland fisherman would say, the minister has "a noggin to scrape," meaning a very difficult task, if this new corporation is to be instituted and truly used to improve the lot of the fisherman. We have seen many plans and schemes come and go which were ostensibly intended to aid the fishermen but ended up as the means whereby those other than fishermen could afford winter holidays down south, palatial homes and Cadillac comfort. I hope that this is truly the start of a real breakthrough for our Atlantic fishermen engaged in the saltfish industry. For the new corporation to be successful I think we must constantly remember its duties expressed in clause 23(b) as "increasing returns to fishermen." I think this is the line that should stand out. All members of the corporation should be aware of it at all times.

I am concerned that in the bill I see quite a large part devoted to inspection and policing of its provisions, including quality control, but no provision is spelled out whereby assistance and advice are given to our hundreds of small producers of saltfish, to help them produce a product as efficiently and as sanitarily as possible, ensuring that it will pass a rigid inspection and consequently result in the highest possible return to the fishermen. It is not enough to have an army of inspectors turning thumbs down. The reasons for such rejections must be pointed out, steps taken and assistance and advice given to correct them.

● (5:40 p.m.)

I do not think a grant limited to $100,000 to be spread over the five participating provinces, for the initial establishment of the corporation, is very generous at all. Surely, this corporation for which almost everyone expresses such great hope and enthusiasm, could have a little better send-off than this. Surely, the minister's colleagues who hold the purse-strings could be convinced to share a little more in the minister's enthusiasm.

For centuries, Mr. Speaker, the marketing of saltcod produced in Newfoundland has been done by sloppy, slipshod, hit-and-miss methods. I am delighted that a serious attempt is to be made in the area of con-

trolled marketing including packaging, etc., with regulations by the corporation governing all export and interprovincial trade in saltfish. Rigid quality control coupled with aggressive, imaginative marketing could raise the lowly saltcod to the prominence which such a delicious, nutritious and valuable food deserves.

Mr. Speaker, apart from our export trade in saltfish, it never fails to amaze me that so many people right here in Canada have never heard of Newfoundland saltcod. They do not know what they are missing. I blame the government of Canada and the government of Newfoundland for not promoting this delicacy and introducing it to our fellow Canadians across the country, as well as the export trade.

I remember last year, while the Standing Committee on Transportation was visiting St. John's, Newfoundland, the committee members were invited to the home of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) to enjoy the hospitality for which the Jamiesons are famous. There was a magnificent spread, Mr. Speaker, turkey, ham, hot dishes, cold dishes and God only knows what else. The Kelligrew's soirée had nothing on it. But the dish which really appealed to the members who were representative of all Canada was the traditional Newfoundland fish and brewis. I took particular note of the way the 20 or 30 mainlanders savoured this delicacy. It may be that their appetites were a little whetted by the stimulant known as screech, but the fact remains that they did go back for second and third helpings. While the Jamiesons may have had ham and turkey next day, I doubt if they had "fish and brewis".

I hope that one of the first things the corporation does, along with promoting export trade, is aggressively promote the sale of saltcod in our own country and the rest of North America. If the name must be changed from saltcod to some fancy-sounding name, and if it must be dressed up in a candy-striped package to appeal to our discerning and advertising mesmerized fellow Canadians and fellow North Americans, then let's do it. We in Newfoundland are a captive market, Mr. Speaker—half a million souls who produce nothing that I know of that our fellow Canadians consume. From the time we turn down our Quebec-made bedcovers in the morning, step out of our Quebec-made pyjamas, use our Ontario-produced toothpaste in a bathroom equipped from Ontario, and through the livelong day, everything that we

put on, rub on or spray on comes from another part of Canada.

We are a captive market and I feel there should be some reciprocal trade. In that way, Mr. Speaker, not only would we be getting the goodwill of the Canadian people with regard to our produce, but I think we would be showing our export markets that indeed we have a good product—it is fit to eat because we eat it ourselves. I do not blame the people of Canada but, as I said before, I blame the government for not long ago adopting an aggressive and imaginative program for putting this product on the local market. There may then be such a demand from world markets that we would be surprised. Canadians are very well respected, and I am sure our saltfish would be too.

Of course, I also hope that demand for saltfish will be strong and that we may be able to keep up with that demand. I am very serious about this and would like to see local markets promoted and see the product enjoy some respect.

I know the minister must be given some time in order to close the debate, so I will say no more. May I indicate, however, that I shall have some questions when we come to the clause by clause consideration of the bill in committee.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I will not say very much in this debate, other than applaude the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr) and his constituents. I could make many observations and talk longer on this subject than other members of the House, because in my constituency more people will be affected by this legislation than those in any other constituency. I think I can say that without fear of contradiction.

We are happy with this legislation. Even though all hon. members will not benefit to the same extent as I and my constituents, I am glad to see they are supporting the legislation, the credit for which must go to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) and not the Premier of Newfoundland. I shall have more to say about that in committee.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, may I first thank all hon. members here who have contributed in the debate, and, more particularly, those who have resisted speaking at some length this afternoon with a view to making a solid contribution in committee later. As hon. members know, the best work is done in committees. I am glad to be able to get the saltfish legislation before our committee next week.

I wish to say very few words. We are talking about approximately 20,000 fishermen and, if you include their dependents, 100,000 people, all of them resident in the Atlantic region. By and large they are on the bottom rung of the income ladder in this country and yet they are among the hardest working people in Canada. Obviously we owe it to them to provide the best legislation we can. As some hon. members have said, this is only a beginning and, as others have said, we must integrate this legislation with other legislation which exists now and which is to be brought along. I agree with both comments.

The main objective of this particular piece of legislation must be the improvement of the incomes and the lot of those engaged in the saltfishery. Some remarks earlier may have left the impression that some of the people who produce saltfish in the Atlantic region will not be able to sell their product. That is not true. This corporation must buy all saltfish offered in the areas which come under the act. In other words, all saltfish offered for sale will be bought.

Of course, the corporation must have some discretion as to quality and it will increasingly put emphasis on high quality and pay top prices for that quality and reduce the price for the poorer qualities. To repeat, anyone offering saltfish will be able to find a market for his product. The area within which the corporation must buy the saltfish offered will include, I believe, all the territory within the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, all of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. So far as the province of Quebec is concerned, I understand that only the north shore along the Gulf of St. Lawrence will be included in the legislation passed by the province of Quebec, but not the Gaspé. One of the reasons I believe is that saltfishing in the Gaspé is relatively prosperous. It has concentrated on very high quality; the Gaspé cure is famous and the area's product sells principally in the United States. This shows, of course, why the saltfish corporation should stress quality and what it may do in future in promoting saltfish in the markets of the world and promoting a product of which we will be proud.

There was reference to a crown-owned corporation backing out private enterprise. My impression of the industry really is that we need all the enterprise that we can get, not only the enterprise of the fishermen but also

all the enterprise of the existing trades. There is no problem here except perhaps in southern Nova Scotia. The Nova Scotia government has agreed with us that several qualities of saltfish, for the time being, will not be included under the act, those being principally the boneless saltfish produced in southern Nova Scotia principally for markets around New York.

• (5:50 p.m.)

It is possible under the act to exclude any grade or quality of saltfish. A province may exclude particular areas, if they wish, from the ambit of this corporation. It is my expectation that in Nova Scotia the boneless product will not be included under the act. It will be brought in by a change in regulations, but the province would have to concur in this. I think one of the worries of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) is removed in that connection.

I think I can end where I began. The fisherman has been looking forward to some action along these lines from government at both the provincial and federal levels. This corporation, if well managed, will give him a price for his product which he deserves and which he will earn. We must have other related programs in the Department of Fisheries and in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. I believe the Saltfish Corporation is a good start. It is a sound idea. It is a corporation in which I have confidence and which I believe will be well run. I look forward to hearing constructive suggestions in committee next week.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being after five o'clock, this House stands adjourned until Monday next at 2 p.m.

At 5.55 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, January 26, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

PROCEDURE ON MOTION TO ESTABLISH JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as announced last week the business for both today and tomorrow will be a debate on the motion to establish a joint committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the constitution, which stands in the Prime Minister's name which is now under government notices of motions and which it is assumed will be transferred in due course to government orders today. There have been discussions among the parties as to the procedure for handling this matter and I think there might be found to be general agreement for a special order to deal with this debate.

The first characteristic of it would be that the ordinary time limits provided under Standing Order 31 would be suspended, that an initial spokesman for each of the parties would be entitled to speak for 40 minutes and that thereafter speakers would be entitled to speak for 20 minutes. Second, the debate would be a two-day debate and all questions necessary to a decision on the motion would be put immediately before the ordinary time for adjournment on the second day.

There has also been a suggestion, and unfortunately I have not had full opportunity to consult on this point, that on each of the two days private members' hour might be suspended in order to allow maximum opportunity for participation. I wonder if that might be agreeable and if that could be a special order of the House?

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the subject and the wish of many hon. members to participate, although the terms of reference relating to this matter are somewhat complex we feel that in the interest of the widest possible debate this is the proper course to follow and would be perfectly agreeable to it.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we have agreed to this procedural motion.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed? Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

HUMAN RIGHTS

STATEMENT ON RACIAL DISCRIMINATION ALLEGED BY CERTAIN STUDENTS FROM WEST INDIES

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, January 19, the hon. member for Hamilton West directed a question to me and to the Prime Minister regarding allegations of racial discrimination in Canada. I should like to thank the hon. member for giving me the opportunity of making a statement on this important matter and of expressing what I hope is the view of all hon. members of the House.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Since the incident which occurred at the Sir George Williams University computer centre in February, 1969, various statements have been made, both in Canada and in the Caribbean, by some of those accused of offences in connection with that incident and by other persons with an interest in the matter, alleging that Canada has a racist society and pursues racialist policies. As hon. members are aware, such statements are without foundation. The fact that the Canadian government does not engage in, and will not tolerate in any department or agency for which it is responsible, policies which involve discrimination on grounds of race, creed, colour or ethnic origin is well known. Furthermore, as an adherent to the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, and a signatory of the international convention on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, Canada has affirmed its opposition to such discrimination. The government reiterates its fullest support of these principles and objectives.

Racial Discrimination

Since the events of February, 1969, I have met on several occasions with a number of people interested in the Sir George Williams University incident. At one such meeting with a group of students and professors, I gave them the government's assurance that the events at Sir George would in no way affect Canadian government policy with regard to the admission of Caribbean students or the functioning of Canadian educational assistance programs. I have also met twice with diplomatic representatives of the Commonwealth countries of the Caribbean, when I assured them that our immigration regulations and policies would not be altered as a result of these events. I also expressly made the point that the incident at Sir George Williams University should not be allowed to damage relations between Canada and their countries.

Racial discrimination is a cancerous growth which gnaws away the humanity of society and is an example of what Robert Burns called "man's inhumanity to man". Canada is not free from racial prejudice. In this, as in all countries, there are people who practise racial discrimination. Racial discrimination arises from ignorance and fear. It cannot be eradicated by Acts of Parliament or regulations, although these can and do restrain its more extreme manifestations.

The Canadian government is opposed to racism in any form and is working to create the conditions in which our society will be free of it. The government cannot carry out this task alone. It calls for the best efforts of all Canadians of good will. Parents and teachers, who form the attitudes of the young, bear a special responsibility.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak not only for members on this side of the House but all hon. members who are concerned about the problem of discrimination because of race, creed or colour when I say I am pleased that the government has stood up to be counted throughout the world for the benefit of those who have the attitude that our eyes continue to be closed to the ultimate results. This has now been discounted. Unquestionably there are many in our great country who continue to practice acceptance of a man on the basis of race, creed or colour. This must stop.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: We have seen the results of such an attitude in other countries which I need not mention. Those who continue to adhere to this philosophy must realize the harm that can come to this country. We must maintain our good relations with the West Indies because there is mutual benefit from such a relationship.

I am pleased to see that the House generally has accepted the spirit of my question. I am also pleased that Canada has stood up to be counted as a country that welcomes all people, regardless of race, creed or colour, who want to come to this country in freedom and take part productively by becoming an actual and viable force in the mainstream of Canadian life.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, we welcome the statement made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. We have always supported the international conventions of the United Nations and of the International Labour Organization. Canada itself has fair employment practices legislation and the Bill of Rights on its statute books, and we support the principles enunciated in the minister's statement.

We welcome particularly the statement that despite what happened at Sir George Williams University the government has no intention of altering its policy under which Caribbean students have been admitted in large numbers to study in Canada.

Without expressing any view on the trials now in progress, or on some of the things which happened at Sir George Williams—indeed, it would be improper for me to comment on the trials at this point—I express the hope that when the trials have been completed and the students have paid the penalty, if any, meted out by the courts, the government of Canada, through the Department of Manpower and Immigration, will avoid taking a very legalistic approach to this matter. I trust it will not arrange for the automatic deportation of these people as it has a right to do when crimes have been committed and convictions obtained.

There is one further point I should like to make, though it does not relate directly to the responsibility of the federal government. It seems to us that the decision of the university to bar from registration this year the students who have been charged, before they have been convicted or given an opportunity to defend themselves and explain what happened, is wrong. To a certain extent at least they have, in fact, been tried and found guilty by the university, and for this reason we believe the course taken is wrong.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank sincerely the Secretary of State for External Affairs, on behalf of my colleagues, for the statement he has just made in respect of racism.

I appreciated the statement made by my hon. friend, the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander). May I say that I am proud of his participation in the business of the House, because, once more, I repeat, once more this proves that any person, regardless of his race or his color, can take an efficient part, not only in the business of the State, but also in the administration and the operation of a State.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the real issue is not simply a matter of race, colour or creed, but rather a problem of individuals. Since Canada throws her doors open to all sorts of individuals, the presence of a certain foreigner in Canada at this time is worrying a lot of people, especially some ministers of the province of Quebec. I rather think it is in that field that Canada should enforce strict supervision in order to prevent some trouble makers from infiltrating into our country.

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

TABLING OF CORRESPONDENCE ON PROPOSED RESETTLEMENT IN ALBERTA

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Citizenship and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I promised the hon. member for Saint-Denis last week or the week before that I would table correspondence on the subject of the proposed resettlement of certain immigrants in Alberta, and if I have leave I will table that correspondence.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notices of motions:

That a Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That twenty members of the House of Commons, to be designated by the House at a later date, be members of the joint committee on the part of this House;

That the committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

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

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

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NORTHWEST PASSAGE—ASSISTANCE TO "MANHATTAN"

Question No. 89—**Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley):**

What is the estimated Canadian Government expenditure in assisting the US-owned oil tanker *Manhattan* in its navigation of the Northwest Passage?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 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 programme 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.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT BRANCH, CTC

Question No. 134—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Has the Policy Development Branch of the Canadian Transport Commission been disbanded and, if so, for what reasons?

2. What has happened to each of the staff members of the Policy Development Branch as a result of this action, and in particular, its Director, Mr. J. A. Macaluso?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. No.

2. N/A.

GRANTS TO INDIAN ASSOCIATIONS

Question No. 143—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

1. For the fiscal year 1969-70, what is the (a) operational and (b) organizational grant being awarded to each association of Indian people, by name, in Canada?

2. What are the anticipated grants for the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74?

3. For the fiscal year 1969-70, what is the salary and operational expense for the new section in the Department of Indian Affairs responsible for the implementation of the government's policy for native people, under Dr. David Munro, the newly appointed assistant deputy minister?

4. What are the anticipated salary and operational expenses for this new section for the fiscal years 1970-71, 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. Per capita operational and organizational grants to Indian organizations.

Association	Payment
National Indian Brotherhood	$61,000
Union of New Brunswick Indians	4,156
Lennox Island Band (P.E.I.)	4,418
Union of Nova Scotia Indians	4,452
Indians of Quebec Association	25,376
River Desert Band (Maniwaki)	926
Ontario Indians	42,981
Iroquois & Allied Indians	10,000
Manitoba Indian Brotherhood	33,358
Federation of Saskatchewan Indians	33,852
Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs	46,046
Yukon Native Brotherhood	2,562
Indian Brotherhood of the N.W.T.	6,082
Indian Association of Alberta	27,322 (money available but refunded by Association.)

While the above funds are available, partial payments only have been made in most cases pending approval of Indian Bands to release balance to Associations.

2. 1970-71, $315,000 total, with $63,000 allocated for the National Indian Brotherhood, calculated at the rate of 25 cents per registered Indian in Canada; and the remainder payable directly to Indian bands at the rate of $1 per registered Indian band member. (The Bands will then disburse the grant funds to whichever organization they wish to support.) 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74. Similar grants are anticipated, subject to discussion with the Indian people, and subject to Treasury Board approval.

3. Salary and operational expenses for seven month period $700,000.

4. Estimated for 1970-71, salary and operational expenses $1,250,000. There have been no approved projections beyond the fiscal year 1970-71.

PROPOSED AIRPORT SITE, TORONTO

Question No. 176—**Mr. Brewin:**

1. Has the Department of Transport participated in any way with the Toronto Harbour Commissioners in the preparation of plans or studies for a projected airport at or near the filled-in lands on the lakefront South of East end of the City of Toronto?

2. If so, what is the proposed site of the airport, the projected capacity and size?

3. Have any studies been prepared by and for the Department of Transport or the Toronto Harbour Commissioners as to noise pollution that might be affected by the construction and operation of the airport?

4. Have any studies been prepared by or for the Department of Transport or the Toronto Harbour Commissioners as to the likely traffic to and from the airport, the flow of passengers, visitors and employees that would use such an airport, and whether there would be satisfactory accessibility and parking accommodation?

5. Have there been any correspondence or communications between the Department of Transport, and (a) The Toronto Harbour Commissioners (b) the Province of Ontario (c) the Municipality of the City of Toronto (d) the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto or each or any agency or representative of the four named authorities and, in particular, have the Councils of the Municipality of the City of Toronto and the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto been consulted (all of the above) in relation to the projected airport?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The Department has received a proposal from the Toronto Harbour Commissioners that an airport be constructed in the waterfront area. This proposal is currently being evaluated.

2. The proposed site is approximately four miles east of the existing Island Airport, on land to be reclaimed east of the eastern spit. The projected capacity would accommodate a peak hour load of approximately 40-50 aircraft movements. The size of the development would be approximately 700 acres of land.

3. Noise studies for the proposed site are not yet completed. This site is being evaluated along with others in the Toronto area by a Project Team charged with the task of site evaluation. Noise is a major consideration in the evaluation.

4. Traffic studies covering all aspects of this question are now in progress.

5. There has been extensive communication with the Province through a joint committee dealing with airport site evaluation, and limited communication with the other named agencies. When all relevant data has been assembled to permit meaningful discussion and evaluation, all levels of government concerned with the waterfront location will be directly involved in the deliberations.

URBAN RENEWAL AND PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

Question No. 218—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Since the government announced its freeze on urban renewal and public housing projects, how many projects of each type have been approved by the federal government in each province in Canada?

2. (a) What amount has the federal government agreed to contribute to each project (b) what is the population of each province to which grants have been made (c) what is the percentage of the total population of Canada in each of the provinces to which grants have been made (d) what is the percentage of money approved for each province?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): 1. Three urban renewal projects have been approved by Governor-in-Council for implementation since the announcement on August 14, 1969, curtailing urban renewal activity. However, as I indicated in my statement in the House of Commons on December 18, 1969, negotiations are underway respecting a number of other projects in eight provinces to which all three levels of government have a degree of commitment. A "freeze" was not placed on public housing projects.

2. (a) The federal government's estimated gross contributions to these urban renewal projects are: London, Ontario, $1,879,416; Cloverdale area, District Municipality of Surrey, B.C., $334,225; Port Coquitlam, B.C., $143,873. (b) 1966 Census population figures for Ontario and British Columbia are 6,960,870 and 1,873,674, respectively. (c) The percentage of the population in Ontario to the total population of Canada is 34.8 per cent and in British Columbia, 9.4 per cent. (d) The percentage of such funds approved in Ontario is 80 per cent and in British Columbia, 20 per cent.

AIR CANADA—SALARY INCREASES

Question No. 346—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. What was the date of the last general salary and wage increase granted to all major separate categories of Air Canada personnel prior to April 1, 1963, its effective date, and what was the percentage increase?

2. From April 1, 1963 to date, what have been the dates (both of publication and coming into force) of any general salary and wage increase for all major separate categories of Air Canada personnel and what was the average percentage for each such increase?

3. What cumulative average percentage increase does the salary and wage level to all major separate categories of Air Canada personnel as at present date reflect when compared to the relative salary and wage level of April 1, 1963?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Air Canada advises as follows: 1. The major separate categories of Air Canada personnel are: (a) pilots, represented by the Canadian Air Line Pilots Association (CALPA); (b) flight attendants, represented by the Canadian Air Line Flight Attendants' As-

sociation (CALFAA); (c) maintenance, station services purchases and stores, represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (IAMAW); (d) sales employees represented by the Canadian Air Line Employees' Association (CALEA).

Category	Effective date	Percentage increase
CALPA	January 1, 1962	2.0
CALFAA	January 1, 1962	5.0
IAMAW	July 1, 1962	4.0
CALEA	September 1, 1962	3.0

---

2. (CALPA) Pilots

Date of Signing	Effective date of Contract	Expiry date	Total percentage Increase During Contract Term
July 11, 1963	July 1, 1963	September 30, 1969	6.0
February 17, 1966	October 1, 1965	March 31, 1968	13.0
September 16, 1968	April 1, 1968	June 30, 1970	17.0
(CALFAA) Flight Attendants			
November 19, 1963	August 1, 1963	March 31, 1965	5.0
April 8, 1965	April 1, 1965	March 31, 1967	6.0
June 12, 1967	April 1, 1967	May 31, 1969	17.0
July 3, 1969	June 1, 1969	May 31, 1971	15.0
(IAMAW) Machinists and Related Personnel			
March 17, 1965	July 2, 1963	June 29, 1964	4.0*
March 17, 1965	June 30, 1964	October 31, 1966	8.0
February 15, 1967	November 1, 1966	December 31, 1968	20.0
July 21, 1969	January 1, 1969	February 28, 1971	16.0
(CALEA) Sales Employees			
September 17, 1964	September 1, 1963	November 30, 1965	7.0
June 23, 1966	December 1, 1965	July 31, 1968	15.0
December 13, 1968	August 1, 1968	July 31, 1969	8.0
July 30, 1969	August 1, 1969	September 30, 1971	16.0

* Previous contract had a wage re-opener clause dating back to July 1, 1963.

---

3. Cumulative increase in Wage Awards from April 1, 1963 to present: Pilots *: (a) General increase, 39.0 per cent; (b) automatic wage increase, 20.0 per cent; (c) total a + b, 59.0 per cent; flight attendants, 42.0 per cent; mechanics, 56.0 per cent; passenger agents, 49.0 per cent.

* Pilots receive two forms of wage increase: 1. Negotiated wage increases. 2. Wage increases produced by their pay formula when they fly more productive aircraft. This formula is based on weight, speed of the aircraft, etc.

CNR—SALARY INCREASES

Question No. 347—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. What was the date of the last general salary and wage increase granted to operating groups and non operating groups of the Canadian National Railways employees prior to April 1, 1963, its effective date, and what was the percentage increase?

2. For April 1, 1963, to date, what have been the dates (both of publication and coming into force) of any general salary and wage increase for operating groups and non operating groups of the Canadian National Railways employees and what was the average percentage increase for each such increase?

3. What cumulative average percentage increase does the salary and wage level to operating groups and non operating groups of the Canadian National Railways employees as at present date reflect when compared to the relative salary and wage level of April 1, 1963?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows:

1. Operating Employees

	Effective date	Percentage increase phased over life of contract
Locomotive Engineers	May 1, 1961	6.5
Locomotive Firemen and Hostlers	April 1, 1961	6.5 Passenger service 4.0 freight and yard service
Conductors, Trainmen and Yardmasters	June 1, 1961	8.0
Non operating employees	March 1, 1962	4.0

2. Operating Employees

Date of Signing	Effective Date of Contract	Expiry Date	Total Per Cent Increases During Contract Term
Locomotive Engineers			
March 20/64	May 1/64	April 30/67	3.5—Rd. Svce. 12.0—Yd. Svce.
August 22/67	May 1/67	April 30/70	22.0—Rd. Svce. 28.0—Yd. Svce.
Locomotive Firemen and Hostlers			
April 17/64	May 1/64	April 30/67	6.5—Psgr./Htl. Svce. 4.0—Frt./Yd. Svce.
August 2/68	May 1/67	June 30/70	24.0—Psgr./Htl. Svce. 15.0—Frt. Svce. 18.0—Yd. Svce.
Conductors, Trainmen and Yardmasters			
February 19/64	January 1/64	December 31/65	5
February 21/67	January 1/66	December 31/68	24
April 25/69	January 1/69	December 31/70	13.4
Non-Operating Employees:			
July 17/64	January 1/64	December 31/65	9.5
Shop Crafts— August 15/67 C.B.R.T. and G.W.— May 11/67 Resid. Non-Ops— March 14/67	January 1/66	December 31/68	24.0
Shop Crafts— February 26/69 Resid. Non-Ops— January 29/69	January 1/69	December 31/70	13.4

3.

Operating Employees:	Cumulative per cent increases of wage awards since April 1, 1963, to termination of present contracts
(1) Locomotive Engineers (Road Service)	28.2
(2) Locomotive Engineers (Yard Service)	45.5
(3) Firemen (Psgr. and Hostling Service)	34.5
(4) Firemen (Freight Service)	21.4
(5) Firemen (Yard Service)	24.6
(6) Conductors, Trainmen and Yardmasters	47.6
Non-Operating Employees:	55.5

Questions

ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEES, PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Question No. 384—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many additional employees have been taken on strength by the Public Service Commission since the date on which the government austerity program was announced by the Prime Minister?

2. What is the total amount of the annual salaries of the additional personnel that have been taken on strength?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Public Service Commission as follows: 1. Since the date on which the government austerity program was announced by the Prime Minister the Public Service Commission has taken on 95 additional continuing employees. These employees were appointed to the Language Bureau which is not restricted under the austerity program.

2. The total amount of annual salaries for the continuing employees is $870,058.

[*English*]

DISPOSAL OF NEWFOUNDLAND RAILWAY PASSENGER CARS

Question No. 418—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What is the intention of the government concerning the retention or disposal of railway passenger cars of the Newfoundland Railway?

2. If a decision has been reached for disposal, have any offers been made to purchase the cars and, if so, (a) by whom (b) at what price?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. Subject to the requirements of the Canadian Transport Commission Order No. R 5185, it is the intention to eventually dispose of all of this equipment.

2. One offer received. Till any disposition is made it is felt it should be kept confidential.

CONVERSION OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT INTO CROWN CORPORATION

Question No. 424—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. What is the present status of the studies by Kates, Peat, Marwick, and Co. on the conversion of the Post Office Department into a Crown Corporation?

2. When did they receive their terms of reference and when is the report due?

3. Will the report be tabled in Parliament so that Members may study the advantages and disadvantages of this new form of administration?

4. Does the government intend to apply this formula to the management of the following government services (a) operation of airports (b) Canada Pension Plan (c) Canadian Government elevators (d) Unemployment Insurance fund?

[Mr. Loiselle.]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): 1. Completed.

2. (a) December 6, 1968; (b) Due on September 15, 1969, received on November 20, 1969.

3. Yes.

4. (a) (b) (c) This is a matter of government policy which would be announced in the usual way. (d) The Unemployment Insurance Commission is already a Crown corporation according to Section 76 and Schedule B of the Financial Administration Act.

PROPOSED CNR TRAIN SERVICE WITHDRAWALS—EMPLOYEE LAY-OFFS

Question No. 448—**Mr. Orlikow:**

How many employees will be laid off by the Canadian National Railway in each region if it is permitted to discontinue the train operations it has proposed to the Canadian Transportation Commission?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: The filing of applications for discontinuance of uneconomic passenger train services is a procedure which the Railways must follow under provisions of the National Transportation Act of 1967 to obtain decision from the Canadian Transport Commission as to the individual services that may be terminated and those which must be continued. It is only after a decision is made by the CTC that it will be feasible to trace through the seniority rights of the employees engaged in these services and estimate the number, if any, who will suffer loss in employment. Of those affected, many will find work in their own craft (engine and train crews), some will be transferred to other employment and others will be absorbed by normal attrition.

SUBSIDIES TO PRIVATE ENTERPRISES—RECEIPT OF SHARES

Question No. 465—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Is it the policy of the government to require that all private enterprise receiving subsidies remit the equivalent in common or preferred shares and, if not, does the government intend to adopt such a policy?

2. Was such a policy applied in the case of Panarctic Oils Ltd.?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): I am informed

by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development as follows: 1. (a) No, (b) No.

2. By agreement tabled in the House on December 12, 1967, the Government made a grant of $9,022,500 to Panarctic Oils Ltd. in respect of which the Government received 900,000 preferred shares of Panarctic at par value of $10 each and 225,000 common shares (without par value) valued by Panarctic at 10 cents per share. Other participants subscribed $11,027,500 in respect of the issue of 1,100,000 preferred shares and 275,000 common shares. Thus, the Government holds a 45 per cent interest in Panarctic directly proportionate to its grant.

CN FREIGHT SERVICE OPERATING COSTS

Question No. 479—**Mr. Laprise:**

What was the 1968 operating surplus or deficit of the Canadian National freight service on the folowing runs (a) Montreal-Chambord-Chicoutimi-Dolbeau and Quebec-Chicoutimi (b) Quebec-Senneterre-Cochrane and Montreal-Harvey-Senneterre-Rouyn-Noranda (c) Parent-Senneterre (d) La Tuque-Parent?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: Canadian National does not analyse its freight traffic on a train run or geographic basis since such a breakdown has no managerial significance. Statistics are taken off from time to time in the case of thin traffic density branch lines which are considered to be uneconomic and the system revenues derived from traffic originating and terminating at stations on the line under study are compared with the system avoidable costs incurred in handling this traffic in accordance with Section 314B (3) of the Railway Act.

In view of the type and volume of traffic being handled on the runs in question such a detailed analysis does not appear justified at this time and to extract the data would entail considerable time and expense.

CNR TURBOTRAINS

Question No. 504—**Mr. Laprise:**

1. How much did the CNR turbotrains cost?

2. Were they withdrawn from service and, if so, for what reasons and is it intended to return them to service?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. The turbotrain was constructed by United Aircraft Corporation and is owned by that Company. No capital investment in the cost thereof has been made by the Canadian National. Original estimates by United Aircraft Corporation of the cost of the five trains was $10 million.

2. The trains were withdrawn from service to permit undertaking modifications of some components which gave difficulty during operations. Some of the modifications require a considerable amount of research and engineering which is being undertaken by United Aircraft. When this work is completed and is proven to perform well under field testing, consideration will be given to returning the trains to service.

TELEGRAM AND CABLE TRANSMISSION

Question No. 509—**Mr. Orlikow:**

What are the results of the investigation into CN-CP telecommunications regarding the delays in the transmission of telegrams and cables as mentioned by the Minister of Transport in *Hansard*, July 16, 1969 on page 11288?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows. The delays in telegaph message handling resulted generally from the necessity of training new staff and those being absorbed into the new one-company managed message points. The problems have been overcome and the cause for complaint is felt to have been eliminated.

As to the handling of cables; in general the overseas cable operators depend on the telecommunication companies to handle distribution of their messages in Canada. Due to circumstances over which this Company has no control many of the cables are delayed outside of Canada. However, earlier in the year some problems were encountered in the Company's computer operation which occasioned delay in transmission of cables from Toronto.

Every available resource was marshalled in order to return the standard of service to normal. Traffic studies indicate that this has been accomplished and acceptable service provided over the past several months.

NEAR COLLISIONS, AIRCRAFT

Question No. 537—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. How many "near collisions" between aircraft flying in Canada have been reported to Airport officials and/or the Department of Transport in each of the years 1966, 1967 and 1968?

Questions

2. Have any additional safety precautions been ordered by the Department of Transport in the last three years and, if so, what are they?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The number of "near collisions" which have been reported to the Department of Transport are as follows: 1966—39; 1967—33; 1968—47.

2. (i) Positive Control of Canadian Airspace above 23,000 feet was introduced in 1966.

(ii) In the interest of improving flight safety in terminal areas, Extended Terminal Control Service was implemented at Toronto International Airport on 1 January, 1968.

(iii) Positive Control Zones have been established at 35 airports across the country.

(iv) Military Flying Areas have been designated in various locations to segregate military traffic from civil operations.

(v) There has been an increase of approximately 20 per cent in the amount of controlled airspace in the low level structure.

(vi) Seven short range, high definition radars have been installed at major terminals.

(vii) Six Scan Converted Radar Displays have been installed in control towers at major terminal airports.

(viii) Special operating procedures have been introduced to ensure separation of high performance aircraft from slower traffic.

(ix) In the interest of safety, Ab Initio Flight Training has been banned at the Vancouver, Winnipeg, Montreal and Toronto International Airports.

(x) In order to reduce collision hazard, aircraft are required to operate at reduced airspeeds flying below 3,000 feet within 10 miles of the centre of a controlled airport.

(xi) Since 1966, 13 new control towers have been opened at various airports across the country, and six mobile control towers have been supplied.

(xii) A computer which is capable of confliction prediction, has been installed at Gander Area Control Centre.

INCREASES AND DECREASES IN AIR FARES

Question No. 594—**Mr. Harding:**

Were there any increases or decreases in air fares allowed by the federal government for passenger services to any of the airlines in Canada during 1969 and, if so (*a*) when were the increases or decreases granted (*b*) which airlines received them (*c*) what was the percentage (*d*) what was the reason given for each increase or decrease?

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Tolls for transportation by air carriers are not subject to approval by the Government or any of its agencies. However, the Canadian Transport Commission advises that a large number of tariff changes involving increases and decreases were filed during 1969 by air carriers with the Air Transport Committee of the Commission and are available for public inspection in accordance with the rules governing the construction and filing of tariffs.

LIQUID AND GAS PIPELINE SAFETY

Question No. 635—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Has the Department of Transport the responsibility for (a) liquid pipeline safety (b) natural gas pipeline safety?

2. What responsibility have the provincial and local governments in these fields?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Transport and the National Energy Board as follows: 1. No.

2. When a pipeline is located wholly within the boundaries of a province, the province has complete responsibility for pipeline safety.

AIR CANADA REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE OR CERTAIN ROUTES

Question No. 637—**Mr. Roy (Timmins):**

What was the revenue and expenditure for each year 1966, 1967 and 1968 of Air Canada on air routes (a) Toronto-North Bay-Earlton-Rouyn-Val D'Or and Ottawa (b) Toronto-Sudbury-Timmins (c) Toronto-Timmins?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Air Canada advises as follows: Air Canada's international system of allocating operating revenues and expenses does not make possible an answer in exactly the form requested. However, there is a breakdown for the Northern Ontario and Quebec service which includes all three of the routes mentioned, which can be provided:

	Operating Revenues	Operating Expenses
1966	$2,913,000	$4,070,000
1967	3,297,000	4,464,000
1968	4,198,000	5,512,000

The above revenues reflect traffic carried over the local routes without revenue for the carriage of any of this traffic onward over other routes of the Air Canada system. The operating expenses are the result of a fully

allocated costing system (in accordance with procedures established by the Air Transport Committee) so that company overhead and indirect expenses are included as well as the local expenses directly involved.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT TAX RECEIPTS—PAYMENTS TO MEDICAL PLANS

Question No. 672—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. What is the estimated amount of money that the federal government will receive from the 2% Social Development Tax for (a) 1968 (b) 1969 (c) 1970?

2. What are the estimated amounts of money paid or to be paid by the federal government to the various Provincial Medical Plans for (a) 1968 (b) 1969 (c) 1970?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of National Revenue and National Health and Welfare as follows: 1. (a) Nil. The Social Development Tax was first levied in respect of 1969. (b) $501 million. (c) No estimate is available for 1970.

2.

Province	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71
Newfoundland	—	$ 9.5 MM	$ 12.3 MM
Prince Edward Island	—	—	1.8
Nova Scotia	—	13.7	16.9
New Brunswick	—	—	10.1
Quebec	—	—	98.5
Ontario	—	65.0	169.3
Manitoba	—	17.8	23.2
Saskatchewan	$11.3 MM	17.7	20.8
Alberta	—	21.2	37.6
British Columbia	21.7	36.1	48.7
Territories	—	—	.8
Totals	$33.0 MM	$181.0 MM	$440.0 MM

SYDNEY-HALIFAX-MONTREAL RAILWAY SERVICE

Question No. 686—**Mr. Corbin:**

In answer to Question No. 1,353 on page 6675 of *Hansard*, 1st Session, 28th Parliament, to whom was Canadian National Railways referring when it refused requested information, on the basis that such information could be useful to its "competitors".

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: As a general rule information regarding specific traffic handlings or movements on a particular point to point basis can be useful to other carriers, i.e. airline, bus, truck, etc.

OPERATING COSTS OF CERTAIN DIPLOMATIC OFFICES

Question No. 701—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the total cost of operation of the diplomatic office of Canada in the Dominican Republic during the past fiscal year?

2. What was the total cost of operation of the diplomatic office of Canada in Ecuador during the past fiscal year?

3. What was the total cost of operation of the diplomatic office of Canada in Uruguay during the past fiscal year?

4. What was the total cost of operation of the diplomatic office in Berlin during the past fiscal year?

5. What was the total cost of operation of the office of the resident High Commissioner for Canada in Nicosia during the past fiscal year?

Questions

6. What was the total cost of Canadian offices associated with the International Joint Commission in Laos and Cambodia during the past fiscal year?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):

	External Affairs	Industry, Trade and Commerce
1. Dominican Republic	130,470	40,588
2. Ecuador	80,503	Nil
3. Uruguay	97,549	16,401
4. Berlin	57,318	Nil
5. Nicosia, Cyprus	197,036	Nil
6. (i) Cambodia 105,894 / (ii) Laos 123,887	229,781	Nil

Note: Offices in Cambodia and Laos are associated with the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Indo-China.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT TRAVEL BUREAU

Question No. 717—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Has the Canadian Government Travel Bureau a machine which answers requests for information by people about Canada?

2. In feeding the machine with the answers to inquiries, how many statements are available for selection?

3. What are the first three of such statements?

4. Have any complaints been received that the replies of the Bureau are incomprehensible or have avoided the question or have otherwise puzzled the letter recipient?

5. Is any part of the machine programmed to answer complaints concerning previous letters it has written?

6. Does the computer apply the signatures of human persons to its letters?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1. The Canadian Government Travel Bureau uses a computer system to type letters in answer to requests for travel information about Canada. Trained personnel first review all such requests, to determine whether they may be answered through the computer system, utilizing prepared letters or a selection of prepared paragraphs stored in the computer memory bank, or whether the enquiries require individually dictated replies. Of the 2.2 million travel enquiries received by the Bureau in 1969, 1.4 million were answered by letters typed by the computer system.

2. The computer has available to it a memory bank of some 60 prepared letters, (e.g. a letter exclusive to hunting in Canada, another specific to camping) and 240 prepared paragraphs. These latter are on particular aspects or topics related to travel in Canada, (e.g. Border Crossing into Canada, Accommodation, Hunting and Firearms) and can be used in combination as directed by travel counsellors to answer a compound enquiry.

3. The first three of the list of 60 prepared letters concern acknowledgment of requests for specific Kits of travel literature. The first three of the range of 240 prepared paragraphs relate to the acknowledging of requests for detailed information that will assist the enquirers in completing their Canadian travel plans.

4. Complaints have been negligible in number. It is possible that, because of a mistake in judgment, a travel counsellor could select the wrong combination of standard reply paragraphs, or the wrong letter. It is also possible that the counsellor's instructions to the computer could be incorrectly transcribed or acted on in the preparation of the punchcard which activates the computer printer.

5. No. Any such letters of complaint are answered individually by staff.

6. The computer printer does not apply any signatures to the letters it produces. Auxiliary printing equipment adds the signature of the Director, Canadian Government Travel Bureau, to all letters produced by the computer.

AIRCRAFT LANDING CHARGES

Question No. 728—**Mr. Reid:**

1. Has the Department of Transport increased its charges for aircraft landing at DOT airports in Canada within the last two years and, if so, when and by how much each time?

2. What is the charge now by aircraft category and what has been the increase each time over the past two years for rated aircraft?

3. (a) Each time these rates have been increased, what has been the drop in air traffic by aircraft category, at DOT airports—Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Calgary (b) what has been the drop in traffic in charter aircraft at the airports given above since each increase in rates?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):

1. No.

2. The landing fees are based on aircraft weight, except in the case of flying training. The schedule of landing fees is attached.

3. Since there has been no increase in landing fees within the last two years question 3 would not appear to apply.

Schedule of Landing Fees

Flying Club or Commercial Flying School: For each hour flown by the aircraft, $ .30.

Domestic Flights: 1. For each 1,000 pounds or fraction thereof of aircraft where weight is not over 45,000 pounds, $ .20. 2. For each 1,000 pounds or fraction thereof where weight is (a) over 45,000 but not over 100,000, $ .25; (b) over 100,000, $ .30. 3. Minimum fee payable regardless of weight, $1.00.

International Flights: 1. For each 1,000 pounds or fraction thereof of aircraft where weight is (a) not over 70,000, $ .25; (b) over 70,000 but not over 147,000, $ .35; (c) over 147,000, $ .50. 2. Minimum fee payable regardless of weight, $1.00.

Trans-Oceanic Flights: 1. For each 1,000 pounds or fraction thereof of aircraft where weight is (a) not over 90,000, $1.33; (b) over 90,000 but not over 125,000, $1.40; (c) over 125,000 but not over 150,000, $1.46; (d) over 150,000, $1.51.

AIR SERVICE, WABUSH-MONTREAL

Question No. 754—**Mr. Peddle:**

1. Has the Minister of Transport received a copy of a brief from the Labrador West Chamber of Commerce to the Chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission and the Chairman of the Air Transport Committee requesting that Eastern Provincial Airways be given traffic rights between Wabush and Montreal, or as an alternative, Quebecair be directed to provide daily non-stop service between Wabush and Montreal?

2. Will this request be acceded to and when will the new service commence?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. The matters referred to in the Brief are under consideration by the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission.

"INDIAN SUMMER"

Question No. 766—**Mr. Burton:**

1. How many copies of the publication "Indian Summer" were printed by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development?

2. What was the total cost of preparation of this publication?

3. What distribution is being carried out of this publication?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. 10,000 English; and 5,000 French.

2. $7,806.00.

3. It has been distributed to all members of Parliament and the press gallery, key personnel within the Department, a few interested people outside the Department, and to a number of federally-operated Indian schools.

AVERAGE DAILY COLLECTION OF INCOME TAXES

Question No. 799—**Mr. Mather:**

In 1960, 1965 and 1969, what was the average gross collection of federal income taxes per working day?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): Fiscal year 1959-60, $13.6 million; Fiscal year 1964-65, $19.2 million; Fiscal year 1968-69; $30.4 million.

Collection figures are maintained on a fiscal year basis. The figure given includes federal income and old age security taxes but excludes provincial income taxes collected by the federal government.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

LICENSED CIVILIAN FLYERS

Question No. 662—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. How many licensed civilian flyers are there in Canada?

2. How many were licensed in each of the years 1960-1969 inclusive?

3. Does the federal government subsidize the licensing and training of civilian flyers and, if so, to what extent and what was the cost in each of the years 1960-1969 inclusive?

4. Is it the intention of the federal government to continue a program of flying assistance grants for civilians?

5. Is the program open to men and women and, if so, at what age can they apply and receive federal government assistance?

Return tabled.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—MAINTENANCE OF AIRCRAFT

Question No. 710—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What moneys have been expended in each of the fiscal years from 1963-64 on maintenance, repair and overhaul of aircraft of the Department of National Defence by private industry and, what amount is contemplated for such in the current fiscal year?

2. How many man-years of work have been provided in each of these years or will be provided during the current fiscal year?

3. Per year, how many man-years of work, have been or will be provided Fairey Canada Limited?

Return tabled.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Mr. Carter: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Government House Leader when I may expect an answer to my question of November 20, No. 516?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I cannot respond offhand but I will be glad to check and respond on Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

TRADE

POSSIBLE BRITISH ENTRY INTO ECM—REPRESENTATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER WILSON

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Prime Minister has not made any statement concerning his talks with the Right Hon. Mr. Wilson yesterday and today, are we to assume that there is really nothing to report, or were any conclusions reached? Specifically, will the Prime Minister inform the House whether he made any representations to Mr. Wilson concerning the position of Canadian products, including wheat, in the event that the United Kingdom should enter the European Common Market?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we did discuss many subjects, including the last one mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition. We talked about Nigeria, we talked about east-west relations, we talked about disarmament, and we talked about the SALT talks. We also went into the question of Britain's entry into the Common Market, and the ministers present, particularly the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, pressed several questions upon Prime Minister Wilson concerning the consequences for Canada of Britain's negotiations to enter the Common Market.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the government of Canada take any specific position with regard to Canadian trade in the event that Britain should enter the European Common Market? In other words, did the government of Canada present a specific proposition to the government of Great Britain with regard to this matter?

[Mr. McCleave.]

Mr. Trudeau: Specific, Mr. Speaker, only to the extent that we pressed on the Prime Minister the importance of keeping Canada informed about the negotiations as they proceed and as they affect Canada. It was difficult to be more specific than that on specific items for the simple reason that the Prime Minister himself avowed that he did not know how the discussions would proceed. Therefore until the British government itself has had further contacts with the members of the EEC, and until it has formulated its position and stated it, it is impossible for Canada to enter upon specifics.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, did the Prime Minister not outline the specific and important areas of Canadian trade which would be very adversely affected if the Commonwealth preference was lost in the event that Britain entered the common market? Did the Prime Minister not ask for and receive assurances regarding Canadian trading arrangements with Great Britain in order that these important trading arrangements can be maintained and protected?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, we pressed upon the government of the United Kingdom and the Prime Minister the importance of the specific aspects of trade with Canada. I repeat, we could not draw any conclusions from the Prime Minister as to these points because, as he emphasized, he himself had not actually begun negotiations yet. So far as Canadian representations are concerned, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the Secretary of State for External Affairs and myself did emphasize aspects of Britain's entry which would be very important to us.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, does the Prime Minister intend to send the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce to Great Britain very soon to ask for these specific assurances he was not able to receive from the British Prime Minister?

Mr. Trudeau: We doubt whether the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce could get from the rest of the British government assurances that the Prime Minister himself asked us to wait a while before receiving.

Mr. Hees: Could he not try?

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question regarding possible changes in trade if Britain should enter the Common

Market, and I address it to the Minister of Agriculture. Will he inform the House whether his department is being kept fully informed as to the position of Canadian exports if such an event should take place and I have in mind agricultural products? Is the department studying the possible effect on Canadian farm exports?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I have nothing to add to the explanation the Prime Minister has already given, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gleave: I have a further supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Calgary North but if the hon. member has a further supplementary question perhaps he should be allowed to ask it.

Mr. Gleave: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister give the House some assurance that his department will be very deeply involved in this matter?

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that Great Britain has been a traditional purchaser of Canadian western wheat and in view of the fact that in the European Common Market French wheat is subsidized and ours is not, was there any discussion of that point with Prime Minister Wilson, or is there any thought of sending trade commissioners and other departmental officials to Great Britain, as another hon. member has suggested, to discuss these problems?

Mr. Trudeau: For one thing, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Wheat Board is always in touch with its trading partners. For another thing, we did reiterate our desire to send representatives to have bilateral discussions which, of course, are always welcome in Britain. It would be futile, however, to attempt such discussions until the British themselves know a little bit more about what their eventual partners in the EEC will be demanding of them. As the hon. member states, the EEC has as one of its basic tenets a common agricultural policy which would be a very important aspect in regard to Canadian agriculture. As the Minister of Agriculture has just said, we are following this matter with great interest but we are not in a position to press any specific demands on Great Britain beyond the general one until the British government knows what its eventual partners may request of it.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Were the conclusions of the Barber Commission report discussed with the Prime Minister of Great Britain and, particularly, did he receive any assurance from Prime Minister Wilson that his government would take action to stop reprisals by British tractor companies against British agencies that sell tractors directly to Canadian farm organizations, especially since such sales would seem to be mutually beneficial to both countries?

Mr. Trudeau: I was assured, Mr. Speaker, that this question had already been raised with the British government at the level of officials and for that reason I did not reopen it with the British Prime Minister.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that in previous discussions about Britain's entry into the European Common Market the British had expressed the opinion that one of the things it would seek to retain in the bargaining was the Commonwealth preference, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the British government is still prepared to attempt to retain the Commonwealth preference as it enters into these bargaining arrangements?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the previous attempt of the British government is that it gave no specific guarantee to Canada of that kind. Indeed, the Treaty of Rome precludes specific guarantees of that kind. The British Prime Minister certainly took the position that he could not promise in advance anything specific along these lines at this time any more than he could on the previous occasion.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—REPRESENTATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER WILSON RESPECTING DISTRIBUTION OF RELIEF SUPPLIES

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister in relation to his conversations with the British Prime Minister. In view of the British government's specific relationship with the Nigerian government, was the Prime Minister able to suggest on behalf

of the Canadian government ways in which the British government might use its influence to effect a more effective distribution of supplies in the eastern region of Nigeria, particularly the region formerly known as Biafra, and was there any suggestion by the British Prime Minister concerning the possibility of the airstrip and air transportation being used to alleviate the very serious situation there?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I had very extensive talks with the British Prime Minister about the Nigerian situation. As he said during his press conference following his meetings with us, both the British and Canadian governments are willing to offer help in any way that would be useful.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether any formula was worked out which might alleviate the transport situation? Also, in respect of the invalid Biafran currency is any program being suggested with regard to exchanging Biafran currency for usable Nigerian currency in order to provide the destitute people in the region with the money to purchase the food available there?

Mr. Sharp: These are questions which should be directed to the Nigerian government rather than the British government. As General Gowon has made clear, it is the Nigerian government's responsibility to look after the welfare of its own people.

Mr. Speaker: Might I suggest that we go on to another question.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—ACTION RESPECTING PROSPECTIVE GAS RATE INCREASES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the statement by the President of the Canadian Gas Association to the effect that a number of gas companies intend to make applications for increases in gas rates, is his department looking into this matter and has he ascertained whether or not there is any collusion or pricing arrangement between the gas companies? If so, what action does his department intend to take in respect of this matter?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the statement to which the hon. member refers. I presume he must be referring to applications which might be made to the National Energy Board under the Act and on which the board would have to rule.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that these applications are not for the export of gas but concern rather consumer gas prices, which come under provincial jurisdiction, I ask is there any question of price fixing or collusion in respect of price fixing, and is the department looking at these applications which, if granted, would have an inflationary effect upon prices for natural gas?

Mr. Basford: As I have said, I have not seen the statement to which the hon. member refers. I shall have a look at the statement to see whether or not my department is involved.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, does the minister not feel he should be aware of what is going on and should be looking at these matters more closely rather than pleading ignorance as an excuse?

[*Translation*]

IMMIGRATION

ENTRY OF DANIEL COHN-BENDIT

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Has he received from the Quebec Minister of Justice a request for the deportation of Cohn-Bendit and if so, has he given it some consideration?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I did receive a communication from the Minister of Justice of Quebec involving the granting of an extension to Mr. Cohn-Bendit in respect of remaining in Canada. I replied to the Minister of Justice of Quebec by telling him I would consider any evidence he might have that Mr. Cohn-Bendit was a prohibited person under the Canadian Immigration Act and any opinion he might have that his continued presence in Canada would lead to serious public disorder.

DEPORTATION OF JAMES AUTRY

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of

Manpower and Immigration. Can he advise whether last September officials of his department, either directly or indirectly, in writing or verbally, requested that United States officials ask for the deportation of James Autry under the Visiting Forces Act so as to avoid political controversy?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is referring to a situation which, according to the way the question was asked, dates back some months. I wonder in these circumstances whether it might not be the type of question which should be placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Baldwin: With respect, Your Honour, I would point out that proceedings are contemplated in this country and are in process in the United States. The answer the minister may make is of some essence and in that regard is urgent.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have to tell my hon. friend I will be happy to advise him on this question later. Inasmuch as the Visiting Forces Act is under the administration of the Department of National Defence I should like to discuss the situation with my colleague.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the minister have this discussion and be prepared to make a statement later?

Mr. MacEachen: I will undertake to answer the hon. gentleman's question.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, when the minister is making a statement on this matter, would he deal with the suggestion that when Mr. Autry applied to have his case heard by the Immigration Appeal Board his request was refused? Would the minister also ascertain why he was refused the right to have a lawyer represent him?

Mr. MacEachen: I would be happy to deal with these points in my later answers.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is addressed to the Minister of Justice in respect of the same case. Would he look into whether Autrey's arrest and subsequent handing over to the United States military authorities under the Visiting Forces Act was illegal in light of the decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal in another case, and will the minister determine whether a question of reparations may be involved in this case?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I will consult with my colleague.

AGRICULTURE

ACTION TO LOWER TRACTOR AND COMBINE PRICES

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): I wish to direct my question to the Prime Minister. It arises out of remarks that the Minister of Agriculture made in the House a week ago today in referring to the recommendations of the Barber Commission on farm machinery. The Prime Minister also referred to this matter a few moments ago in reply to the Leader of the Opposition. As recorded on page 2530 of *Hansard* the Minister of Agriculture said, in regard to Dr. Barber's recommendations:

> He also recommends that discussion be held with counterpart officials in the United States and in the United Kingdom. This has already been initiated.

Farther on he said the following with regard to the preliminary report or position paper written by Dr. Barber for the agricultural congress last March:

> During the intervening period a number of actions have been taken—

I understand that Prime Minister Wilson held a press conference during which a question on the export of tractors by Great Britain was asked, to which he replied—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member put his question, please. It seems to me the preface is rather long.

Mr. McIntosh: My question is with regard to the reply by the Prime Minister of Great Britain that this matter was not currently under discussion between the two governments. Can the Prime Minister clarify the situation and say whether the subject is now to be considered closed and forgotten?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot make any comment on the specific point made by Prime Minister Wilson, if he was correctly quoted. I know, and the Minister of Agriculture has confirmed, that some of our officials have been in contact with British officials, but it is possible that the British Prime Minister was not briefed on this matter because he might have felt that, since the discussions had begun, there was no need to put the matter on the agenda as a specific item. For that reason he may not have been prepared to discuss it.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that tractor prices were not discussed by the Prime Minister and Mr. Wilson over the weekend, what action, if any, does the government intend to take with regard to the great disparity in tractor prices between Great Britain and Canada?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, as is pointed out in Dr. Barber's report, there are a number of recommendations. One is to have discussions not only with the U.K. government but also with officials of the U.S. government. In addition, Dr. Barber recommends that we start discussions with the farm machinery manufacturing companies. We are setting up these discussions today because the machinery companies have now had a copy of the report for a little over a week and we think that now is the appropriate time to call them in and have a discussion with them. So far as other recommendations are concerned, I am sure the hon. member will recognize that a sequence of actions is outlined in the report and that the government has proceeded on several of them.

Mr. Muir (Lisgar): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. After these discussions have taken place, does the government intend to take action in this regard?

Mr. Olson: It would be impossible, if not improper, to predict what we would do until we have ascertained the attitude of the farm machinery companies toward the findings and recommendations contained in the report.

An hon. Member: It is not hard to predict.

[*Later:*]

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he can tell the House when the Barber Commission will report on the cost of farm machinery repairs since charges for such services are even more exorbitant than the prices of new machines?

Mr. Olson: Dr. Barber has indicated that he will bring in his final report, which will deal with those aspects of his inquiry, some time this summer. I was trying to remember whether he said it would be in mid-summer or late summer, but I am not quite sure.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

REFUSAL OF MEMBERSHIP TO WOMEN—SUGGESTED VIOLATION OF BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice arising out of his responsibility under the statute of 1960 known as the Canadian Bill of Rights. In view of the fact that the National Press Club has taken a stand—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am sorry, but this is serious. In view of the fact that the National Press Club has taken a stand against the admission of women to its membership and in view of the fact that the club occupies quarters in a building owned by the government of Canada, will the Minister of Justice look into the question of what he should do about this apparent violation of the Canadian Bill of Rights?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, because a delicate issue is involved here, I would like to have an opportunity to study that proposition.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): While the minister is studying the question, will he also examine the propriety of the members of this House of Commons being made honorary members of such a club, that is, all of us but one who happens to be a woman?

WOMEN

INQUIRY AS TO ROYAL COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I wish to direct to the right hon. Prime Minister. Can he indicate to the House when the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women will be tabled in the House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my answer is the same as it was last week. The Royal Commission has not taken me into its confidence with regard to the rapidity of its procedures, perhaps because the members have some cause to believe that I am not the right person to whom this can be told.

GRAIN

ACTION RESPECTING ILLEGAL FEED GRAIN SALES

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): In the absence of the Minister without

Portfolio responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board, could the Minister of Agriculture assure the farmers in the Peace River area of British Columbia that Canadian Wheat Board inspectors will investigate and charge firms and individuals who have sold off-board feed grain illegally?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker, if it can be established that this has been done illegally. However, I should draw to the hon. member's attention the fact that it is not an illegal act to sell grain within a province or, indeed, to sell it to a feed mill which might then sell it to another farmer.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister discuss also the very serious question involved in the picketing now being carried on by members of a farmers' union in British Columbia to prevent farmers in the Peace River section of Alberta from hauling grain to elevators in respect of which they have lawful licences and permits?

Mr. Olson: Yes, I will draw that to the attention of the minister who answers for the Canadian Wheat Board.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Would he also investigate the propriety of putting restrictions on the sale of feed grain within Canada?

Mr. Olson: It has been a long and well established law in Canada that the movement of feed grain across provincial borders, grain which is not sold and bought from the Canadian Wheat Board, is an illegal act.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he has been asked by the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board to start a thorough investigation into the bootlegging of millions of bushels of grain in western Canada as a result of the rigidity of the Wheat Board which does not allow trading between provinces even though the farmers need money?

An hon. Member: That is the regulation.

Mr. Woolliams: Change the regulations.

Mr. Baldwin: Change the government.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—POLICY RESPECTING TWO-PRICE SYSTEM

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Could he tell the House whether he was stating government policy when he said in Vancouver that he was in favour of the two-price system for industrial milk, that is $3.60 per cwt. for the industrial milk subject to the quota system and twice that amount, depending on market conditions, for surpluses?

Mr. Speaker: The question as put is not in order. However, the hon. member may, under Standing Orders, ask the Prime Minister whether the statement made by the minister in question expresses the policy of the government.

[*English*]

INFORMATION

APPOINTMENT OF MINISTER TO DIRECT OPERATIONS OF INFORMATION CANADA

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Has a member of the cabinet been appointed to direct the operations of Information Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, Information Canada has as yet no real existence as a specific project. I explained to the House the other week that we did have officials preparing a statement on government policy and the government position, and that the cabinet had been discussing it. However, until we announce the setting up of such an agency, a minister naturally will not be appointed to operate an agency that is as yet not legally in existence.

Mr. Hales: Could the Prime Minister advise the House when he intends to make a policy statement on this matter?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I think it will be soon; that is to say, within a matter of a week or two.

IMMIGRATION

PROPOSAL BY FRENCH IMMIGRANTS TO QUEBEC DESIRING TO MOVE TO ALBERTA

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Could the

minister tell us whether he studied the proposal of a group of French-speaking immigrants to Quebec to establish a co-operative, vertically-integrated farming complex before referring the group to the Unemployment Insurance Commission or to local welfare offices?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I have studied the proposal. There is no policy now nor has there been a policy to undertake a mass movement from one part of Canada to another.

Mr. Bell: Walter Gordon tried it.

Mr. MacEachen: In this case there was no evidence forthcoming to justify such claim that 10,000 families were involved. In any event, we offered to this group all the services available to immigrants to Canada and all the services available to Canadians from the department. It was when I received a letter stating that there were certain individuals urgently in need of assistance that I recommended in order to meet the situation, if it did exist, that such people should make use of the Canada Manpower Services or the welfare services of the provinces. In all our dealings with this group we have attempted to be helpful but also realistic.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker I have a supplementary question. What steps does the minister intend to take in view of this group's charge that immigration brochures distributed by Canadian embassies and consulates contain "lying propaganda" and that this group was lured here by false promises about a golden land of opportunity?

Mr. Woolliams: They do not like the cold weather.

Mr. MacEachen: I believe that one has to analyse the group, Mr. Speaker, and know what numbers belong to it before one can answer the question. There is some doubt that it does represent a large number. We do attempt to give a realistic picture of what immigrants will meet in Canada, and I believe the experience of immigrants since the last war does not justify the claim made against Canada in this particular instance.

Mr. Baldwin: Did you tell them about inflation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Since we will shortly be running out of time I have to seek the co-operation of hon. members regarding supplementaries.

[Mr. Thompson.]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON REPORT BY GLENDON COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development I should like to address a question to the Parliamentary Secretary. Inasmuch as the government has just received the report and study commissioned by it from a group of students at Toronto Glendon College about the attitude of students toward the native Indian, would the government, through the minister, be prepared to make a statement in a few days with respect to the recommendations contained in that report?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I shall discuss this matter with the minister.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TRANSFER OF NERVE GAS FROM OKINAWA TO UNITED STATES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs in reference to a matter I brought to the attention of the Prime Minister on Friday. Has the minister been advised by the government of the United States that they expect to move five shiploads of nerve gas from Okinawa through the Strait of Juan de Fuca to Bangor, Washington, for shipment to Hermiston army base, and have representations been made asking that this nerve gas be detoxicized before being moved?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have had our ambassador in Washington make inquiries. I have not yet received a report but as soon as I do I shall inform the House.

AGRICULTURE

SKIM MILK POWDER—ACTION TO REDUCE SURPLUS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if he would take the first opportunity on motions to outline to the House what steps his department plans to take to dispose of the very large quantity of skim milk powder at present on hand in Canada and which has been overhanging the Canadian milk market for a long time?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I shall make a better suggestion and that is that the hon. member spend some time at the meetings of the Standing Committee on Agriculture which has been studying this question for two or three hours twice a week for the last two weeks.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I am simply asking the minister to say what the department intends to do. As he knows, at the last meeting of the Canadian milk producers he had no answer whatsoever and could tell them nothing. He said absolutely nothing.

An hon. Member: Learn the rules.

Mr. Hees: He knows absolutely nothing.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PHASING-OUT OF MARINE DIVISION

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. Is it the intention of the government to phase out the marine division of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and, if so, how soon will this take place, within the next few months or over a longer period of time?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker, there is no such intention but I shall try to bring forward some further information on the subject if the hon. member wishes.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the minister for his statement that there is no intention to do away with the marine division of the RCMP.

TRANSPORT

REPORTED INCREASE IN SHIPPING COMPANY RATES

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker I should like to ask the Minister of Labour if he has any information that shipping companies are increasing their rates because of the real danger of labour difficulties on the west coast when the 90-day cooling-off period will end on February 5?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, negotiations are proceeding normally. I am rather surprised, however, that management would raise the rates in anticipation. I think this would be an inflationary move on their part as they have no way of knowing what the increase will be. Perhaps they should be good Canadians and wait before raising the rates.

COMBINES

REPORTED COLLUSION BY BANKS, FINANCE COMPANIES AND AUTOMOBILE DEALERS AFFECTING BUYERS

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can the minister inform the House whether his department is investigating reports of collusion between banks, finance companies and auto dealers affecting car buyers so far as Canada is concerned?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we are always interested in such reports and if the hon. member will send us the report she is referring to I shall look into it.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

LAC LA BICHE NEWSTART PROGRAM—RESUMPTION OF OPERATIONS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): My question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to inform the House if operations have resumed on the Alberta Newstart program at Lac La Biche? While the minister is on his feet, perhaps he could tell the House what the future of this experimental program is across the country?

Mr. Speaker: I would think the second part of the question should be answered by way of a statement on motions.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the reply to the first part of the question is negative.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INQUIRY AS TO WHITE PAPER

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs when we may expect the white paper, or a white paper, with respect to the government's foreign policy? I ask this question, Mr. Speaker, because the study has been going on for

some two years. I recognize, of course, that the government cannot determine its defence policy until it determines its foreign policy.

Mr. Baldwin: If any.

An hon. Member: So said a famous Canadian.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the white paper on foreign policy is in draft form and as such has been before the cabinet. I hope it will not be long before it is published. It is our intention to publish it in the present session.

ACCEPTANCE BY VATICAN OF FEMALE CANADIAN DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, to go back to the question of discrimination against women, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether, in light of the Vatican's recent refusal to accept the credentials of an official from the government of West Germany, he can inform the House if the Canadian government, during the negotiations to establish diplomatic relations with the Vatican, undertook to appoint only men as high diplomatic officers?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the Vatican, in light of the ecumenical movement that is going on, will in due course accept women whom I regard, as I am sure my hon. friend does, as the equal of men in all respects.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Tell that to the press.

ISRAELI-ARAB CONFLICT—REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I apologize for not giving him notice of it. In view of the announcement by President Nixon of additional arms aid to Israel, reminding the world of the constant and dangerous escalation of the arms race in the Middle East, is the government making representations with a view to bringing about direct negotiations between the parties to the conflict in the area?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Canadian government with respect to the conflict is to support the operation of resolution 242 which we helped to draft, and until it is clear that there is no possibility of reaching agreement under the terms of that resolution we have no intention of changing our policy.

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—EARLIER ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the fact that the Canadian Dairy Commission always announces its new policy just before April 1, which is highly inconvenient for the dairy industry, could the minister inform us whether this year he will ask the Commission to announce its policy earlier?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can announce the policy somewhat sooner. As the hon. member knows, we have invited not only the standing committee of this House but indeed the whole of the dairy industry to assist us in formulating and designing a program that will meet some of the surplus problems which have been raised during the past 12 months. It seems to me it would be a disservice to the industry if we were to announce the programs before we had received their recommendations. If their recommendations are received in time to allow us to consider them carefully so that we can announce the policy a few days before April 1, we will certainly follow that course. On the other hand, I think we shall have to wait—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate.

UNITED NATIONS

WORLD FOOD PROGRAM—MODIFICATION OF CANADA'S EFFORTS

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Does the government plan to heed the request of Francisco Aquino, Director General of the World Food Program, that Canada's efforts under the program should be modified and that we should send different types of commodities?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think this information ought to be given to the House by way of a statement on motions inasmuch

as the subject matter is very general. I would think the hon. member might wish to give some thought to that.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture because the Prime Minister obviously does not know the answer. May I ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. No matter whether the hon. member asks his question of the Prime Minister or of the minister directly concerned, I suggest that he should limit his question to inquiring whether a statement might be made.

Mr. Lundrigan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, my original question was whether the government was going to modify its effort under this program. It was a very simple question.

Mr. Speaker: In that case it could be placed on the Order Paper, I suggest.

• (3:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister) moved:

That a joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That twenty members of the House of Commons, to be designated by the House at a later date, be members of the joint committee on the part of this House;

That the committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

Thet a message be sent to the Senate requesting Their Honours to unite with this House for the above purpose, and to select, if the Senate deems so advisable, some of its members to act on the proposed joint committee.

He said:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, it is a question of considering the motion standing in my name on the order paper, but I think that hon. members will want to take this opportunity to discuss the whole process of constitutional review. Indeed, at the time of the last public federal-provincial conferences on the constitution, the House deemed it appropriate to discuss the process of constitutional review, and following the December conference, leaders of all parties agreed to initiate this debate on the constitution.

[*English*]

We are faced, in a sense, with a paradox when we face this motion. The presence of this motion on the order paper is indicative of the interest of all parties in debating the process of constitutional review in this chamber. Indeed, parties of the opposition have pressed the government for many months, and even over a period of two sessions, to set up this committee. I believe that this reflects on the part of hon. members a very great desire of participating in the constitutional debate taking place in this country. But I spoke of a paradox, because at the same time there is a feeling in certain provincial quarters, and even in the country at large as expressed by members of provincial legislatures and, indeed, perhaps by some members of this House, that there is basically nothing wrong with the present constitution, nothing at least that would put it very high in priority on the order for action.

There is a feeling indeed in some quarters that this government is a little bit hung up on constitutional matters, that we are giving them too great a priority, that we are spending too much time on the constitution and too little on other things, and that the debate is taking too long. We have even heard in some quarters, and I am merely repeating that in this operation we have in mind only Quebec; that the rest of the country is not very interested in the process of constitutional review. I say this is a paradox, Mr. Speaker, because if we examine the origins of the constitutional debate we will see that it really began at the instigation of the provinces, indeed, of all the provinces. It would be fair to say that they started the process of constitutional debate. They are the ones who embarked the country on this long and important process. I say this as much to their credit as to their debit because I believe that

the process of constitutional review is an important process.

It is necessary, however, in order to explain this paradox, to remind ourselves once again that it began at the November 1967 conference, convened by the Prime Minister of Ontario, Mr. Robarts, and which was attended by the premiers of all provinces, barring that of British Columbia which was represented by its attorney general. The provinces at that time pressed the federal government to participate and I think members of opposition parties will recall that they, too, were pressing the government to attend the Confederation for Tomorrow Conference in Toronto. They chided us and urged us to get into the constitutional debate.

Notwithstanding that that was the position of the opposition, the federal government took the contrary view. Not only did we not participate in the 1967 conference, but in the years prior to that we had taken the very clear position that the constitution was not the most urgent thing to be dealt with, that there were many problems facing Canadians which could be dealt with under the British North America Act. Although we were not prepared to discuss the subject, we urged the provinces and the public at large to regard these exercises with a certain amount of deliberation.

I think the change in attitude on the part of governments is easy to explain, Mr. Speaker. The provinces realized in 1967 that new power relationships were being developed between the federal government and the provinces. It is perhaps natural that they wanted to insert these power relationships into a constitution which would be redefined. Hon. members will recall that around that period the provincial responsibilities in financial terms were increasing at a very fast speed compared to those of the federal government.

Statistics show that between 1954 and 1964 federal expenditures increased 56 per cent. In that same period provincial expenditures, including municipal expenditures, increased 204 per cent. This is evidence of these new relationships that were developing, Mr. Speaker. It is precisely because of that that the federal government was preaching against haste in upsetting the constitutional relationships between the federal government and the provinces until a fair amount of preparatory work had been accomplished.

We realized that once a questioning of the consensus on which the country was built, began, and once it was agreed upon by Canadians to reopen the fundamental law from which all authority and power flowed in this country, it would be impossible to close that issue until we had dealt with it thoroughly. This was the position taken by the government under the leadership of hon. L. B. Pearson. It certainly was the position of many members on this side of the House.

I, personally, went on record as saying that of all the urgent problems facing Canada, in my view the constitution had lowest priority. In September, 1967, a couple of months before the Confederation for Tomorrow Conference, I was speaking to the Canadian Bar Association in Quebec city. I told them we should be very careful before opening the basis for all law, order and authority within the country, that we should do our homework first. I emphasized the need for preparation in order that changes in the basic and fundamental law would be orderly and progressive and not arrived at piecemeal, bit by bit. That is why I proposed on that same occasion, with the approval of the government of that day, that we begin with a discussion of a fundamental Bill of Rights in order to ascertain the values which united Canadians before going on to issues which might divide them.

This is the paradox that has to be explained, Mr. Speaker. We should not forget the urging on the part of the provinces and, I repeat, of the opposition, for the government to get on with writing a new constitution for Canada. We remember all the cliches of those days; that the constitution was 100 years old that it did not read well; that we should have a more inspiring document for our centennial, and that the previous government was lax in its desire to get on with this review. Nevertheless—and this is the paradox, Mr. Speaker—in addition to these pressures, we began to hear more and more from the provinces and other quarters that this whole constitutional thing was a hang-up of the federal government; that the present government was too concerned with these matters and should be getting on with other things. How does one explain this paradox?

[*Translation*]

In my opinion, this can be explained first by the fact that the provinces, after the period of euphoria during which they became aware of their increasing powers, have reached a point where they realize that they have much to do, under the present constitution, that many problems must be solved now,

and that the solutions cannot wait until a new constitution is drafted.

This process of increasing provincial powers was foreseeable. We live in a civilization, in an industrial society, whose industrialization rate tends to increase. I feel it is true to say that Canada is perhaps one of the countries with the fastest industrialization and urbanization rate in the world. And I think that urban growth has caused a great number of problems, particularly at the municipal level. We have witnessed, for example, problems relating to welfare, slum clearance, air and water pollution in the cities, housing, urban transportation, fire and police services, water supply, telephone and communication systems, even recreational activities which have brought cities to provide more parks, more recreational centres and more libraries. These problems all emerged at the municipal level and therefore were also of provincial jurisdiction. I believe that after several years of debate on constitutional matters some provinces and municipalities realize that they really have much left to do and that all these problems must find a solution before the constitution is to be revamped. I think this is the reason why the provinces and municipalities very frequently suggest that the constitution is really of relative importance and that the federal government should not spend too much time considering it.

On the other hand, we cannot, at the federal level, take that position, because we are, by the very nature of federalism, elected to deal with national unity. Indeed, we are commissioned to consider the problems that might lead to the disruption of Canada as a whole.

It might be advisable at this time to quote a letter that Sir John A. Macdonald wrote in 1886 to the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. This will help explain that at that time as it is today, it was normal for federal members of Parliament to concern themselves with constitutional matters more than would be the case for members of the Legislative Assemblies. Here is the letter:

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Should your ministers found their advice for an early dissolution on the ground that they desire an immediate expression of the will of the people as to their remaining in the confederation, you will, I have no doubt, feel it your duty as a Dominion Officer to decline to allow that subject to enter into consideration at all. The representatives of Nova Scotia as to all questions respecting the relations between the Dominion and the Province sit in the Dominion Parliament and are the constitutional exponents of the wishes of the people with regard to such relations. The Provincial members have their powers restricted to the subjects mentioned in the British North America Act and can go no further.

[*Translation*]

The quotation is to be found at page 379 of Pope's collection of the correspondence of Sir John A. Macdonald.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that quotation explains that at that time as well as today, it was natural for the federal members to have a greater interest in constitutional issues because they have as it were the prime responsibility to ensure that this country is going ahead, all the while maintaining unity in every part.

As to national unity, Mr. Speaker, it is important to mention that it is not only a problem which affects the province of Quebec, and which deals mainly with language issues. Indeed linguistic differences between the French-speaking and the English-speaking communities raise a problem insofar as national unity is concerned. The government of the right hon. Lester B. Pearson as well as ours have always squarely tackled the study of this problem. The solutions we have recommended in the field of bilingualism and the legislation of this session are recognized, I believe, as a major contribution towards maintaining national unity.

Admittedly, national unity also involves certain economic aspects: disparities between regions and between the various classes of society can contribute to destroy national unity just as much as linguistic issues can. This is why our government has taken important initiatives concerning regional economic expansion and its powers to spend, not only as regards the overall power to spend through which we transfer certain financial resources to provincial governments by way of equalization payments or otherwise, but also as regards the power to pay certain allowances directly to less fortunate people in order that the more affluent Canadians be more adequately taxed, which will contribute to maintaining a regular income for Canadians.

Another aspect of national unity has to do with the very geography of the country and the scattering of the population; today, as in the time of Sir John A. Macdonald, we have to tackle straight off the problem of communications. At that time, it had to do mostly with the railways, and then the telegraph. But we realize that today the problem of communications covers a much wider field. In fact, not only people, but messages and information have to be conveyed to their destina-

tion. It will be with that in mind that this session will have reviewed the policy of the government in this connection.

Finally, national unity is embodied in the federal-provincial relations I dealt with earlier and which brought this government to take on still more energetically constitutional matters. The point is not to believe that the federal-provincial meetings on the constitution alone tackle the problems of national unity. In fact, the federal government took it upon itself to call a conference next February—that is in three weeks—not on constitutional problems but on federal-provincial relations in non-constitutional fields.

Surely, these are as many facets of the more general problem of national unity. While considering them, we can see that if a country is to survive, it should solve the constantly recurring problem of national unity.

[*English*]

In other words, the unity of a country can only be built up on the basis of a consensus of the people, on the desire of the people to live together within the boundaries of the same country. I think modern history has shown us that there is really no other basis for national unity than this. It is impossible to hold that countries are the product of boundaries which are given by nature and which cannot be moved, and that the people living within those boundaries must forever form a country because those boundaries were destined to the people by the laws of nature and of God. We have only to look at our own boundaries, at the 49th parallel or the Alaskan panhandle, to realise that there is nothing written on the surface of the globe which says that this country was obliged to have these boundaries and that the people living within them were bound to form one nation.

I think it is true, also, to say that speaking the same language is not in itself the foundation of one nation. We know there are nations separated by artificial borders whose inhabitants speak the same language and, conversely, we know there are certain nations within whose boundaries two, three and even four languages are spoken.

It is neither geographical boundaries, nor language, nor, indeed, history which determine the existence of a nation. We are aware that nations are not eternal and that history has changed them all over the centuries. We are, therefore, forced to the conclusion that the only basis for a nation is a consensus, a willingness of people to live together. People choose to form a nation. There is a nation if the people want a nation to exist. In this sense, the French philosopher Renan can describe a nation as "un plébiscite du peuple de tous les jours"—a plebiscite of the people every day, not in a literal sense but in a literary sense. The people have to be willing to recognize that the nation exists in order that it might continue to exist. This means, in reality, that all major groups, all important participants in a nation, have to feel that they are better within the nation than outside it. So long as we cannot ensure the continuation of this consensus, so long as the institutions of a country and, singularly, the constitution of the country, does not correspond to a desire of the people to stay within a nation, its basis is very frail indeed. It is this principle which guided federal action and, indeed, federal strategy in its whole approach to the constitutional question.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It was our belief that the nation could only be based on such a consensus that guided us in the process of constitutional review. First, we took as a principle that there was a great deal of preparation needed before the constitutional review should be embarked upon. Indeed, as early as 1966 the federal government was setting up a special section and engaging the services of specialists in order to get on with the preparations for a constitutional review.

The second principle was that the review should not begin until there was both a recognition, and a desire on the part of enough Canadians that the review should not only begin but that the whole area of federal-provincial relations should be re-examined. This, too, explains in part the fact that the federal government made haste slowly in embarking upon the process of review. In our view it would have been a mistake to open the constitution for debate if there were not a widely shared desire on the part of the Canadian people, and of all parties in this Parliament, to embark upon such a review.

Third, it was important that the review only proceed within a country which was fairly stable, and by that I mean at a time when the federal government and the provincial governments were both strong. As far as we were concerned at the federal level, we always made it a condition that the whole of the constitution could be re-examined but that two basic principles had to be maintained.

The first was that Canada would continue as one federal country. By this we meant that the federal form of government should be preserved. The second principle was that we did not want to see the development of any constitution which would create forms of special arrangements whereby the members of Parliament from one part of the country would have, at the federal level, less power than the members of Parliament from another part of the country. This did not mean that the federal government could not in the future, as it had in the past, embark upon certain specific special arrangements with one province or another.

But any move towards the so-called special status, Mr. Speaker, a move which would have ended with the setting up of a federal form of government wherein at least one province had much stronger powers or jurisdiction than the other provinces, would inevitably have resulted in a situation where the federal members of Parliament from that province could not speak in the federal government with a voice equal to that of members from other provinces. Inevitably, that would have led to a downgrading of the federal presence from that province. Thereafter the people of that province would have been less interested in their representatives in the federal government, and in its ways and procedures, because their representatives would have less power and less significance than members from other provinces.

I repeat that that is why we always stated as a precondition that the debate on the constitution only be opened at a time when the federal government was sufficiently strong to be able to assert what was needed in order to maintain essential federal powers. But apart from these two principles—that of the maintenance of one federal country, and the other that the central essential powers be maintained—we agreed that all aspects of the constitution should be considered. Indeed, it is important that Canadians realize that we are discussing all of the aspects which are of immediate concern to them, questions which have to do with the responsibility for the cities, for pollution, for poverty, for education, and for Indians. These precise questions are part of the constitutional review upon which we have now embarked. There has always been a willingness, indeed a desire, on the part of the federal government to get into these discussions but this was contained until we had been assured that the new constitution would emanate from a stability and a consensus freely arrived at rather than from violence and revolution.

The fourth principle, Mr. Speaker, is the importance of looking at all aspects of the constitution, but having respect to the two principles I just mentioned.

The fifth is the insistence on the part of the federal government—and I repeat that this is part of our approach, and no doubt one on which the opposition parties will wish to comment—that the debate begin on the values that deal with people and with subjects which unite people rather than divide them. It is this principle that explains why our agenda for the constitution began with a discussion of a fundamental Bill of Rights to be written into the constitution. We felt this was a proper vehicle for all Canadians to discuss the questions of value which unite them.

From there, the next step was to discuss the institutions of government themselves—the authorities and the legal entities set up under the constitution to look after people to preserve their rights, and to defend their rights under the law. This led us to consider the second broad aspect of the constitution.

Only following consideration of these two aspects did the provinces and the federal government feel it wise to place on the agenda the specific issue of the division of powers. We felt, and I believe it was also the feeling of the provinces, that rather than start with a debate of the division of powers between federal and provincial authorities it was important to debate first those values which united Canadians. Fundamentally we believed that Canadians were interested in being well served by all their governments, whether federal or provincial, and that only secondarily were they interested in quarrels regarding authority and influence between these levels of government.

The sixth principle is one of controlled development of the constitution, and I suppose this is a way of explaining why the whole process takes time, Mr. Speaker. There are certain circumstances where a constitution must be written fairly quickly. After a revolution, when anarchy exists, when society has no authority by which to govern itself, it is necessary to get on rather quickly with the constitution, that is to say, with the definition of the power relationships among the various authorities within the country. But we wanted to do it not after a revolution, and indeed not after the founding of a new country. We wanted to take a country which

existed and which had desired to take another look at itself, a second century look at itself, and to re-examine the consensus upon which it existed. We were trying to devise a new constitution for a nation in a period of peace, without upsetting the consensus, without giving cause for violence, or for violent upsurges within the country. This, inevitably, takes a long time to complete.

If the consensus is to be continued, it is certain that all the aspects of the constitution can only be discussed and examined within a process of development which is controlled, which is not haphazard but which is well planned. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the adjustments to the new power relations, if there are to be any in Canada's new constitution, have to be gradual. If the adjustments were to be rapid, it would mean the upset of old power relationships, of institutions and of views, and this is the way of revolutions. Obviously the transfer of any influence, power or authority has to be gradual or otherwise it will not have the consent of the people who believe in the democratic way.

The seventh principle is that, while this long process was continuing, one fundamental principle had to be observed and respected: that was that during the whole process of constitutional review the constitution had to be obeyed.

• (3:40 p.m.)

If the provinces or the federal government had found themselves authorized to say that, the constitution was up for a new deal, that we were rewriting the fundamental law of Canada, that in the meantime the federal or provincial governments could usurp whatever powers they wanted because this was the way they saw the new constitution in the future, then obviously we would have had chaos. It is for this reason that the policy of the federal government was to insure, as far as it was concerned, total respect of the constitution during the process of constitutional review. We have repeated often enough that the only basis for liberty, freedom and order in our country is the constitution, and that if the constitution is not obeyed by provincial and federal governments there is no reason why citizens should have to obey federal and provincial statutes and laws. That is why, though some quarters have indicated impatience with the federal government's position, that we have always said that until the constitution is changed, and until we agree on a new constitution, this government intends to obey the present constitution.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

This leads me to the eighth principle, Mr. Speaker, and this is the last one I want to mention. It is obvious that, during this long process of constitutional review, other priorities must be met. It is important that the people of Canada realize that as far as the government is concerned no program has been delayed because of the constitutional review. I am not saying that there are not some things that we, as the government, have not done because of the constitution. On the contrary, because of the constitution we have not done certain things which we felt were not within our jurisdiction, but we have not delayed any programs on the pretense that the constitution was being debated and we were not sure that we should proceed with them. There are many examples which I could give but which I must shorten. Whether programs concerned minority rights, pollution, Indians or, indeed, many others, we have always taken the position that the federal government would and should discharge its responsibility under the present constitution and would continue to do so until the constitution was changed.

Nor has the process of review precluded federal-provincial meetings on other subjects. This is why the federal government took the initiative of inviting the provinces to the forthcoming February conference where we will be discussing non-constitutional matters.

I reach the end of my intervention at this stage, Mr. Speaker. We are to vote on a motion to set up a parliamentary committee. Let me make three brief points on that motion.

We believe it is the role of the parliamentary committee to review and judge the actions of this government and the position it has taken on the constitution. I think this is a welcome development and it is all the more imperative because of the need for consensus that I was discussing earlier. It will be important for all parties in this Parliament, and indeed, for all people in Canada to review and to judge the actions of this government in the constitutional review.

Legitimacy of a constitution cannot be founded, and will not be founded on force in this country. It can only be founded on consent, and it is this consent that we think can only be the result of a widespread debate on the positions which have been developed by the federal and provincial governments. The parliamentary committee will provide a forum where the Canadian public can learn about and discuss federal proposals. As the

terms of reference appear on the order paper, it is apparent that we are encouraging the committee to hold hearings across the country and to become a fundamental part of this process of education of Canadians. I mean by this education, not in the sense of proposing particular principles for government, but education in the sense that people will be invited to evolve for themselves their notions of the principles and consensus on which they want this country to be based.

We know that certain provinces have set up parliamentary committees of their own to examine the proposals put forward by provincial governments. We feel it is quite proper for the federal parliament to have that kind of a parliamentary committee and that kind of a forum. From what I have said, I think it follows that no one expects early results. The committee's work will, I presume, take as long as the review process itself. It is impossible that the committee will be expected, even at this session, or even within the next, to bring in a final report. I take it that the committee, and this is authorized in its terms of reference, will prefer to make periodic reports on specific aspects of the constitution that it has been examining.

[*Translation*]

Those are the few points I was anxious to make on this subject. I believe that the committee's terms of reference result from the very matters agreed upon between federal and provincial representatives for the process of reviewing the constitution. Should this recommendation be adopted by the House, as I hope it will, the committee will definitely have to assume heavy responsibilities not only toward the House, but also toward the whole country.

And all Canadians, as well as ourselves members of Parliament, will have to exercise great courage, patience, far-sightedness and dedication. We are certainly at a crucial point in the constitutional development of the country, and the eyes of the nation are upon us.

[*English*]

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister would permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I thought the hon. member was rising at this time to participate in the debate. The time allocated to the right hon. Prime Minister by order of the House earlier today just expired. Perhaps the hon. member could be allowed to ask a question with the unanimous agreement of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to hear the Prime Minister theorize and hypothesize as to what sort of forces hold a country together. I wonder whether he feels that this theory has been upheld by the recent events in Nigeria?

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we just listened to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) discussing the problems of the constitution very earnestly and very quietly. I do not know that I will be able to be quite as quiet as that all the time, but I want to assure the Prime Minister and members of the House that I have never believed in injecting any partisan controversy into a discussion of the constitution. On the other hand, if we are to make progress I think we have to talk to each other quite frankly on occasions such as this.

I enter this debate with quite a strong feeling that this is an occasion of some considerable historic significance. I do not know how many times in recent years or in the past the House has engaged in a full and wide-ranging debate on the constitution. Be that as it may, I think we are holding this debate at a time when the constitutional discussions initiated by the Government of Canada, through a series of federal-provincial conferences, have bogged down. It seems to me it is not exaggerating at all to say that the successful development of constitutional discussion in this country will depend in a very real way upon the workings of the committee of the House we are about to establish.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Federal-provincial meetings have demonstrated practically no progress. If progress is to be made, it must be made by or at least with the assistance of this committee. I believe we have gone much too far in the direction of turning our constitutional discussions into something so complicated, and perhaps so colourless and lacking in immediate relevance to our people, that even the most important constitutional questions excite very little or no public interest except when they stir some emotions. Of course, when emotions are stirred this does not make it any easier to reach a new consensus. During the past number of years there have been many feder-

al-provincial conferences dealing with attempts, some of them successful, to make fundamental changes in the structures and ways by which we govern ourselves. But these federal-provincial conferences have been carried out by heads of government, both provincial and federal, or by persons delegated by the heads of these governments.

Never have Canadians as a whole or as groups been involved in this process; nor have the representatives the people of Canada have elected, either in Parliament, the legislatures or in the local councils, been involved in any meaningful way. So, I hope this committee will give a voice to the views and the actions of the Canadian people. I hope the committee itself will provide opportunities to Canadians everywhere to make their views heard and have them considered and publicized rather than filed away and forgotten.

Today marks the beginning of a change in our approach to constitutional reform in this country. The Prime Minister almost suggested that we entered this process, if not by accident, at least without fully intending to do so. Certainly, the constitution is too important to be left to lawyers, prime ministers and provincial premiers. The change I suppose is not very startling in terms of the experience in other countries. It simply lacks the involvement of the Canadian people to a considerable degree in the constitution and rephasing of our constitutional procedures.

Why should the constitution be significant to the average Canadian? After all, he probably cannot tell one very much about it. So, why not leave it to the constitutional lawyers, the premiers, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) who sometimes professes to know what is best for us. Political authority in a modern state must include more than providing the possibility of using our collective strength to clean up our environment or improve our standard of living or health, important as these matters are. Surely, the political process is the means by which we make the hardest choices we have to make collectively. Quite simply political authority is a life and death affair and our constitutional process is the one workable way we in this country have developed to make sure this life and death authority is organized on terms favourable rather than unfavourable to the Canadian people. This is the reason the constitutional proposals made by the government of Canada cannot and should not be decided upon simply on the basis of government.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Our ministers must not alone decide everything about the way in which we are to be ruled. In any event, it is painfully evident to all of us that the present method of approach outlined by the Prime Minister, that of federal-provincial conferences—federal-provincial conference after federal-provincial conference—is not working. Bringing the public into the discussions through a parliamentary committee might just break this log jam. For some years our party has been pressing for the establishment of such a parliamentary committee on revision of the constitution. It has always seemed to us absurd that serious discussion of constitutional revision should be taking place almost everywhere—not primarily everywhere but any place—other than in this House of Commons and in Parliament. This after all, as the Prime Minister has reminded us, is the only institution which is entitled to speak for all Canadians.

Various provincial legislatures have had either parliamentary committees or citizens committees studying and reporting on constitutional matters. There was a Confederation of Tomorrow conference in 1967, a series of federal-provincial conferences beginning in 1968, the Etats Généraux of Quebec and a great many other privately sponsored conferences and studies of constitutional ideas. But the federal Parliament surely has been left out of this process. Last year the Prime Minister refused to co-operate in the establishment of a committee such as this. I regret this, but am delighted he has changed his mind in the meantime. Obviously, we welcome and will support the motion to set up the committee. It is sad indeed that the committee was not set up long ago, but this can be said: The need for the committee obviously is greater now than the need has been in the past. We have always seen this role as being not just one of study and discussion of various constitutional ideas. It has been our thought and hope all along that the parliamentary committee and, through the committee, Parliament itself might be used as a means of reconciliation and a means of arriving at a national consensus.

I was very interested that the Prime Minister took the time he did to develop the thought that the consensus must lie at the very basis of nationhood. I believe this is so. There is not a consensus in this country today with regard to the constitution. I think we must face this. It has been our hope that a parliamentary committee of this sort, made up of elected representatives representing the

various parts of the country and the various ways of life in this country, could help the Canadian people achieve a consensus with regard to the constitution. Let us see if the people's elected representatives, consulting each other, consulting other members of the House and listening to and drawing in the people themselves, can begin the task of overcoming the differences and divisions from which obviously the government of Canada and the provincial governments have suffered in the discussions which have taken place at the federal-provincial conferences. I think this can be a useful way to build an understanding about the basic issues which will knit Canadians together and not divide them.

This means the committee must hear groups and individuals from all across the country. The committee evidently has this power. The results of public hearings and consultations with the people sometimes are somewhat painful and a little surprising, but whether this be so or not these public hearings and consultations are necessary to the process of building a real understanding of the problems. There is one important group of elected people who, besides members of the House of Commons, have been almost entirely left out of constitutional discussions during the past number of years. One very serious result has been that the federal and provincial governments together have not been nearly as diligent about confronting some of our most serious problems as they should have been. I am referring to the absence of municipal representatives from these discussions.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I am not arguing that they should necessarily have the authority to attend federal-provincial conferences ex officio, but we have suffered from the fact that they have not really been able to take part in the discussions at any level. It is my hope, and the hope of those who sit with me in this House, that the parliamentary committee will provide for the representatives of our cities, towns and counties precisely that forum and that public platform which has been denied to them through the past quarter century with regard to this matter. Indeed, I would go somewhat further and suggest that if the committee is to have some resource people to help it, it should consider consulting the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities in the course of selecting some of its personnel, because I think it is only in this way that our members of Parliament can be assured that the interests of both the great metropolitan centres and the bustling frontier communities are properly taken into account.

All this will not be possible if the government adopts toward this committee a narrow, partisan approach. Individual members of the committee ought to have the maximum freedom to consider and discuss ideas, to present their own ideas and to convince each other of the merit of these ideas. Let us keep the whips away and, if I may say so without offence, let us all agree that this is no place for the sometimes hamhanded interference of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald).

I think the committee should be representative in every sense of the regions and the people of the country. There should be a co-chairman representing the official languages, and I think consideration should be given to one of the co-chairmen being a member of one of the opposition parties.

The terms of reference and their interpretation must not be restrictive. The wording of this resolution is a little curious, but I think that is mainly because of its parentage rather than for any other reason. It is a vast improvement over the first draft that I saw on Friday which seemed to have the effect of confining the committee to the consideration of matters that have already been proclaimed by the federal government. This would have had the effect of preventing this committee from considering on its own the proper way to approach constitutional matters. It would seem to confine the committee to staying in locked-step with discussions at federal-provincial conferences. As I see it, this defect has been removed, and the resolution that is now before us would permit the committee to consider all matters which the federal and provincial governments agreed to discuss as constitutional matters back in 1968, which, I believe, includes just about anything that one is likely to want to discuss.

It is certain that this committee must consider its method of approach to constitutional matters. It may very well decide that the method chosen by the Prime Minister and the government, and outlined by the Prime Minister this afternoon, is not working and that another method of approach, perhaps one quite substantially different, might well produce results.

The Prime Minister has said that the role of the committee is to review and judge the job which, in effect, the government of

Canada has been doing with regard to constitutional review. I would put it differently. I think the job of this committee is to review what has happened in connection with constitutional review, but also to decide what is the best method of proceeding with constitutional review and what method is most likely to produce the results that we want in this country.

If there is any doubt about the interpretation of the motion or about the ability, capacity or authority of this committee, then I would certainly want it corrected because it must be admitted that the approach taken by the federal government and imposed on federal-provincial conferences has so far been a failure. If there has been any progress, it is hardly measurable. The Prime Minister referred to this when he said that discussions had commenced with an outline of the program concerning human rights. As the Prime Minister has reminded us, the government put this forward as a measure for uniting rather than dividing Canadians. Yet, last December the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) had to report to the federal-provincial conference that there was no progress, or, to put it more accurately, he had no progress to report after almost two years of discussion.

In the spring of 1968, the federal government brought down, practically on tablets of stone, its white paper on international relations. I felt that that white paper was somewhat over-simplified and ignored some of our history, but certainly on the basis of that, no progress at all has been made toward the solution of one of our long standing constitutional problems. I refer to the question of how it would be possible for us in this country to sign treaties which involve, in whole or in part, implementation by provincial legislatures. There has been no progress in this regard. The whole matter seems to have become a contest between the government of Canada and the province of Quebec. This does not seem to have been resolved, either. Certainly, there has been no progress in filling in some of the great gaps in our constitution regarding matters of great importance such as, for example, the right to sign treaties involving implementation by provincial legislatures.

The white paper seems to be rather useless with regard to any of the policies of the federal government, which so far it has been unable to enforce. Indeed, I am a little puzzled about this whole thing because on reading some of the Prime Minister's earlier works I noticed that he quoted with approval F. A. Angers. This is what he wrote:

> I cannot express it more concisely than F. A. Angers who said: "In general, the Canadian state is not the central government, but the central and the provincial governments taken together... In matters of education the Canadian state is the provincial state, and none other."

I am puzzled as to the bearing of that statement on, for example, the authority in this country to sign treaties involving areas that call for implementation by provincial legislatures.

Mr. Trudeau: Do you disagree with the quotation?

Mr. Stanfield: No, I just said I am puzzled.

Mr. Trudeau: May I ask the hon. member a question? The hon. member obviously quotes me as though he did not approve of what I said. Does he disagree with the quotation?

Mr. Stanfield: I do not necessarily disagree with it. It may be right with regard to domestic matters, but I am puzzled at the deduction which the right hon. Prime Minister would draw from this quotation with regard to external relations and, for example, treaties relating to this. This is what puzzles me in the light of the government's white paper on this matter.

The failure of the constitutional conference was summed up rather succinctly by Professor Denis Smith in the Toronto *Star* last Friday, January 23 as follows:

> And so, as the meetings go on, the country is faced with one failed federal proposition after another: the reconstitution of the Senate and Supreme Court; the entrenchment of a bill of rights; the proposal for maintaining the federal role in social services such as it is, against the intransigency of Quebec; the claim for federal "paramountcy" in the field of pensions. The Prime Minister's claim that this is progress cannot be taken at face value; one can reasonably argue that Mr. Trudeau's constitutional program has collapsed in shambles.

• (4:10 p.m.)

That is why I think the work of this committee is going to be particularly important. I have taken the position all along that the responsible course for the loyal opposition to take in matters of constitutional review is to give the Prime Minister and the government of Canada time and full opportunity to proceed as they think best. I think members of the House will agree that we have done nothing to interfere or deepen in any way the difficulties of the government with regard to constitutional review.

In our desire to give them plenty of time and opportunity to put their approach to the test, we have taken a non-partisan approach. This is not because I regard myself as a knight in shining armour riding a white horse, but because I recognize the great difficulty of achieving a consensus in this country with regard to a revised or a new constitution. I recognize also that such an achievement will require the co-operation and best efforts of us all. This has been our attitude. Our attitude is also that should the Prime Minister and his government be able to achieve agreement with the provinces and arrive at a new or revised constitution satisfactory to Canadians generally by following their own approach and on their own terms, well and good. We would support this, but so far it is clear that the government has not been able to achieve it. I say this in an objective way: so far there is nothing but failure to show for the methods followed. Parliament and the country have to be concerned about the implications of this failure and about the consequences of continued failure and deadlock.

As to the implications of failure, I am much more concerned than the Prime Minister seems to be. In fact, I am not sure what the Prime Minister considers to be the implications of failure because he has contradicted himself a little on this subject several times. In the House on February 14 last, speaking of urban renewal, housing and urban transport, he said:

> Until the constitution is brought into the twentieth century in some of these respects, governments are to a large degree powerless to solve the problems either by acting alone or in co-operation with other levels of government.

In other words, we need a revised constitution before we can tackle some of these important problems confronting the country. Two months later, on April 24 last, the Prime Minister said in an interview that:

> —Most of the fundamental issues in this country could be settled under the present constitution through co-operation between the federal government and the provinces.

That statement of course was made when the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) resigned as Minister of Transport, and was made in reply to an accusation by the former minister that he resigned because we did not then have an adequate housing policy in Canada. So, the Prime Minister's theory of confederation does not allow the federal government to deal effectively with the modern problems facing this country. This, Mr. Speaker, was a dispute within the government. This was certainly the basis of the resignation of the former Minister of Transport and it seems to be the basis of the grievances of the hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens).

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I do not consider the Prime Minister reluctant to assert federal authority in constitutional discussions with the provinces in certain areas. It seems to me the question is, rather, which areas has the Prime Minister chosen for an assertion of federal authority? This government has been quite aggressive in constitutional discussions in certain areas vis-à-vis the provinces, notably in the field of welfare as the most recent example. Certainly, this government has pushed to increase the constitutional authority of the federal government with regard to pensions. It may very well be, and I suggest it is, that because of the aggressive position of the federal government in these areas it is neither exercising nor seeking adequate authority in other areas where federal leadership is generally considered to be required today. Insofar as the subjects mentioned by the Prime Minister himself are concerned, pollution and urban problems for example, presumably he does not wish to be regarded as a thorough-going centralizer.

I want to emphasize that I believe the federal government has the necessary authority, in co-operation with the provinces, to tackle problems such as pollution and urban problems. But perhaps the Prime Minister believes that there is no such authority. We have not seen any indication in constitutional discussions of a desire on his part to seek an enlargement of the federal role.

Mr. Trudeau: The Canada water act.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not think that is a constitutional matter, Mr. Speaker. I am not quite as confused as all that. I think we should ask some questions, and I think the committee should ask itself some questions.

Why is it more important for the federal government to increase its constitutional authority in the area of welfare rather than to increase its constitutional authority in a way that could help to cope with the pollution problem in the country?

Mr. Trudeau: We have not discussed that yet.

Mr. Stanfield: That is right, they have not discussed that yet; they are bogged down.

Mr. Trudeau: Welfare, for instance?

Mr. Stanfield: Yes, welfare. Is the Prime Minister particularly aggressive in the field of welfare, I ask, because the province of Quebec attaches more importance to exercising authority in the field of welfare itself?

Mr. Trudeau: Are you suggesting that we should not have tackled welfare?

Mr. Stanfield: No, but this is where the question of urgency arises. Why use welfare to seek an increase in federal authority rather than pollution? Is this the subconscious manifestation of the policy of confrontation? The Prime Minister has indicated that he welcomes the confrontation apparently developing in provincial politics in Quebec. Is the government of Canada consciously or subconsciously seeking a confrontation by following these methods?

Mr. Trudeau: Does the hon. member believe that welfare is less important than pollution?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I shall deal with this as I go along.

Mr. Trudeau: Go ahead.

An hon. Member: Stop laughing John Turner.

Mr. Stanfield: I do not know why my hon. friend should get so upset. I am putting forward quietly my presentation of a point of view. The only reason I can understand for the Prime Minister and the gentlemen alongside and behind him becoming so agitated about it is that they think there might be something to it, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly the federal government is engaged in a protracted struggle to preserve—not only preserve, but to increase—the federal authority in some fields. To date, however, it has been negligent in other areas where difficulties are arising as a result of technology and modern developments. The government has been neglecting areas where most Canadians would argue jurisdiction is pretty important, both as to the exercise of jurisdiction and as a clarification of any doubt existing as to the ability of the federal government to exercise that jurisdiction.

My point is that I would like the committee to consider the practicability and the possibility of some adjustment in the direction of federal thrust. I should like the committee to consider whether it is possible that the federal thrust for additional authority might be changed, and whether this might not lead to the prospect of a genuine reconciliation, as well as to the prospect of the federal government having the authority it needs to deal with national problems. It is not a question of reducing the ability of Parliament or the federal government to serve Canada. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that the committee may well consider methods which would show how the usefulness of the federal Parliament and the ability of the government to serve the Canadian people would be increased. This is something the committee should be prepared to consider.

• (4:20 p.m.)

It is said by some that the Prime Minister and members of the federal government are going through the exercise of constitutional review merely to prove how impossible it all is. I have to say, after having listened to the Prime Minister this afternoon that it seemed to me as if his heart was not in it. He seemed to feel that it was unfortunate somebody else had started the process because, certainly, the Prime Minister's heart was not in it.

Mr. Forrestall: His heart cannot be in it because some allege he has no heart.

Mr. Stanfield: I wonder whether the Prime Minister intends to show us that, since the federal government and the provinces have failed to agree, the provincial premiers can go back to their offices reconciled to the workings of the present constitution. Would it really be as easy as all that, Mr. Speaker? Could we really say, as the Prime Minister has suggested,—forgetting for a moment what has just happened—that we cannot drop this matter until we have fully explored it but, once we have fully explored it and shown that we cannot reach agreement, we should forget about it?

Mr. Trudeau: When did I say that?

Mr. Stanfield: That was the suggestion. The Prime Minister said that, having put our hand to the plow and having started this thing, we must explore it fully. But he did not indicate at all whether he would be really concerned if the process failed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Stanfield: Oh, oh; listen to the hon. gentlemen groan. The point I wish to make is

that I gravely doubt whether it is as easy as all that; I gravely doubt whether our future as a country would be so serene.

Mr. Trudeau: And just where, did I say that?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister asks where he said that. Let me say this: If the Prime Minister is convinced that a failure of this procedure would have very serious consequences for the country, why did he not say that? Why did he say that we must pursue this process to the end?

Mr. Trudeau: Because I do not think there will be a failure, that is why.

Mr. Stanfield: If this constitutional conference fails, and if the constitutional process fails then, surely, we will be a lesser country. Surely, that will be demeaning to our self respect as a country and undermine our capacity for achievement as a united nation. Surely, such a result will be destructive to any spirit or hope of unity. And, Mr. Speaker, I pause before I say this but I think I must say it, our days as a nation would be numbered.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. gentleman is saying that.

Mr. Stanfield: If, as Canadians we are unable to agree on a consensus relating to our constitution and unable even to agree upon how to amend it at home, I ask, what would be the consequence in the Prime Minister's home province of such a failure? Would it have a settling effect, or the opposite? Would such failure strengthen those who believe in Canada or would it strengthen those who do not?

Some seem to think that the way to resolve the issues in Quebec is by some sort of high-noon confrontation between the theories of the Prime Minister on the one hand, and the theories of Rene Levesque on the other, with the winner taking all.

Mr. McGrath: A shoot out.

Mr. Trudeau: You people seem to want it.

Mr. Stanfield: Some of us do not like the idea of gambling with the future of Canada in that way.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: So, instead, you people are wishy-washy about federalism.

Mr. Stanfield: To put it bluntly, some of us think Canada is bigger than the theories of the Prime Minister and Rene Levesque put together.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: We think that the way to build for the future of Canada is not by causing confrontation but by seeking reconciliation. We also think that there are so many serious problems facing the people of Canada that Canada just cannot afford the luxury of this continued stand-off, this constitutional deadlock, between the federal and provincial governments.

Mr. Trudeau: That is why the hon. member's party came up with the concept of special status.

Mr. Stanfield: The Prime Minister made his speech, Mr. Speaker, and I am now trying to make mine.

Mr. Trudeau: But the hon. member is attacking me. I did not attack him.

An hon. Member: He is becoming nervous and excited, and cannot help it.

Mr. Stanfield: Although the Prime Minister has misrepresented my position in the past after I have spoken, this is the first time he has done so before I have finished my speech.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I suggest that this committee must question some of the current dogmas of the federal government and explore other methods of reaching a constitutional consensus. I assume that in order to achieve such consensus, to achieve an arrangement that is in the best interests of the country, there must be some modification or redistribution of powers. There must be, on the one hand, a clarifying of and expanding of federal powers in some areas and, on the other hand, a clarifying and expanding of provincial powers. Some may say this would not lead to agreement or consensus and that if the federal government yielded any powers to the provinces related to any areas of dispute, more would be demanded of the federal government.

But I say that we must try, Mr. Speaker, and we ought not to accept defeat or failure before we try. For example, is it essential to good government in Canada that the federal government should claim all the constitutional authority in the field of welfare and of the

related field of pensions. It asks for this in its white paper on the subject and that would bring about an increase in the power of the federal Parliament as compared with existing power. This government has said it is going to get out of a number of shared cost programs such as the hospital plan, the medicare plan and a number of other federal programs. These plans relate primarily to health; but they also relate to welfare and to income maintenance. The government has its own reasons for wishing to get out of these programs; and, in getting out of these programs the government will be reducing the authority it will be exercising in these areas. Nevertheless it seems to take the position that it is in the best interests of the country for it to do so.

This indicates that in the view of the government there is nothing really sacrosanct in maintaining the federal government's role in welfare and income maintenance at precisely its present level. Of course, it does not follow that the position put forward by the province of Quebec should be accepted, although the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) for one said sometime ago that it should be. There may well be some ground in between that is acceptable, and I should like to see the committee explore that. I mentioned two areas as examples.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired unless there is unanimous consent for him to continue.

Some hon. Members: Go ahead.

Mr. Stanfield: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will be as brief as I can. Instead of hanging on stubbornly for more constitutional authority in this area, the committee should consider whether an increase in federal authority would be more useful in other areas. The committee should also consider whether some restricted form of delegation between the federal and provincial governments might play a useful role in reaching a consensus. I know the Prime Minister used to be against this. I do not know his current views. There is nothing new in this.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The late Angus L. Macdonald, the distinguished former Premier of Nova Scotia and federal cabinet minister, advocated some form of delegation as a means of overcoming certain problems in our federal system. Twice in the last decade, the federal and provincial governments have virtually reached agreement on the principle, although not on the details. I think the committee should address itself to this question.

The Hon. Walter Weir, at a federal-provincial conference in February, 1969, put forward a formula in some detail which contained five classifications of legislative power. It made some provision for a delegation. This is an approach that should be considered, with the power of delegation being clearly defined and restricted. I ask the House and the committee which this House will appoint to bear in my mind that we do not have all the time in the world to arrive at some workable arrangement.

The Prime Minister spoke about the length of the process, but the situation in Canada today is such that the people across Canada are becoming increasingly impatient and frustrated by the apparent preoccupation of the federal government with constitutional questions. The Prime Minister may think this is not exactly fair and perhaps it is not. But the impression in this country is that the federal government is unable or unwilling to take effective action with regard to other problems.

The Prime Minister recognizes that the government appears to have a constitutional hang-up and Canadians are becoming fed up with this. On the other hand, if the situation in Quebec has not deteriorated it certainly has not improved in the last year or two. The people of Canada want to see an end to this constitutional deadlock, a break in the log-jam, so that they can have answers to their questions and action on their problems.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that nothing is much easier than announcing a policy that is uncompromising, immutable and utterly irreconcilable with other points of view. Nothing is easier and more popular at certain times, but countries survive and grow, just as families get along together, by way of adjustment and honourable accommodation. Far from being a sign of weakness, honourable accommodation is the most successful and civilized kind of leadership. It serves to reconcile and unite rather than polarize or devise. It serves to overcome pettiness, suspicion and animosity. Successful and honourable accommodation and compromise summon from the people of a country, as is required from members of a family, the best of tolerance, generosity and understanding that is in them.

In that spirit, there is greatness for a country. In that spirit I trust this committee will examine, with open minds and in an objective way, all the possibilities for a consensus of understanding, that the committee will work for reconciliation and seek a national consensus so that the present deadlock may be broken and governments can get on with their jobs.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to underline at the opening of my remarks on behalf of my colleagues and myself that, although I share the disappointment that I am sure all hon. members feel at the slow pace at which the constitutional conference is proceeding, I am not prepared to contemplate failure of that conference and I am not prepared to discuss the evil consequence of such failure. Despite my political disagreement with many leaders of governments in Canada, I believe that they and the people of Canada have a determination to make this country work, make this country great and, with that determination, failure should not be contemplated at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Nor is it possible, Mr. Speaker, for any reasonable person to believe that such a thing as constitutional review can take a short time and be completed within a year or two. We all fully expected that the process would be a long one and that the discussions might take quite a few years. It is not the length of time that the discussion takes which is important, but the manner in which the discussion is being carried on; whether from step to step there is a greater understanding on the part of the various representatives of the people of Canada or, on the contrary, whether there appears to be a worsening of the situation, a reduction in understanding and co-operation and willingness to achieve a fruitful result.

My unhappiness about the conference is not the time it has taken, but as I sat as an observer at all the meetings of this continuing conference, I wondered whether the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and others were right in calling it a review of the constitution or whether I was present at an auction of power seekers trying to find the particular place where they can exercise more power without defining the purpose for which that power is to be used. It is a sense of competition between the federal government and the provinces. It is a sense of auctioning parts of Canada between the federal and provincial authorities. This is what makes me sad about the constitutional conference and makes me worry about the future, not of that conference alone, but the future of my country.

The Prime Minister spoke today. I am not making a personal remark when I say with great respect that the Prime Minister seems to misunderstand the reasons and forces throughout this constitutional review. If he does understand them, and he is an intelligent man, he certainly does not tell us. He spoke today about the increasing powers of the provinces, le pouvoir croissant, as I heard him.

They are not increasing the powers of the provinces, Mr. Speaker. They have not increased their powers under the constitution. It is not a question of power between the federal government and the provinces that confronts Canada. It is the development of the industrial urbanized society which has forced upon the provinces expenditures way beyond anything contemplated 100 years ago. That is the problem that faces Canada.

• (4:40 p.m.)

It is the exercise of the present constitutional powers by the provinces, often with the encouragement of the federal government along lines which I and my hon. friends support, which has substantially increased provincial expenditures. The Prime Minister gave us a figure of 204 per cent for the increase in those expenditures between 1954 and 1964 as against an increase of 56 per cent in the same period by the federal government. I say to the Prime Minister that it was not by any good husbandry on the part of the federal government that the increase at federal level was held to this proportion. The extent of the provincial increase is accounted for by the fact that the responsibility for education, for road construction, for health and welfare services and for dealing with the consequences of a modern technological society lies constitutionally on the shoulders of the provinces. This is why provincial expenditures increased by 204 per cent as compared with 56 per cent for the federal government.

I do not know why the Prime Minister mentioned those figures. I hope he did not intend to wag a finger of admonition at the provinces; I hope he understood there is nothing in those figures about which he, or we, can boast. It is the present constitutional set-up which produced them.

New developments in society cry out for a revision of the distribution of powers and responsibilities in our country and for a fresh consideration of the fiscal capacities of the several levels of government. This is known to everyone; I am not being original when I say this. I would remind the House that the powers now given to the provinces and municipalities, as well as the magnitude of expenditures, cannot be exercised or carried out by them. The burden is too great for them unless there is some kind of federal participation on an effective and substantial scale.

Everybody talks about urbanization and the effects of urbanization. The fact is that this is the source of the demand for a review of the constitution. Canada today is no longer what it was in 1867, a country with a small population the greater part of which was rural, a country in which education was merely a luxury for those who could afford it, a country where health was something to be left to God and the environment, because little else could be done about it. We are no longer that kind of country. Seventy per cent of our people are now living in urban areas and by 1980, 80 per cent will do so. All the problems the Prime Minister mentioned this afternoon, urban transportation, housing, urban renewal, recreation—particularly for the children in these huge agglomerations of high-rise apartments and choking streets—pollution and so on, have descended upon our society and will become more evident as we continue. Many of them do not recognize provincial boundaries—water pollution is one example. Many of them are beyond solution by local people, whether their representatives be municipal or provincial. What is required is the kind of national approach which the present government has refused to take, as I shall show in the course of the next few minutes. This is another reason why the need to reconsider the powers of the various levels of government and the financial capacities of those various levels became essential in the 'sixties and remains so in the 'seventies.

Another development in our society which made it necessary to examine our set-up and try to find ways of improving confederation is the tendency—one which perhaps my hon. friends and I welcome more than others in this House—for an increasing degree of government intervention in the economy, and toward an increasing provision of welfare and the benefits of a good society to our people. Whether they welcome this or not, I am sure hon. members in all parts of the House recognize this tendency. We feel, moreover, an obligation to continue collectively to provide for the welfare of the people of Canada. This has involved a much larger degree of participation by government at all levels in the development of the country and in bringing costly amenities of life to our people. It has involved, particularly at the federal level, a search for means whereby these obligations of government in a modern society can be fulfilled.

There is a fourth development which has demanded an examination of our constitutional set-up. There is ever-increasing acceptance by people of all parties that there is a collective responsibility to achieve equality not only of opportunity but also of condition for all people in all areas, and not merely in one's own country but all over the world. This was not accepted years ago. When I first became active politically some decades ago in Montreal, I recall having to debate with people who held that if we provided unemployment insurance it would simply make people lazy; that if we gave them pensions it would destroy their souls; that if they walked in shoes with holes in the soles they were great people because they could be proud of the fact that the holes were their own. This was the attitude taken not only in Canada but in societies all over the world.

It has now been discarded, and increasingly people all over the country are demanding that governments in Canada should provide greater equality for all our citizens from coast to coast. The difficulty which arises is: how can all this be achieved; which level of government can best provide for bringing about equality of condition as between the people of Newfoundland, Ontario and British Columbia; which level of government has the means, the authority and the fiscal capacity to bring about the economic, cultural and educational development of any area? This is a pre-condition for giving the people in the disadvantaged areas of Canada an opportunity to hold their heads at least as high as those Canadians who, by accident of birth or by immigration, live elsewhere in our nation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: These are the reasons for reviewing the constitution, and if they are not the reasons, that review is a waste of time and a futile exercise which we ought to stop right now. It is the failure of the Prime Minister and the federal government to set before

the constitutional conferences these basic and human reasons which in my opinion have been responsible for the marketplace haggling which is a characteristic of these conferences instead of genuine co-operation among those who seek a common goal for all Canada.

The fact is that we have not made much progress at these meetings.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

The constitutional conference is now entering its second year of proceedings and does not seem to have made very substantial progress. In fact, the situation tends, it seems to me, to become more serious in many fields. The problems which the conference must face are obviously complex and difficult. It is not my intention to blame anyone for this lack of progress. However, I would say that in several fields the position taken by the government and the attitude of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) reveal a lack of flexibility which puts obstacles in the way of the difficult discussions which must be carried on by the heads of governments in Canada.

To my mind, the Prime Minister's refusal, as emphasized by him this afternoon, to admit that Quebec is confronted with particular problems calling for special solutions is and will always be an insuperable obstacle to the constitutional review.

Mr. Schreyer, my colleague who is premier of Manitoba, mentioned this fact to the conference and also to newspapermen. Obviously, the whole system of shared cost programs as well as the problems concerning housing, urban renewal, pollution, manpower training and some aspects of social welfare, for which federal initiative and participation are required, are in danger. In my view, that is due to the obstinate refusal of the Prime Minister to discuss such problems with Quebec in a different way than with the other provinces.

I do not mean by that that we should give in every time the Quebec government makes requests to Ottawa. I agree with the Prime Minister that Ottawa should not concede, as Quebec wants, that the federal government must never allocate funds for social security programs concerning Canadians living in that province.

Evidently, it is essential that Canadians throughout the country enjoy the services of the federal government and that they maintain direct relations with its institutions. It is therefore also important that Quebecers, just like the citizens of other provinces, make use of Ottawa's special services, in order to judge the importance which the federal government attaches to their problems as well as to those of other Canadians.

But to insist on this basic principle in a federal state does not mean to deny some special problems and an unfaltering will to solve them by special means. I can hardly understand how someone like the Prime Minister who has the future of Canada so much at heart and who has a thorough knowledge of our constitutional history can remain so impervious to things that are essential to our country.

It is unfortunate that another problem, bilingualism, seems to be getting worse. Two years ago, one could see real progress towards the recognition of bilingualism in Canada. Some provinces had made considerable efforts in that direction and everywhere there was a growing interest in the advantages to be derived from bilingualism, not only for greater unity but also for increased fairness and wealth in Canadian life and culture. Regretfully, linguistic quarrels and a few unfortunate events in Quebec created an unhealthy atmosphere that threatens the spread of bilingualism in the other provinces. I should like to give an example which is rather distressing for me. I was educated in Montreal in the English language, and I am aware of the rights I enjoyed, as are my friends and colleagues. Today however in the province of Quebec, people are wondering whether those rights will continue to exist in the future. Not only the extremists' position in Quebec is to be dreaded, but it seems evident that at the administrative level, the attitude of the Quebec government is making the problem worse.

The members from Quebec know, I am sure, that there is a new procedure in that province with regard to higher education. When a student graduates from a secondary school, he must attend a junior college for two years before being admitted to university where he has to study another three years in order to obtain a B.A. or B.Sc. degree.

I have learned from reliable sources that presently, there is only one English-speaking college in Quebec. Now, to be recognized, such a college must get approval from the Provincial Department of Education, and I am told that so far, they have refused to approve the creation of other English-speaking colleges.

The result, if such information is accurate, is that next fall, about 3,000 English-speaking

high school students will be unable to be admitted to a CEGEP, and consequently they will not be able to take up university studies.

This is an unfair situation unlikely to serve Quebec's or Canada's interests. Such a policy only aggravates the situation and reduces the hope for a united Canada and the development of bilingualism throughout the country. We must face this situation as openly as possible, because today, higher education is no longer considered a luxury for the young, but a necessity for economic and social progress, in these times of technological revolution.

[*English*]

I deliberately cited this example of retrograde behaviour on the part of the government of Quebec to underline the difficulties which are now being created, and to underline the feelings which I have that far from improving the situation in Canada the exercise of reviewing our constitution, not the exercise as such but the situation despite this review, has resulted in a great worsening of the attitude of one community to the other in this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that we in this party, as I have already said, are not concerned about the time the review may take, but we are quite concerned that despite the brave words of the Prime Minister today, and on some other occasions, the constitutional review be not used as an excuse for inaction in any areas in which this country needs action immediately. The Prime Minister says that although the exercise was really initiated by the provinces they now seem to be a little less interested in the constitutional review, and that some newspaper editorials underline their lack of interest.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Let me say to him that I am not surprised at that. Let me say to him, I hope without presumption, that he is misunderstanding the attitude of the provinces and most of the writers of newspaper editorials. They are not disinterested in constitutional review. They are in despair at the failure of the federal government to deal with the problems which press upon the provinces, the municipalities and the people resident in them while this review is going on. That is the reason for their disinterest. It it not a rejection of the need to review and rewrite our constitution that our Prime Minister is witnessing. It is a cry from the heart that the Prime Minister stop fiddling, which is the way they look at it in this context, while their issues and problems mount or while Rome burns.

For example, how can the leader of any federal government expect that the provinces will look at constitutional review with open hearts and minds when right in the middle of that review they hear from spokesmen of the government, and I am not exaggerating even though I am not quoting, that as soon as it is possible the government intends to withdraw from the cost shared programs—perhaps not all of them but a good many of them? Just imagine what that means for the provinces. They are induced to come into the program because of the federal participation and then they are told, a year, three years or five years after that, the federal government is going to withdraw. It is true the government will make provisions for certain financial returns, but it intends to withdraw and from then on the responsibility will be entirely upon the provinces.

How does the Prime Minister expect a representative of any government in Canada to sit with him and discuss the allocation of powers under the constitution when the premiers or Prime Ministers of the provinces see the federal axe hanging over them, over the residents of the provinces, over the treasury and over the entire program of social security which has been so painfully built? It is this attitude of the federal government I condemn, not the time they are taking or that the Prime Minister is taking in getting these conferences going because they cannot be done fast.

At the same time that this review takes place, the federal government makes threats about withdrawals from programs which are the very lifeblood of the provinces and which attack the basic welfare of the Canadian people from coast to coast. How can the Prime Minister expect representatives and the Prime Ministers of provinces to feel at ease and leisurely consider the many complex legal and social issues involved in constitutional revision when every one of them knows that in the large cities they have programs for urban renewal. While there has been some research done, the federal government and its minister responsible for housing sit in offices reviewing, reviewing and reviewing but obviously becoming more confused daily. The more the minister reads and the more he reviews the less he apparently knows of the problem. The provinces and municipalities sit with the Prime Minister and demand that something be done about

urban renewal in the large cities of this country, yet they are expected to come to a constitutional review in a leisurely way to sit and discuss constitutional problems as though there were not very urgent matters pressing upon them at home. What we resent and think is a betrayal of the needs of Canada and the Canadian people is that we are constantly being threatened by this government about our system of social security. We do not know what the result will be but we hear about task forces investigating the total system of social security and reporting. We hear statements from the government about the need for selectivity instead of universality. I am certain that every representative of every province in this country is wondering what this means for the various programs which the people in the provinces enjoy and which they share in many cases with the federal government.

How can anyone expect the Prime Ministers from the disadvantaged provinces of this country to come to the table to discuss constitutional revision when the gap between the income of their people and the income of the people in other provinces increases while this constitutional review is going on? In spite of all the reorganization of the federal government and the establishment of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, the fact is that the gap in income and welfare between the people in the Atlantic provinces and the people in Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta has increased in the last few years. This has not narrowed. How can any Prime Minister representing a province in dire need like the Atlantic provinces are, and like the province of Manitoba is to some extent, come to the table and sit with the federal government in a leisurely manner discussing the social and legal implications of constitutional review?

These are the problems that make constitutional review appear irrelevant to the representatives of the provincial governments. These are the problems that make the constitutional review misunderstood and perhaps irrelevant to the people of Canada. These are the problems that make the constitutional review irrelevant to so many people in the province of Quebec. I say to the Prime Minister and the federal government that if they are serious about the unity of this country, and serious about building a new constitution as the basis for that unity, they have to tackle these problems immediately, with some verve, some imagination, some heart and some generosity.

I say that history is full of examples that when people sit down to write a document, a constitution, an agreement, a contract or whatever it may be for something in the future while they ignore or appear to ignore the problems that choke the people at present, the documents are not going to be written or if they are written are not going to be any good, and to the extent that they are any good, will not be worth the paper they are written on because underneath them will remain social bitterness and social misunderstanding and a great deal of regional resentment that will not allow any constitution to work.

The solution is not easy. This cannot be done overnight, but I say that the solution to the constitutional problem of Canada will not be found by merely writing a new constitution and not by merely modernizing the division of powers, but it must be based in my view and the view of my colleagues—I am sure I speak for them—on action now by the Parliament and the Government of Canada on the problems I have indicated and the many more that are well known to the Prime Minister. This should be done while this constitutional review is being carried on so that the representatives of the provinces will be sitting down with a federal government which recognizes these problems and is doing something about them. They will then, perhaps, see a better future for the citizens of the provinces and will then be willing to discuss constitutional review in a much better mood than is now the case.

I am not going to attempt to give a blueprint of the kind of thing that the committee ought to discuss because I do not think this is the purpose of this debate today. We support the setting up of this committee not only because it will enable members of opposition parties to participate in discussions on changing the constitution, but even more important, as far as I am concerned, this is the only way in which the people of Canada, through their various organizations, can be heard on the subject of constitutional change.

I am not saying this in terms intending to belittle anyone of the provinces or anyone of the governments, but you sit at these constitutional conferences and watch 11 men who have been thrown up by the accident of election with the duty and the obligation—

An hon. Member: You better amend that now.

Mr. Lewis: I am not amending it. This applies to my friend Mr. Schreyer as it does to the Prime Minister of Canada. By the accident of election 11 men, some with one view of Canada and some with another, some thinking they are Gods and some thinking they are demi-Gods, but no one less than that, sit there settling the future of my country. These may be the people in Canada to do it, but all of us will have some doubt about some one in that group of 11.

• (5:10 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Particularly one.

Mr. Lewis: I do not know what the alternative is. There probably is none, but as I said there is a serious question about 11 men who are there by accident of election—11 men, no more. It is true there is a cabinet, but essentially the present system means that it is the Prime Minister who settles the constitution and the future for all the people of Canada. By this means I feel there is no opportunity, except in an election or in elections, for the people of Canada to express themselves and to take part in the process of constitutional discussion and constitutional change. This is the reason we, like members of the official opposition, asked a long time ago for a parliamentary committee. If I remember correctly, my colleague the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) asked for this back in 1966 when the present Prime Minister was minister of justice, and at the time the justice minister rejected it as he later rejected the request of opposition members.

I suggest to the Prime Minister that he was wrong. It may be that the Prime Minister and the premiers, 11 of them, sitting in the constitutional conferences might have behaved differently than they have behaved if the people of Canada had been given an opportunity to appear before parliamentary and legislative committees across the country and have their say about Canada and its future instead of leaving it only to the Prime Ministers. This committee will provide an opportunity for appearances by the Federation of Agriculture, the National Farmers Union, the Canadian Labour Congress—

An hon. Member: The CMA.

Mr. Lewis: The CMA, if that association has anything to say and the Canadian Bar Association if it has anything to say that concerns the welfare of the people of Canada. All these organizations and many others will have an opportunity to appear before us and participate in this historic event.

We in this party object—and we so informed the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald)—to a joint committee on which the Senate is represented. Personally, I love every Senator individually but do not want to sit with them on any committee such as this despite my love for them individually. Aside from our opposition to the Senate as an institution in this Parliament there is another reason why in this case I object to a joint committee. I do not intend to move an amendment in this regard but I wish to place this on the record. They were not elected by the people. They do not represent the people of Canada. They were appointed by some prime ministers over the years. Many of them are defeated candidates.

Mr. Trudeau: Whom are the members of the CMA elected by?

Mr. Lewis: They at least represent the doctors. If you want the Senators to appear before the committee to present their case for the Senate, we will hear them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: It is their presence on this committee to which we object. However, I shall not say any more about that. In any case, my time I believe is about up.

The second point I wish to make is that made by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). I am probably wrong, but I was under the impression that an earlier draft of the motion contained in it a provision giving the committee permission to hire counsel and other experts. I regret very much the omission of such a provision and I hope, after the committee is established and meets, that it will come back to the House of Commons and request and receive authority to hire whatever experts and whatever assistants members of the committee may think necessary.

Some others of my colleagues will speak in this debate and will indicate some things we believe might be done immediately, such as the inclusion of a provision for delegation of power which might solve present problems without the necessity of waiting for the total revision of the constitution.

Since the clock tells me I must, I shall conclude by saying this not very original thing to the House. I agree with the Prime Minister that countries and nations are not,

despite what some people think, ordained by God and are not the result of any tablet from Mount Sinai. They are the historical development resulting from many things which it is difficult to indicate. When I wrote an article for a Canadian magazine about three years ago I said, when in certain circumstances I was asked why I was going back to Canada after I had finished my studies elsewhere, that this is rather difficult to answer and that I can only say, like Gertrude Stein, my country, my country is my country. But it is a great country; it is a tremendous country; it is a beautiful country. It is a country which has great riches underground, in the forests and in the waters. It has a great people, not greater than any other but just as great as any other people in the world.

We have the possibility of building a model society for the peoples of the world to see. We have a duty to build it because we have the resources with which to build such a society. The leaders of governments in Canada will go down in history as destroyers of human hopes if they do not succeed in this constitutional revision. The people of Canada will never forgive them if the result of this revision is not a better constitution serving the interests of the people of Canada, and indeed of the people of the world, better than our constitution has served us until now, although it has served us. As has been said, historically we face an important task. I hope and pray we are able to fulfil it with distinction and with justice to the people of our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher)—Post Office—assignment of new productivity executive; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—Manpower—adult retraining and educational programs—alleged wasting of money; the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—Pollution—dumping of oil and other waste in Great Lakes.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

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

That a Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That twenty members of the House of Commons, to be designated by the House at a later date, be members of the Joint committee on the part of this House;

That the committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committee as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

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

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to say a few words this afternoon on the motion introduced by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for the setting up of a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Commons to study the constitution and amend it slightly if need be.

Under the circumstances, we support the appointment of that committee which will enable us, first of all, to update our constitution, which is over 100 years old with a view to improving it and repatriating it, patching it up or renewing it if necessary. Indeed, that agreement has too often been bandied around by federal administrations which could not see beyond their centralist limits.

Today, when he came to the house, the Prime Minister did not agree with the constitutional review. He finally reconsidered his decision, and I congratulate him on it, and

allowed the creation of the present committee to study our constitution.

This review will be most fruitful at the coming federal-provincial conferences. I am convinced that it will depoliticize the conferences and encourage various groups, and even some responsible individuals, to give up their personal concepts and adapt themselves to the aspirations of the majority. Finally, it will enable us, members of this House, as well as all other responsible people at the provincial level, to hear opinions other than those of our respective governments and, for once, to have views from Canada as a whole.

One must not be afraid to face reality squarely, to find out why some provinces interpret the constitution differently. For instance, why should I, as a Quebecer, fight for ideas which some of my colleagues do not share?

To review briefly the history of the constitution, Mr. Speaker, allow me to go back to 1867, the year it was born. In 1867, Canada comprised Upper and Lower Canada. The constitution was drawn up merely in an attempt to do justice, on the one hand, to Lower Canada which was mostly made up of French Canadians settled on an area larger than present-day Quebec and, on the other hand, to Upper Canada, which territory was mostly occupied by English-speaking people.

When I hear the Prime Minister say that Quebec may not claim any more than the other provinces, I simply do not agree. Had Quebec, as a province, not been different from the others, the present constitution would have been entirely different; it might even never have existed.

History teaches us that our constitution owes its origin to the existence of Quebec. In fact, without the French Canadians in Lower Canada this country today would be administered by a single government, and there would be no need for Confederation.

Under that agreement, the provinces concerned agreed to form a central government, whereas up to then, every one of them had managed to administer itself. It must be kept in mind that the federal government owes its power to the provinces.

The numerous quarrels we have had for so many years are due to the fact that federal governments believed they had founded the provinces. We will achieve Canadian unity only if those provinces remain strong, with free government that respect the union, and only if the central government respects that agreement in order to facilitate its negotiations with each of the provinces and to be able to take more effective action in areas of national interest.

I said at the outset that the Prime Minister first opposed a review of the constitution, contending that the present one was adequate to enable the Canadian people to live in harmony. I do not disapprove altogether of his idea because regardless of the snags it ran into, our constitution adequately safeguards the rights of the provinces.

Of course, the central government is highly responsible for those snags which could have probably been avoided had it co-operated more with the provinces instead of always trying to play cat and mouse with them.

In the field of taxation, what has been done? The provincial fields of jurisdiction were first encroached upon and if this continues, some day they will be taken over by the federal government at the individual, municipality and school board levels.

• (5:30 p.m.)

We oppose precisely this evolution, we of the province of Quebec, just as the citizens of other provinces should oppose it. In view of the feelings in some provinces, they remain indifferent because they profit by this attitude, while we, in the province of Quebec, have to fight against this new invasion of our provincial rights. Besides, as was mentioned by the previous speaker, as long as it is not understood that Quebec has requirements that are different from those of other provinces, we shall say that Quebec cannot give up in order to administer and to do justice to its people. We shall hold on until the end in order to stop this process.

During the study in committee, we will have surprises. Some Quebecers will come and testify impartially without indulging in politics or sentimentality, to speak frankly, like Canadians. I know that several other provinces, as mentioned by the previous speaker, are ready to recognize that Quebec has certainly got something that other provinces have not. This must be well understood.

The constitution was made because of Quebec. Quebec has its Civil Code and the other provinces their common law. It is not the same thing at all.

I could enumerate many other things. We are not like the others in Canada but this does not prevent us from being good and perfect Canadians. However—

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Will the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Gauthier: Certainly.

Mr. Trudeau: Does the hon. member assume that the members elected in Quebec are unable to represent and speak for this province in the same way as the members elected in other provinces speak on behalf of those provinces?

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the question put by the Prime Minister. It is indeed possible to represent the interests of one's province and I am here to do so. I sought election in order, to better defend the interests of my province, but in an orderly way.

People come and say that Quebec cannot manage its own administration. We are confronted with a problem: it has to be solved. Taxing powers are not evenly distributed. The federal government is boasting of surpluses and the provinces are registering deficits. The balance should be restored and this, in my opinion, should be done at the committee level. Why is the balance upset? It is because of the intrusions of the federal government in the fields coming under provincial jurisdiction.

There have been all sorts of reasons given for that. War, for instance. War was given as an excuse for encroaching upon three provincial fields of taxation: real estate tax, personal and corporation income tax and estate tax. The federal government maintained that these steps were unavoidable.

It was but an excuse, for the problems were solved through some other means. It was just an excuse to trespass on the provincial jurisdictions in order to get hold of the money in Quebec.

They promised, however, to return it as soon as the war would be over. The war has been over for a long time now but the money has still not been wholly returned. It is taking a long time and meanwhile the federal government goes on collecting money in the provinces. That is how the provinces have been deprived of their three main sources of income.

What can the provinces do in the meantime? They lack money. They also have a right to develop, as pointed out by the Prime Minister and other members. The provinces must keep pace with progress, and for that purpose, they need money which they do not have. The power to accumulate capital for administration purposes was taken away from them and they could not get it back, in spite of promises to that effect.

That is not what the provinces need, and especially Quebec. Quebec should be allowed—and it has this right—to raise the money it needs to survive, instead of getting it from a third party.

There lies the greatest cause of injustice. Today, the same system is still being implemented. Full powers of taxation are enjoyed and all the money required is sought in the provinces.

It is wished to establish an industrial development committee. I am very happy about it. Under the circumstances, we cannot have the whole loaf, only crumbs. The establishment of this committee will enable the federal government to give something to provinces. Therefore, the provinces will obtain money tc promote education and to give assistance to the municipalities, the school boards and ever to individuals.

However, if you consider the whole issue closely, you find it is a dangerous infringement on the part of the federal government in fields coming under provincial jurisdiction.

Why? Because the federal government has all the necessary authority to lay hands on the money earned by the workers in the various provinces and to distribute it like a good father. This is not what the provinces want. They no longer want a federal government which interferes in the fields of provincial jurisdiction.

The committee should recommend that the federal government let the provinces have exclusive jurisdiction in matters coming under their competence, while granting them the rights corresponding to their duties. Are not, health, road safety and education within the competence of the provinces?

Let us give the provinces the means to raise the money required to administer, for instance, the areas connected with health or education in the province of Quebec. Then there will be peace and the province of Quebec will have the money required to cope with the situation in the areas of education or health. Thus the province of Quebec would not always have to beg the central government in order to obtain what the latter has hypocritically stolen from that province.

It was a hypocritical agreement that was entered into during the last war. The province of Quebec had been promised that its powers of taxation would be handed over right after the war. That was a piece of hypocrisy.

Today, the money required to administer the province of Quebec is still taken away from the workers. Some seem astonished—in a hypocritical way—that the Quebec government is clamouring for its revenues. What a joke!

• (5:40 p.m.)

First you take away a man's clothes, throw him naked on the street, then have the police arrest him because he has nothing on. Such is the situation of the province of Quebec, to whom they say: you need our help because you cannot administer some of your departments. But what do they do? They simply hand over to the province the money which already belongs to it. The committee should finally be able to understand the situation.

I went out West, and I met honest people there. I had talks with them and I believe life would be more worthwhile if rights were respected.

Mr. Speaker, is it conceivable that the municipality should tell the father, the wage-earner: "Turn your salary over to me and I will give you as much as I please. You will eat what I choose."?

Yet that is what is taking place between the federal government and the provinces. Little wonder that Quebec is in a turmoil, and we have not seen anything yet. If the federal government does not put a stop to this thrust, I cannot answer for anything in Quebec, a province well known to me because I travel through it all year long. And let nobody think that only a small minority of 3 or 4 per cent is involved.

The unrest brought about by all this disunion today is due to the hypocritical interference of the federal government in Quebec. Having been stripped, the citizen is covered with a piece of cloth and told: "You're lucky! I am honest and generous since I cover you with a cloth". That is not what Quebec wants. It simply wants to recover its taxation rights, in order to give its people what they need in the fields coming under its jurisdiction.

I do not know if this is clear enough and if I can be understood today by most members. I am so anxious that this review prove useful. I hope my words can convince some sincere members from the other provinces. I do not think any member would purposely do wrong. If he does, it would be because he is misinformed.

The problem has never been put properly. We have had to learn false histories of Canada and now we are being told false economic stories. As I said at the outset, we must face the facts if we want to do constructive work in committee. If we Canadians want to get along with each other and cooperate. I am sure we shall have made a first step towards Canadian unity.

The policy of the federal government in the western provinces has been clearly explained, and the citizens have understood. We do not wish to take anything away from anybody, but we want at least to be allowed to keep what we have to live, like all other Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, had I known that I was going to speak today, I would have prepared my speech and would have been able to make a clearer presentation. I may however have that opportunity if I am appointed to the committee, although I am already sitting on some others.

I am confident that the members of the committee will get to the grass-roots and will discuss the matter without bias. If, for once, this is done within the committee whose sole aim would be to ensure Canadian unity, then the committee will be doing a good job.

It is essential that this review be made democratically and that the witnesses, wherever they come from, be heard with an open mind. The report of the committee should be submitted to the provinces, so that they may be in a position to discuss the future of the country without forgetting that the main point to be considered is national unity.

Mr. Speaker, I would have liked my intervention this afternoon to be better prepared, but we do not control the circumstances. I hope that my comments will lead hon. members towards this unity we are all hoping for. Let us co-operate to reach that common goal and everyone of us should apply his intelligence and his goodwill to that task.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. Is the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson) rising to ask a question?

Mr. Thomson: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) would permit a question. In transferring taxing powers to the federal government, in the opinion of the hon. member did the province of Quebec lose more than any other province of Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can answer the hon. member who wanted to know whether Quebec had endured greater losses than another province in the adventure of Confederation. Even if I tried to do so, I would not have all the statistics. I told the House about the principle of taxation. Those who work want only one thing: to get their pay directly at the end of the week and not through a third party.

Provincial governments have responsibilities to which correspond the right of access to three taxation fields which hopefully will be given back to the province of Quebec, provided it is willing to deal with them. It must be recognized once and for all that Quebec has that right.

[*English*]

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, when this motion was put on the Order Paper I had high hopes that the debate would be a departure from the federal-provincial discussions on the constitution. I hoped that, perhaps by co-operation among members of the House, we might be able to break the deadlock that has taken place in federal-provincial conferences and reach a consensus as members of different parties. I hoped this would be done in a non-partisan way. I still hope we can do this and that we can make a real contribution in this respect.

However, this afternoon I was a bit disappointed, and that is why I just said that I hoped all these things would be done. When the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) rose to speak, he also said he would be non-partisan, then immediately made derogatory remarks about the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and questioned the order in which the agendas had been drawn up. He wanted to know why the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had not dealt first with the problems of the cities instead of with welfare. I found all this a little picayune. I suppose if we had started with the cities, we would have been accused of not starting with welfare. The fact is that from the very beginning the Government of Canada under the former Prime Minister set out a program of action for these federal-provincial conferences.

• (5:50 p.m.)

All the proposals of the government have been set out quite clearly in the constitutional booklets. The first booklet dealt in a general way with the proposals for constitutional reform and the sociological and political implications that were necessary for making the changes. The next booklet dealt with the charter of human rights. Other booklets are entitled, "The Constitution and the People of Canada", "The Federal-Provincial Spending Power", "The Taxing Powers of the Constitution" and "Federalism and International Relations". We then went into the division of powers. The first matter dealt with in the division of powers was welfare and income maintenance.

I hope the parliamentary committee, comprised of members of all parties, will co-operate in developing a consensus on the Canadian Constitution and will break the deadlock that has taken place in the federal-provincial meetings. I agree this committee may be able to do things that the federal-provincial conference has not been able to do, because we have not only representatives of the four parties in the House but representatives of the different regions in Canada in a way the government does not. The Conservatives have strong representation from the Maritimes and the Prairies. The Creditistes have strong representation from rural Quebec. The New Democratic Party has representation from the Prairies as well as some of the cities. I am optimistic; I think we can work to accomplish something that will bring about a constitution befitting this great country of ours.

In addition to the usual witnesses from the intermediary bodies, trade unions, the CMA and other groups that have been mentioned, I hope we will meet members of the legislative assemblies of the provinces, not only government members but opposition members. I agree with the Leader of the Opposition that we should meet representatives of the cities either through citizens' associations or the city councils. A committee of this House did hear the chairman of the executive committee of the city of Montreal when we were dealing with the Company of Young Canadians.

I think it would be well for us to hear the representations of the cities in this matter. I believe now is a good time for us to take this initiative. We cannot be dogmatic in this regard. Perhaps it should have been done before, or maybe it should be done later. In any case, we are doing it now and this is a good time because frustration is building up among some Canadians because of the lack of progress resulting from the constitutional conference. It appears to them the conference is not resolving anything.

As the Prime Minister pointed out, the provinces which started this process to a great extent have not put forward their proposals in the same precise manner as the Government of Canada. An exception to this is the province of Quebec, which had an all-party committee of its legislative assembly. The province of Quebec put forward specific proposals, but the other provinces have not been so specific. They have discussed the proposals but have not replied specifically to them. Some provinces have from time to time tried to act as broker between the federal government and the government of Quebec, but they have not spoken in specific terms in the same way as the federal government in its seven constitutional papers which have been very specific on the points put forward for discussion today.

Many people, in their frustration, are beginning to say they have had enough of this constitutional discussion and we should get down to discussing some of the problems of Canada which have a higher priority, such as pollution, inflation and the problems of the cities. When dealing with problems such as those I have just mentioned, we must not forget that they are very much related to the constitution. Very often we cannot act in the way we would like to act, because of the constitution. This is natural. The constitution was drafted 100 years ago at a time when technology had not developed to the extent it has today. These problems have grown up around a new technology and new type of society. The legislative categories in the constitution are just not adequate.

We have been successful in doing some of these things through co-operative federalism. This process of co-operative federalism originated in the United States and we have used it for the last ten years. Problems do not fit easily into categories of legislation. No matter how perfect a constitution, if we are to do a good job it is obvious that all levels of government must co-operate and use their different areas of jurisdiction to deal adequately with problems.

Unfortunately, the division of power under our constitution is in many respects out of date. This matter is under review to help us deal with problems more expeditiously and with greater vigour. I do not think it can be said that we have not acted in areas where we have jurisdiction, nor that we have not taken initiatives where the jurisdiction is not clear. An example of that is the Water Act. One might argue that the jurisdiction in this area is not clear, yet the federal government, following the Resources for Tomorrow Conference, took the initiative and tried to do something about a very real problem. No matter how perfectly we set up these divisions of power and categories for legislative competence, we will still need a spirit of co-operation, a creative federalism, if we are to have a smoothly-run country.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, immediately before supper I was discussing the division of power under the present constitution and I said that the powers which the federal government and the provincial governments now exercise are not adequate to meet the technical and social realities of 1970.

It seems to me that under the present constitution legislative powers are too inflexible and too exclusive. In my view it would be better if we made greater use of concurrent powers such as those now used in respect of agriculture, immigration and pensions. These powers belong to both levels of government, though should conflict arise the right of paramountcy is given to one of the jurisdictions. In other words, both governments are free to legislate, but if there is conflict the constitution states which jurisdiction has paramountcy.

A solution along these lines was put forward in the recent white paper on the constitution, dealing specifically with income maintenance. I believe that an arrangement of this kind would result in a more flexible and functional constitution. I also believe that in certain cases we should consider favourably a proposition giving one level of government the right to delegate its powers under the constitution to another level of government.

Several problems have arisen in recent years directly related to the constitutional situation. One of them has to do with conditions in our cities. Some people have criticized the federal government on the grounds that it is not concerned with the cities; that it has done nothing to legislate for them. Such statements are inaccurate. We have passed a good deal of legislation which affects the cities—measures dealing with transportation, housing, health and welfare, labour, manpower, and so on. This legislation has had a great impact on the cities. The fact is there is no

comprehensive power vested in the federal government under the present constitution which permits the federal government to legislate directly for the cities. The comprehensive powers under section 92 of the BNA Act belong to the provinces.

If we were to legislate unilaterally in a comprehensive way, we would be violating the present constitution and, moreover, doing so at the very time we are trying to negotiate a new constitution with a new division of powers. Were we to take such a course, our proposals at these constitutional conferences would simply not be credible. We cannot legislate unilaterally in areas which belong to the provinces, while supporting an entirely different principle at constitutional conferences. Again, such a course might be taken as a licence to the provinces to intervene in areas which are specifically federal.

This leads us to the field of external affairs. Some provinces have been seeking to conclude agreements with other countries with regard to matters over which they say they have jurisdiction. Nevertheless, as has been well set out in the white paper dealing with international relations as they concern the constitution, if this were permitted, unfortunate consequences might follow. For example, Canada might be following a general foreign policy with respect to, say, Rhodesia or South Africa which included a boycott. At the same time, a province might decide to carry on a teacher-exchange program or an apprentice training program in co-operation with the country concerned, stating that such arrangements fall within the jurisdiction of its department of education or department of labour.

It is evident that the federal government cannot permit arrangements of this kind. Even in areas of provincial jurisdiction, relations outside Canada must be carried on under the umbrella of the federal government. It seems this question is coming to the fore once again: over the weekend it appears there has been a breakdown of the entente between Ottawa and Quebec with respect to this sphere of responsibility. I think the federal government will have to adopt a much tougher attitude in respect of intrusions by the provinces into this area of jurisdiction. Certain sanctions will have to be imposed.

The federal government will have to put its foot down if Quebec or any other province continues to intervene in external affairs. I would go so far as to say we should revoke the Canadian passports of individuals who blatantly disregard federal jurisdiction in this field. We should refuse visas to officials of foreign countries who wish to come to Canada under arrangements of which the federal government does not approve. If necessary, we should sever diplomatic relations with the countries concerned. In fact, it will probably not be necessary to do these things but we should let it be known that this is the type of sanction which the federal government has power to exercise. Let us make it clear that while we intend to respect provincial areas of jurisdiction, we do not intend to allow them to intrude into federal fields; we shall try to negotiate these matters with the provinces, but if they insist on intruding into federal fields of jurisdiction, sanctions will be brought to bear.

There are other items I should like to discuss, one of which was referred to by a speaker from the New Democratic Party. He mentioned the frustration expressed by the Premier of Manitoba at the close of the last federal-provincial conference. The premier stated in an interview that Quebec had a special set of problems which called for special arrangements. When asked whether it needed a special status, Premier Schreyer replied, "Those are not my words. I said 'special arrangements' ". Well, some have stated there have always been special arrangements for Quebec and for other provinces, too. That is true, Mr. Speaker, but these special arrangements have not been in the area of legislative powers.

• (8:10 p.m.)

In Quebec we have the Civil Code; we have special arrangements with respect to French education and English education. There has always been the right of using the two languages in the legislature. There have been other special arrangements which apply to the province of Quebec, but there have been no special legislative powers which Quebec has and which, for other provinces, belong to the federal government.

It is all right to suggest special arrangements, but I do not think we can expect that one province will have the power to legislate in certain areas that, for other provinces, come under the jurisdiction of the federal government. If we do that, as has been suggested many times by the Prime Minister we may end up with a situation where a great many members of this House will not have the same power as other members who sit here. Special arrangements, yes—and let us

be specific about those special arrangements—but special powers, no.

There has been quite a bit of discussion with respect to the proposed charter of human rights, and as an English-speaking person from the province of Quebec I see a great need for this particular item, especially because of what happened in St. Leonard and what might happen in other parts of Quebec. I think we must be certain that our civil liberties are protected in a way which cannot be derogated from or taken away by the federal government, provincial governments, municipal governments or school boards. I believe that they should be protected in the constitution through a Bill of Rights or in some other way which would require special legislative power to effect their change.

I do not accept the argument of those who say these rights are protected by the courts. They have not been protected by the courts. If we had such a charter of civil liberties, the people of St. Leonard would not have had their right to education or language taken away from them, and many years ago the people of Manitoba might not have had their right to education in French taken away from them.

With respect to the proposals relating to a special or revised Supreme Court of Canada, I believe it is extremely important that we have one section of the Supreme Court to deal with civil law cases coming from the province of Quebec, and that civil law cases are not decided by judges trained in the common law. Having practised in that area of law for many years, I can understand how a court dominated by common law judges can often twist the civil law or put an interpretation on it which a civil law judge would not.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is one area that has not been discussed and which we must consider for constitutional change, and that is the House of Commons itself. Last year we made a lot of changes with respect to rules of the House, but in my view there are many other problems which will have to be dealt with in a constitutional way.

We talk about whether this Parliament and the House of Commons are really relevant to the demands of the day. In many ways I do not think the House is relevant to those demands. I think the only way we can make it relevant is to change its constitutionality. Mr. Speaker, some of these suggestions have already been put forward. I do not think they suggest we are going to the republican system, but they borrow some things from that system. For example, I feel we should have a set period for a Parliament, a four-year period or a five-year period. The government would continue in office during that period whether or not its legislation was defeated.

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

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, in 20 minutes there is not too much that can be said about the constitution but I would make some statements which may be of some use at this time. Following the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), I have just one or two comments to make about his speech. He said something about changing the House of Commons constitutionally. I, of course, would point out that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is trying to change it constitutionally.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: He is doing his best to sterilize it at the present time. The hon. member also said something about concurrent powers, and he particularly mentioned agriculture. As I look opposite and see the amiable and distinguished Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), I think that while he is operating only under concurrent powers he has made such a mess of trying to do things for the people of western Canada that he could not do any worse even if he had full power. Therefore, I do not see that concurrent power would really be of any assistance.

I am very interested in this motion, Mr. Speaker, because about five years ago I put on the Order Paper a private member's notice of motion along very much the same lines. I went a little further with mine. I think that one or two years later the motion was put on behalf of this party. I was fortunate in the draw, and we had quite an interesting debate on this issue. This was in 1965 or 1966.

I proposed the establishment of a committee of this kind because I believed then, as I more strongly believe now, that only through a mechanism of this kind can we bring before the people of Canada, in a simplified way, the extremely important issues which are involved.

I was rather amused by the Prime Minister, who said everything had been very carefully planned. The right hon. gentleman indicated

that all the steps were taken one by one, all according to a deep-laid plan, and that everything was coming out just as he had anticipated. I cannot accept that for a moment.

The Prime Minister was engaging in playing a nice little game. He had his constitutional experts locked up in one little room and his economic experts locked up in another little room, and he was running from one room to the other having a great time. Suddenly the Prime Minister of Ontario called the Conference for Tomorrow, and from then on the federal government and the Prime Minister were kicked into this issue and were compelled to take steps which I do not think they had the slightest intention of taking. I do not think there was the careful preparation to which the right hon. gentleman referred. I think that is so much hogwash, Mr. Speaker—certainly the results would so indicate.

With respect to the terms of reference, this is a rather peculiarly worded motion. I hope that once the committee is functioning there will be no attempt to prevent its canvassing fully all the problems and all the suggested alternatives of our constitutional difficulties. I will take one minute to enlarge on this theme.

I have read the motion. It refers to the conference of February, 1968. At that time, Mr. Speaker, there was a series of subjects laid out for the continuing consideration of the constitutional conference. These subjects covered the waterfront. From that time until now this government has put forward a number of proposals, some of which I agree with and some of which I do not, dealing in one way or another with all the questions which were first outlined in the agenda and in the report made in February, 1968.

I would take it from that—and I did not understand the right hon. gentleman to indicate anything to the contrary—that when the committee is given jurisdiction in this matter after the motion has been passed, there will be no attempt to inhibit the committee from the fullest and most complete discussions.

I have said something about the various conferences which have taken place. There is no question about it—my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has made this quite plain—that there has been a complete failure so far as the conferences are concerned. I think this was almost inevitable because of the way in which they were developed. All we have had is a confrontation among adversaries, among 11 governments all seeking to hold the power they have within their respective establishments, and if possible to add to that power. I do not fault them on that score; I think it is perfectly natural and what one might expect of the type of conference and discussion that has taken place. But this is not good enough. We shall not get anywhere if we continue this type of meeting.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Conferences must be held, of course, to capitalize on and consolidate the gains which are made in other ways. However, to the extent to which we hoped in the past that a series of constitutional conferences of heads of government would produce workable changes and reforms in our constitution, we might just as well realize that this will never take place in that way.

Mr. Olson: What do you suggest?

Mr. Baldwin: If the minister will wait a while, he will hear some excellent suggestions, although on the basis of our experience with agriculture I do not know that he will listen to them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude my remarks before my time expires. I should like to see this committee take a view that is as non-controversial and objective as possible. I do not expect that politics will not be involved. Of course they will, and that is to be expected, but I hope the hon. members who comprise that committee will approach the subject matter in a frame of mind which will be more conducive to light than to heat.

I should like to see the committee composed of members of this House and members of the other place who will travel from place to place in Canada. I do not expect we will have a repetition of the famous confederation parade which took place in 1964 and 1965, but I think we can absorb something from that. After all, this is not a means by which we are going to settle conflicts between governments immediately.

The more than 21 million people in Canada are now engaged in the process of looking at the world they live in and should be coming to a decision on how they want to rearrange the powers of government at the various levels. In the first place, it must be abundantly clear that these are simple issues. The constitution as discussed by lawyers may become quite complex, quite difficult and very learned; but there are a number of simple

issues which must be put to the people of Canada.

Do they desire, for example, to continue the same kinds of government in the questions involving transportation, education, trade and commerce, and so on and the new problems that have arrived on the scene regarding pollution, our cost of living and inflation? I suggest these problems will continue to be with us for many years. We must consider the problems of our Indian people. They are demanding rights which have been taken away from them. We also have problems in respect of the urban situation. As one hon. member said, 70 per cent of the people of Canada living in urban areas are seeking houses, solutions to the problem of juvenile delinquency, urban reclamation, and so on.

These are problems which have emerged. The people of Canada want to know where the jurisdiction lies and what is to be done about them. I think it is as simple as that. I hope this committee will be able to reduce these problems to simple terms. I suggest to the news media, the press, television and radio people that this will provide a magnificent opportunity for them. We will shortly be dealing with the whole issue of television and radio coverage in this chamber, in committees of the House and places in this building where the electronics media may have access to members for clarification. I hope they will be allowed to play a very important and significant role in reducing these problems to the most simple terms possible for placing before the people.

The committee will be the master of its own destiny. It will indicate what procedures it wishes to follow. I suggest that the committee give serious thought to not only permitting but encouraging radio and television production of its proceedings, so there will be available to the people of Canada an explanation of what is going on and what are the issues. In that way we will do what I think is essential. We will fulfil a condition precedent to the settling of these problems by letting the people "in" on a great national debate. In this way all the people of Canada who are interested will be able to see what issues are at stake and express their points of view. I think only in that way will we arrive at solutions.

Whether the people live in Quebec, Ontario, Peace River, Vancouver or Victoria, they are all Canadians. When the people see what is involved and how these issues have been reduced to simple terms, they will in due course exert pressure on the respective governments to bring about answers to problems. Not too much time will elapse before that situation comes about. They will not seek the answers of the Government of Canada or the answers of the governments of Saskatchewan, Newfoundland or Quebec; they will seek the answers that they want. I suggest to the members of the committee that will be formed that this is one way in which these questions can be brought home, simply and easily, to the people of Canada in order that they may have a chance to participate. This chance has been denied them up to the present.

Let me take just a minute to deal with some of these questions. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) quite properly chastised the Prime Minister because, as he said, he was hung up on the constitution and many of the problems I have mentioned. The federal government has ample authority under the constitution to deal adequately with the serious problem of pollution. What will happen if we accept the government's position on this question? We may wait two or three years before the government comes to a conclusion, if it ever does, as to what authority it has. Only then will we consider legislation. Consider at the weak, pitiful water bill we have been debating: even the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene), with his usual eloquence, was hard put to it to promote a suitable defence to the criticisms from this side of the House.

The government has jurisdiction under the Navigable Waters Protection Act which prohibits the pollution of water. It has jurisdiction under the Fisheries Act, which contains similar provisions, the Shipping Act and the Migratory Birds Convention Act. These four pieces of legislation, enacted by the federal Parliament, contain definite and categorical sanctions against the pollution of water. We are compelled to put up with this monstrosity conceived by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and his colleagues.

The same thing applies to urban matters. There was a Supreme Court decision not long ago to the effect that rapid transit arrangements in large metropolitan areas are the subject of federal jurisdiction. This is true in respect of housing, and so on. For years the federal government has been involved, with no suggestion that it has been usurping a jurisdiction which belongs to the provinces. It

has been involved in these programs. There are such problems as juvenile delinquency, urban renewal and other measures related to the cities. The federal government has a very substantial measure of jurisdiction today. I am not suggesting, in breach of certain obvious rights which exist in the provincial governments, that this federal government or any federal government should rush in hamhanded and deal without consultation and co-operation with these questions. However, there is jurisdiction which can be exercised. I suggest that the right hon. gentleman, the Minister of Agriculture and their colleagues have been using the constitution as a smokescreen. They have been afraid.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: There are a number of areas in which the federal government has jurisdiction to act and in which it could have acted. I do not suggest it should do so without adequate consultation. At the same time, this does not mean there are not a great many areas in which the provincial governments must not only retain but to some extent change or even increase their jurisdiction.

A federal entity comes about because by reason of geography, economy, culture, race, and so on. There are natural divisions which should retain their particular identity. There is nothing wrong with that. I think all people who speak about Canada say it is a great country because it is unique in its diversity. Why should there not be diversification in so far as the provinces are concerned? British Columbia, sheltered behind the Rocky Mountains, is quite different from Alberta. Alberta and Saskatchewan, both carved out of the same rib at the same time, went different ways after a period in which their history was approximately the same. One had a government under the premiership of my hon. friend from Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) and the other had a Social Credit government. Both were as different, ideologically, as can be, but were created at the same time.

That there should be diversity is a fact. Some of us who have been involved in municipal government know that under a common municipal act there may be 20 municipalities, each operating under the same legislation but which because of the people involved and because of certain divergent and distinctive characteristics are different kinds of municipalities. I think I would be going contrary to the views of the political party to which I have the honour to belong if I did not say I believe in diversity individually and with regard to provincial governments, and that there should be every opportunity to continue to develop the peculiar distinctions between the different provinces of this country.

I see my time is running out, and there is so much more I should like to say. However, there is one other important item with which I shall deal. The federal government now has an opportunity to seek some redress in these constitutional problems. The Supreme Court has handed down decisions which would seem to take away some of the jurisdiction which might have belonged to provincial governments or the federal government from time to time. It may well be, in light of existing conditions, that these decisions should be different.

A recent case in the Supreme Court of Canada, *Regina v. Binus,* laid down, not as obiter dicta but as part of the judgment, that the principle of *stare decisis* did not apply. In other words, the Supreme Court of Canada can hand down a decision in constitutional cases different from that which it has handed down in the past. Over the last six or eight years it seems to me the federal government should have been reviewing some of these constitutional cases in collaboration with the provinces. Constitutional history has set governments on paths different from those intended by the Fathers of Confederation.

I see, Mr. Speaker, that you are growing impatient so I shall await another opportunity to make the few more comments I wanted to make.

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think one of the most striking features that emerges in any debate on our constitution is the difference between what the constitution actually is in practice and what the people of this country believe it should provide for and what it should be. When I look over a range of national problems, I see the vast divergence between the constitution as it is and what the ordinary person in this country thinks it should be.

At this time of inflation, the average Canadian thinks the federal government should have power, if it wishes to exercise it, to control rents, prices and the cost of living. We know it does not have that power. The average Canadian thinks the federal govern-

ment should have greater involvement in housing and in the control of policies concerning urban planning, major labour disputes and agricultural prices.

The average Canadian increasingly in this day and age believes the federal government should have a good deal more to say about foreign intrusion into our economy. Although I do not like to disturb any sacred cows, the average Canadian of my acquaintance also believes there is and should be some federal responsibility in the field of education. I am sure I am not the only person who has constituents who moved across the length and breadth of Canada and found, each time they moved, that their children lose time in school and some became discouraged to the point that they dropped out of school altogether.

One of the serious problems we face in this country—it is not a technical or legal problem but a serious, practical one—is the difference between what our constitution in fact is and what the ordinary person thinks it should be and wishes it were. The average person is confused by the lack of connection between his idea of who should govern the country and what actually happens. He wonders why the governments of this country are paralyzed in respect of major decisions.

The average person says, and with truth, that the present system lends itself to buck-passing, to the ducking of responsibility and to a patent inability to deal quickly with major problems. I say to all of us in this honourable House that these are things we cannot ignore. They are problems which exist and with which we must be prepared to deal. We cannot deal with them in the traditional way, whereby the provinces blame the federal government for what is wrong, or vice versa, and one party lists a great number of things it thinks another party should be doing or talking about.

When we say we have a constitutional problem, believe me we should mean it, because we have. We should be prepared, together in this Parliament and indeed with all our fellow legislators across the country, to bring about some kind of solution. The confusion about the meaning of our constitution would seem to be the best possible reason for the type of public inquiry which is now envisaged by this resolution. One thing this inquiry might do, as my hon. friend just suggested, is bring the issues out in the open. It will have an educational function.

I hope, however, no one is under the illusion that it is only the public which must be educated. It seems to me that the people who require education the most are those who represent us collectively in these dominion-provincial discussions of our constitution and other matters of joint concern. We have 11 governments, one federal and ten provincial, which meet to discuss a great variety of issues. I am sure I am not the only person who believes that perhaps they should listen more to the public and less to themselves in some of these discussions.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Who speaks for whom at these conferences? If, for example, the federal government and the province of Ontario were in conflict, which of the two would represent my constituents? Is it true that they would be represented in this conflict, if it existed, by the province of Ontario? Not always. Certainly the problem which has emerged is that the various governments, whose position is established by law, translate it into the belief that they speak for the people where any of their interests are concerned. I say that this is not so, and what we should attempt to do in the work of this committee first and foremost, is find out what the public really think about their constitution. Surely you can make them more interested by the use of television and by all the other modern means of communication.

I think that this committee would fail in its duty if it did not go out actively to try to find out what the public think. This cannot be done by the kind of formal presentation where one interest group or another comes before the committee in a small room. Why do we not use imaginatively and definitively the means which we now have at our disposal? Let us have polls taken and surveys conducted in an attempt to ascertain the attitude of the people about their constitution and about the authority which they feel should have the main and the leading role to play in the various matters of contention between the federal government and provincial governments.

The present discussions, as many speakers have indicated, have been going on now for a period of two years, and obviously they have not taken the course that some people thought they would. My friend, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), referred today to the fact that sometimes they are like public auctions. But he knows better than I do that these discussions have less of that quality than any previous discussions among

the federal government and provincial governments.

I am sure that some provinces came to these discussions with the belief that all they had to do was to state their terms and more money and authority would be given to them. But for once we have an honest discussion of the problems of our constitution where something is asked for by the provinces and equally something is asked for by the federal government.

There is a great need in this country to expand the federal power in many important areas of our life. I think that what has been surprising in these constitutional discussions is that they have not been what my friend referred to as a sort of public auction of the tax rights or authority of the federal government. Rather, they have turned into an honest discussion of how we can functionally rearrange our constitution to make it a more fitting instrument in this twentieth century. The discussions have been far-ranging, from a proposal to entrench a Bill of Rights, to the recreation of the Supreme Court, to treaties, and the old subject of the distribution of power between the federal government and provincial governments.

The reception that has been accorded the federal proposals is one which we should have expected. There have been a variety of responses. Some provinces like some proposals and dislike others; some political parties like some proposals and dislike others. Some people say, as has been said today, that there should be a really dramatic declaration by the federal government in these discussions, and they follow that by saying, "But we must not have a confrontation". We should not be afraid of a constitutional discussion and we should not be afraid of controversy that might develop at those constitutional discussions because they affect the future of all of us and of our country.

I would like to make one or two specific comments about the work of this committee. The first comment is one which at least the members of my profession in this House will understand. It is that it is completely beyond the range of possibility to develop a perfect constitution. Even if tonight it were possible for us in this chamber to write down in black and white, indeed in letters of gold, a constitution which would solve all the problems of this country, we know that tomorrow something would crop up somewhere which would make that constitution out of date.

The codifiers, from Justinian to Napoleon, have found out to their sorrow that one cannot legislate perfection in the law or in constitutions. Therefore, we must recognize that any constitution worthy of its name must be one which is capable of sound application by the various levels of government and of sound interpretation by the courts.

I would like to speak for a few minutes about the application of the constitution. If I may adopt a colloquialism I would say, "Don't knock the BNA Act," because it has survived 100 pretty strenuous years. Notwithstanding all the difficulties which may have arisen in applying it, the collective good sense of the Canadian people has always prevailed in difficult situations. We have emerged from the little, rural type of country which we were 100 years ago into a great, burgeoning industrial nation—and we have the same written constitution as we had then. Any constitution, whether it was written in 1867 or is written today, must be one that can be applied in the same way to developing circumstances and to new conditions.

One of the great things that has happened in recent years has been the systemization of federal-provincial relations. The criticism which has been levelled at all these federal-provincial meetings, which have been so important in the recent history of our country, is that they were held in secret. That criticism can be met, or at least blunted, by the appointment of this type of committee which will throw this process open to the public view and which, I hope, will encourage all the participating governments to express their opinions openly.

In speaking about the application of our constitution to the problems of our day, I am bold enough to make one suggestion: what one might call the major, sweeping problems facing this country can never be made the subject of the sole jurisdiction of either the provinces or the federal government. At the present time, as I have said, matters such as housing, welfare, pollution, economic growth and the like are primarily subjects under provincial jurisdiction, but really they are under the joint jurisdiction of the federal government and provincial governments.

• (8:50 p.m.)

No matter how the constitution might be rewritten, it is my opinion that major problems of this kind will continue to be jointly under federal and provincial jurisdiction. Therefore, we must be prepared to carry on,

as we have in the last few years, in a joint approach of the federal government and provincial governments toward the application of our constitution to the major problems of Canada.

My hon. friend from Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), at the conclusion of his remarks spoke about the interpretation of the constitution and about the new doctrine expounded by the Supreme Court of Canada, that it is not bound by its previous decisions in every instance. In my opinion we have not used our constitution in the same dynamic, testing sense as the Americans. I think that a modern federal constitution requires to be tested in the fire; it requires to be continually used, to be expounded and used as a probe to determine where and by whom jurisdiction in new areas can be exercised. We have not done this, neither the provinces nor the federal government, to anything like the extent of the United States.

I think that in the future, no matter what has been done with the constitution, we will find it necessary to subject it more frequently to judicial interpretation. This will emphasize the role of the Supreme Court of Canada. To me this also signifies that one of the most important areas for consideration in amending the constitution is the proposal which has been made for the reconstitution of the Supreme Court on lines which will make it more acceptable to the provinces of Canada.

Mr. Horner: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question, Mr. Speaker. We are arriving at a decade which suggests that the individual should be more important than all other things which may concern his administration. The hon. member is suggesting that the whole administration of the individual should lie within the realm of the Supreme Court of Canada. I ask for clarification on that point. Is he really suggesting that the jurisdiction of the freedom of the individual should rest solely with the Supreme Court of Canada, rather than under Parliament and the freedoms which Parliament should grant in a democracy?

Mr. Blair: Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that that is a question. I was speaking about the interpretation of the constitution in terms of assessing the distribution of power as between the federal government and provincial governments. I was not addressing my remarks to the other, equally important question of the protection of human rights. I have not time to deal with that matter but I can say, very briefly, that it is important and long overdue that we entrench a Bill of Rights in our constitution. I think, following the example of our neighbours to the south, that we can have every confidence that this would enhance the freedom of Canadians and more particularly is it important in an era wherein there is increasing government intervention in every aspect of the life of the community.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I should like to express some views on specifics which I think are important in dealing with the constitution. Repeating what I said at the beginning, I am concerned that in our country people expect the federal government to play a leading role, most particularly in the development of the Canada economy. I think it is quite apparent at the present time that because of our constitutional arrangements, the federal government cannot play the role it should in the development of Canada and the Canadian economy. It is true that it has wide powers—taxing power, spending power, control over currency, banking and international trade, control over transport and communications—but it is not able to exercise powers in important areas affecting the life of the citizen. It has limited powers in terms of national planning. It has, as we know, limited powers in housing, control of economic growth and to exercise, when need be, firm economic controls on inflation. As I said earlier, if there is any meaning to the questions raised about foreign intrusion into our economy, the federal government has very little power to deal with this problem. It is hampered in its approach to harmful business practices—

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

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be granted leave to continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Blair: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I merely wish to add that the federal government is hampered in its control of harmful business practices, as was pointed out in the recent report of the Economic Council.

In conclusion, may I say that the appointment of this committee is an important development in our growing knowledge of our

constitution and the problems it creates. I hope the committee will become a positive force in indicating to not only the members of this House but to all people the scope we have to make our country operate successfully under the present constitution by agreement, by novel interpretation, by experimentation and by amendment.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, if there is a general feeling that our constitution should be examined with a view to changing it, I believe that the proper first step is to have this examination carried out by a committee of Parliament. But I remain convinced, as I was when this matter was before the House last February, that there is no urgency about this matter. Certainly it should not be given precedence in Parliament over much more pressing national problems.

The hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) covered the waterfront in his remarks when he said that the federal government should be strengthened and the provincial governments should be strengthened. I just worry about what the citizens of this country will do.

I agree that the hon. member is correct in his assessment of the constitution, because I am also convinced that the constitution as it stands today, 103 years after its coming into effect, is quite adequate to meet the demands made upon it, no matter how complex and difficult our public affairs become. It has proved to be flexible and adaptable to a very wide range of national crises from world wars to worldwide depression.

As long as Canadian leaders and statesmen have utilized our constitution in good faith, it has proved more than adequate. Unfortunately, in recent years we have had clear evidence that even such a basically sound document as the British North America Act is not proof against the manipulation of an unscrupulous Prime Minister. Its strength lies in its use, its weakness in the fact that it can be bypassed. In my view it lacks the vital provisions that would curb the assumption of unlimited and irresponsible power by the executive.

• (9:00 p.m.)

If we are to amend our constitution, the first and most urgent change we should make is to write into the constitution curbs on the taxing and spending powers of the federal government and the ability of the Prime Minister to ignore Parliament and the constitution. The record of the government immediately past, and of the present one, is appalling in respect of trampling on the constitution, slighting the rights of the provinces and concentrating power in the hands of the central government at Ottawa an ever larger share of total spending and total government taxation.

Taxation in this country has risen steeply until today it has reached the dangerous pinnacle of more than one-third of the gross national product. This is beyond the point which economists and historians claim it is safe for any society to go without running the risk of complete economic and social decay. We should provide a constitutional check to ensure that all governments stay within a fair and proportionate share of the national economy.

Whatever political theorists may say, or whatever political opportunists may claim, we are still a federal state, not a unitary state and not a state with a very strong centre and very weak parts. In Canada it should never be a question of a central government that is stronger or weaker than the provincial governments, or vice versa. Our constitutional problem should only be to preserve a fair balance between the two types of government. Our constitutional basis provides, and for very good and proven reasons, for certain matters to be handled by a central government and certain others to be administered by regional or provincial governments.

The essential thing is to ensure that each type of government is guaranteed the freedom and the financial muscle to discharge its constitutional responsibilities. I am one of those who is hopeful that the proposed committee will be able to make the existing constitution work without change or, at least, with the minimum of change.

I have mentioned that recent governments have abused our constitution and that Prime ministers, in particular the present one, have assumed extraordinary powers. To me, one of the most obvious and damaging examples of this abuse of the constitution is in the deliberate exclusion by a variety of means of the monarchy from our processes of government. Let me emphasize strongly that when I speak of the monarchy I speak of it only as an institution, a constitutional device that happens also to be the core of our particular system of parliamentary democracy.

I believe it is wrong and would merely be misleading to argue, as many do, for or against the monarchy on grounds of sentimental attachment or emotion. It is not the

person of the monarch we must be concerned about, but the institution of the monarchy. The only question to be asked about the monarchy is this: Is it a sound and useful piece of political and constitutional machinery; is it effective in governing a modern state democratically and in freedom; and is it as good as, or better than, other expedients available?

The fact is that our system of government is laid down in our written constitution. The British North America Act, in section 17, under part IV entitled "Legislative Power," says:

> There shall be One Parliament for Canada consisting of the Queen, an Upper House styled the Senate, and the House of Commons.

So, whether we like it or not, the sovereign is constitutionally an integral part of our government. To slight or ignore the sovereign, as successive Liberal governments have done in recent years, affects the sovereign but little; it merely demeans and weakens our system of government and the nation. I am convinced that the oblique attacks on the monarchy in this country have less to do with political and constitutional requirements of a modern state than with anti-British sentiments and emotional resentment of pomp and ceremony. If I am correct in that, I think this is an even weaker and more dangerous argument than is sentimental attachment to the royal family.

If you take the trouble to read the story of the birth and early times of confederation, I am sure you will discover, Mr. Speaker, that there were very few colonists in North America of that day who held any sentimental attachment to Great Britain or any love for things or people English. The colonies of those days, the colonies that banded together to form Canada, were settled by many people who had little cause to love England. There were Scottish immigrants driven from their ancestral homes by English influence. There were communities of people who had fled England for religious freedom. There were those of French descent only recently losers in a war against England.

Even the United Empire Loyalists, who had come to the British North American colonies to get away from the new republicanism to the south, had done so more because they preferred British-style government and British institutions than because they loved England. One has only to read of the Loyalists who went to England, instead of what is now Canada, to realize the bitter feeling between the two groups.

[Mr. Schumacher.]

Also, we should never forget that one of the chief movers and front-line fighters against the British government in the Lower Canadian rebellion of 1837 was not a French Canadian but a direct descendant of United Empire Loyalists, Dr. Wolfred Nelson.

The facts of the matter are that it was not ties with England and sentimental attachment to that country that prompted our ancestors to opt for the monarchical system of parliamentary democracy. It was shrewd and unemotional assessment that British methods and institutions of democratic government were preferable to the available alternatives.

Recent history has borne out this contention, I believe. In Britain's former colonies, some of which have detached themselves completely from the mother country while others have maintained varying kinds of loose association, British forms of government and British institutions have been retained and cherished. It is significant that India, a country that apparently had little cause to indulge in any sentimental tie with Britain, retained a British form of parliamentary democracy and a judicial and other governmental systems identical to those introduced in the days of British rule.

It is true that India abolished the office of Governor-General and recognizes the sovereign only as the head of the Commonwealth, but she retained the substance of British parliamentary, democratic government. The only real change was to substitute a president as head of state rather than the British reigning monarch. In my view this is no advantage. A president must be chosen. This means the office immediately becomes a political one, no matter how restricted the powers of the president may be. This, to my mind, destroys one of the chief advantages of hereditary monarchy, namely, that it provides a truly non-political figure at the head of government.

I happen to believe we should retain the system of government that incorporates a hereditary and non-political monarch. I do so, however, on grounds of constitutional effectiveness, not because I am misty-eyed about royalty. I also believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is essential today that the question of retaining or abandoning the monarchy be brought out in the open and debated dispassionately on grounds of its worth as an institution and its entrenched position as an essential part of our system of government. I think it is damaging to our social and political stability

to stand by and watch a few determined anti-monarchists destroy the effectiveness of the institution by ridicule, innuendo and unconstitutional trickery. I think it particularly damaging because I believe this is being done strictly on grounds of anti-British sentiment and for political expediency.

It is my hope that this point will be one of the principal ones discussed by the committee that is proposed. As for curbing the first minister's appetite for dictatorial powers, I believe this, too, must be given priority before Parliament is relegated to the role of a constitutional museum and this country sinks into authoritarian socialism. It would be amusing, if it were not so tragic, to hear people crying for a greater degree of centralized governmental power when this trend runs so directly opposite to the political slogan of this government, "Participatory democracy". The more power is centralized in Ottawa, the further government is removed from the people. This is not peculiar to the federal scene. It occurs at all levels, including provincial and municipal. But it is a fact of modern life that our young people have recognized and against which they are protesting.

• (9:10 p.m.)

We believe that if democracy is to mean anything, everyone must have the opportunity to be heard and to sway government policy to the best of his or her ability. Canada is a union of regions and cannot be remolded at this stage of development into a unitary state. If the pressure for centralized power persists, it will shatter confederation and fragment its parts beyond reuniting. The Fathers of Confederation knew this well. They recognized this basic fact and wrote the constitution accordingly. All that is needed today is some of their practical common sense and a genuine desire to make our constitution work.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Schumacher: Decentralization, not more centralization, is the only apparent way of adequately protecting regions and minorities in this country and of giving these regions a fair and reasonable voice in their own and national affairs. It is the only manner in which Canadians can be given the chance of close participation in their own affairs.

We have heard a great deal about the concept of the "global village" and that Canada is shrinking in on itself because of great advances in the technology of transportation and communication. The truth is that it is not a homogeneous whole and probably never will be. As for technological advances, if they are so dramatic, how is it that it takes a simple letter ten days to be delivered to Alberta from Ottawa?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Schumacher: The hon. member for Moncton (Mr. Thomas) has advised me that it took 16 days for a first-class parcel post package with $5 postage to be delivered from Toronto to Moncton.

My idea of Canada is a national government politically, constitutionally and financially, strong enough to discharge its constitutional responsibilities and, when necessary, to assist in keeping the various regions in economic balance—and no more. With this concept I see regional governments equally strongly situated to discharge their regional responsibilities. I say regional rather than provincial because it may well be that amalgamation of one or more provinces will eventually make better economic sense in this country.

If total government spending were limited to a percentage of the gross national product, all governments would then have to work for policies which would increase the size of the pie for all if they were desirous of increasing their spending, instead of the present situation where all they do is increase their slice of the pie at the expense of the citizen. To achieve this balance of power and strength between governments, I believe it has now become necessary to bolster it with constitutional provisions that would effectively prevent encroachment of the federal government on the regional governments.

One of the great areas of federal excess has been not only its own profligate spending but the pressure exerted on provinces to spend. This has been apparent in many so-called "national" programs, such as medicare where a combination of federal manipulation and political blackmail forced many provinces to commit themselves over their financial head.

I believe that one of our great troubles today is that those who enjoy power do not understand our constitutional heritage. They in fact appear to despise it and would change it, without any reference to the Canadian people, by subtle and unconstitutional means. Having no regard for the constitution, it has been easy for them to find ways around it.

This fact alone has caused me to change my mind to a certain extent and to now believe that some constitutional safeguards for the constitution itself should be incorporated. We must aim at making it impossible for anyone to bypass the constitution and Parliament. If we do not, Canadians will find themselves in the classic position that bred the United States revolution and the twin "taxation without representation". Our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) may yet enter the history books as the twentieth century's George III, a slimmer Gallic version of Lord North.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the establishment of a parliamentary committee as a means of adding another dimension to the discussion surrounding our constitution, because in the discussions so far it is apparent to me that some of the provinces for one reason or another are not standing up for their rights as they should be.

I hope the committee will be useful in persuading the government that what is needed in this country is decentralization, that the provinces should be allowed to discharge their responsibilities in respect of education, health services including the ever-expanding problem of mental health and urban transit, and that it is no longer acceptable for the federal government to treat them like beggars.

What I have suggested, Mr. Speaker, really amounts to ways and means of ensuring adherence to our present constitution and to the necessary minimum required to keep Canada together by giving our people a continued feeling of confidence in our nation, a feeling which I think we all believe is beginning to be questioned in many areas of the land.

Mr. Alastair Gillespie (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, in rising to contribute to this debate tonight, I do so as a non-expert. I make no apologies for not being a lawyer. I speak as a former businessman and I think I speak for concerned citizens through the land.

I feel the big debate in the next ten years will be on how we at the centre of power will use power or find the power to deal with such questions as pollution, foreign ownership and regulating our economy. Today's citizen is very much aware of the fact that the world as he knows it may not exist in 50 years time because of man's capacity to destroy it through his industrialization. He is aware of the fact that the automobile, through the discharge of exhaust fumes, may in the next 20 years raise the carbon dioxide content of the air to such a level that the temperature of the earth will rise by ten degrees and in so doing the ocean levels will rise six feet or more. Once this happens, it becomes an irreversible process. I suggest to hon. members this is something of considerable and enduring concern to the citizens of Canada.

The Canadian citizen is concerned about foreign ownership and the fact that if we do not find some way to deal with this question we may have no country and no identity by the end of the century. He is concerned about what he thinks are King Canute methods of dealing with the question of inflation. He does not understand that the call for voluntary restraint is no more than a call to those who are most sensitive, to those who are most responsible and an opportunity for those who are less responsible.

• (9:20 p.m.)

He is not convinced that by asking people to show restraint the tide of inflation will somehow abate. He is concerned that the federal government does not have the power, or so it seems to him. Why else would we be speaking purely in terms of voluntary restraints? Why, for example, does not the federal government have the power to deal with consumer credit? Why does it not have the power to deal with wage, price and dividend restraint? Why does the approach have to be by way of voluntary restraint?

As a member of this House I am impressed, as I know others are impressed, by the initiatives shown by the federal government with respect to the need for constitutional change. Since this government took office there has been a substantial dialogue. As the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) mentioned this evening, seven papers have been published dealing with constitutional matters. The last conference, held not very long ago, was attended by certain municipal representatives. This is the first time for a long time that a municipal representative has been included as a member of a delegation; on other occasions municipal representatives have been included as observers. I, for one, hope that future constitutional conferences will see municipal representatives included as members of provincial delegations. In this way, it seems to me, the cities can be included in the dialogue between the provincial governments and the federal government concerning this important area of constitutional change.

Citizens, as we all know, will come to us and say, "I really do not understand the problem. Governments are to serve the interests of the people, and you people argue that you do not have the power; the provincial governments have the power. I go to my provincial member, and he says, 'This is not a question for me; it is a question for your federal member.'" We have all run into this kind of difficulty. We have all been told we are overgoverned and overtaxed. I think the citizen today has begun to wonder increasingly about the nature of the distribution of powers. He is asking the question more and more, "Does the federal government lack the power?" If it lacks the power, let it say so as representative of all Canadians; and let us remind ourselves that we are the only institution in Canada which is representative of all Canadians.

As I say, I do not bring to this debate the knowledge of a constitutional lawyer or of an expert, but there are certain areas to which I should like to draw attention. It seems to me that one of the first principles when solving any problem is to find out whose responsibility it is and then to ensure that there is commensurable authority to go with it. At least, this is the way business deals with problems.

It seems to me that what we lack today is power at the centre. A few moments ago, the hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) said what we needed in our constitutional arrangements was greater decentralization. I believe the application of power should be decentralized, but I do not think this is inconsistent with there being greater power at the centre, particularly when dealing with economic matters. As the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) said a short while ago, this is an area wherein we lack substantial power.

Looking at the motion which has been presented to us, I am happy to see that the committee is to be given the power to call witnesses. I am concerned, however, that it does not appear to have the power to hire staff. I hope this is nothing more than an oversight and that the committee will be given power to hire staff. In this connection, I hope, too, that more assistance will be forthcoming to the caucuses. I speak as a member of the Liberal caucus who would much appreciate the kind of assistance which is available to many hon. members opposite in terms of research staff. If the committee system is to work effectively, we must supply committees with the necessary staff.

I hope this special committee will call for a projection of the spending intentions of the provincial governments and the federal government collectively over the next five years and then ask, of qualified witnesses, just what revenue would be forthcoming to the provinces and to the federal government if there were no changes in existing levels of taxation at either the federal or provincial levels.

Let us get this information and place it before the public and members of the House of Commons. Unless we possess information of this kind, the whole question of spending and taxation powers becomes, in part, an academic exercise. If we are to consider the distribution of powers, we must have this information.

The committee should ask the question: Does the federal government possess the authority it needs today to deal with the various threats to our survival? For example, does it have authority to deal with pollution?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Gillespie: It has made a start in the Canada water bill. But what about air pollution? Has it all the authority it needs to deal with pollution from automobiles?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Gillespie: Has it the necessary authority to deal with industrial pollution? Let us make absolutely clear to all citizens of Canada where the responsibility lies.

Let us consider the field of foreign ownership. The British North America Act, if it was designed to protect the land mass against United States annexation, has been eminently successful. But if it was intended to protect the ownership of our natural resources, it has been a failure. The provincial governments, and particularly the provincial premiers, could not care less, it seems to me, about who owns our natural resources. I suggest that the federal government does not appear to possess the authority to regulate this essential aspect of our national affairs.

Third, with respect to regulating the economy, surely it is time we transferred power to the federal government to regulate consumer credit. Surely it is time we transferred standby powers with respect to the regulation of capital spending. Surely it is time we transferred the necessary power to deal with wages, prices and dividends in times of inflation. If we duck the opportunity presented by the conference coming up in two weeks time,

we shall have done a great disservice to ourselves and to this nation. I trust the committee will direct itself to these questions.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, to my mind the Canadian Parliament is debating an extremely important matter. The official opposition has repeatedly requested, since 1965, the appointment of a parliamentary committee on the Canadian constitution. We did not do so to embarrass the government in power but because we were convinced that this was both urgent and necessary.

Four stands have been adopted to date in the face of the Canadian constitutional crisis.

The first, that of the *status quo*, does not meet the objectives of the provinces; this was quite obvious at the last constitutional conference at which time the provinces demanded immediate amendments. As we know, the powers are not well divided. There is duplication in the activities, and the present constitution does not meet the needs of our modern times.

The second, which is as extreme as the first and, obviously, just as unacceptable, advocates total decentralization of powers in favour of the provinces. This attitude was advocated especially by certain Quebec groups and would require the creation of associate states. Let us face the facts: this tenent is unacceptable because it would mean the end of Canada. In fact there would be two states, or more if other provinces took advantage of the right to decentralization.

The third, we also reject: it is that of the present government. It consists in the centralization of powers, and denies the provinces the possibility of playing a dynamic role within the Canadian confederation.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Finally there is the fourth, which I shall describe in a moment. It seems logical to us, members from Quebec, because it does not treat the provinces as agencies of the central government, but as useful, active and responsible members within the Canadian confederation. That principle has been advocated repeatedly, as well in Quebec as elsewhere. It strikes us as much more acceptable.

That is the way Quebecers now see the constitutional crisis, and how the majority of them feel it can be overcome.

It must be admitted from the start that Quebec is not just another province. This has been proclaimed for the past hundred years. Five-sixths of Canada's French-speaking population live in Quebec and that is what makes it different from the other provinces.

Other differences could also be mentioned, resulting from Quebec's geographic position, commanding the main route of communication toward the interior of the continent. It could also be said that Quebec is different because of its immense untapped reserves of natural resources. Merely taking into account that it is different because its population is primarily and predominantly French-speaking, it must be recognized that Quebec can enrich Canada, if it is to be different from its southern neighbour.

On many occasions, French-Canadiens have expressed dissatisfaction about their status within the Canadian confederation. In fact, one only has to read the report of the Tremblay Commission, the report of the Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, and the statements from all the Quebec premiers, Liberal or Union Nationale, at the constitutional conferences, and more especially since 1960, to become aware of the continuity in Quebec's demands.

This government has always claimed to be sympathetic to Quebec's requests, but so far, it has done nothing about them. It may say that it has passed an official languages bill, with our consent. Yet, everyone knows very well that both languages have been recognized and protected in Quebec for a long time, and that the government passed that bill, after several years of delay and hesitation, much more to favour French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec.

The government has therefore done nothing to allow Quebec to follow its cultural vocation. Quebecers are more and more conscious of the role they can play in Canadian life, or of the lack of it. Unless they are allowed to take an active part, it is to be feared that they might decide to leave Confederation.

Separatism is a dreadful threat. And that is something Quebec members have to live with every day. Even though we know that separatism could have harmful effects on both Canada and Quebec, it still remains a possibility.

To realize it, it is enough to consider how Quebecers are getting more and more indifferent to federal politics. At the last election, the percentage of the Quebec vote was the lowest in the country; 72 per cent, compared to 78 per cent in 1963.

The government should not either bow to Quebecers' claims just to cajole them, to keep them of its side; that would be hypocritical.

The requests of Quebec must therefore be given the importance they deserve, because we are convinced that Quebec has its place within the Canadian confederation and that its particular charasteristics can play a precious role. It is by acknowledging these characteristics of Quebec that Canadian unity will be achieved, on the basis of equality of the two founding nations, whatever word may be used to designate the two ethnic entities which exist in Canada. The main thing is to realize that Canada has two majority groups which are sociologically different. Contrary to what the Prime Minister said during the election campaign, it does not mean that there are two countries within a single state, because that is not what the people of Quebec want. Since they want to live in a single country, the majority of Canadians must also recognize the differences which may benefit confederation.

It is not enough to recognize that the province of Quebec is different; it must be recognized also that it is in a position to discharge a very large part of the responsibilities issuing from that difference. In the area of culture, we see that these last few years, the province of Quebec has increased its connections and its relations with the French-speaking world. Because its main group is of French culture, the province of Quebec must allow that group to live more intensely in French, and to add to its culture.

How can we expect five million French-speaking people, on a continent inhabited by 220 million English-speaking people, to be self-sufficient insofar as culture is concerned? To the extent that the human body needs fresh air, the French-speaking civilization needs sources on which to feed.

But whenever Quebec tried to improve its relations and enter into agreements with French-speaking countries, the federal government showed its displeasure and opposed any such move. Don't we French Canadians from Quebec have every reason to wonder why in the course of the last 60 or 70 years the federal government did not choose to strengthen its contacts with French-speaking countries in order to meet the cultural requirements of the Quebec people as well as those of other French-speaking Canadians?

There is no doubt that Quebec has greatly benefited and still benefits by these agreements with French-speaking nations. Let us mention for instance the numerous exchanges of teachers, students, technicians and experts as well as the increase of French investments in Quebec.

• (9:40 p.m.)

If Quebec benefits from such exchanges and agreements, the rest of Canada is in no way deprived. By increasing such exchanges with the French-speaking world, Quebec does not deprive anyone of anything. We should, rather, rejoice that Quebec benefits so greatly from them.

Besides, no objections were ever raised against Ontario having offices in different countries, in England for instance, because this could promote its culture and its interests. The federal government did not raise any objections either when Ontario instituted in its Department of Education a Cultural Exchanges Division and signed agreements, with France amongst others, for exchanges of students and professors.

However, Mr. Speaker, if Quebec dares take some steps in this direction, the central government first objects, to agree later on, as was the case for the conferences of the Education Ministers of French-speaking countries; on the other hand, if it does not agree to it, it intimidates the countries which would like to have relations with Quebec as was the case when diplomatic relations with Gabon were broken up.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, these are unpleasant facts to hear but the truth has to be spoken before our English-speaking Canadian friends, here in this sanctuary which is the House of Commons.

It is not just in the field of culture that Quebec needs to take steps in order to fulfill this characteristic. There is the field of social welfare, the field of immigration, the field of education which belongs to Quebec and to the provinces, but where the federal government continues to withhold the amounts Quebec would need for its administration, under the pretense that in its opinion, these amounts must be used for university education.

However, university education does not come under federal jurisdiction, at least in our opinion. The Quebec government is quite able to look after its education system properly and to decide what amounts of money must be allocated without any conditions being set by the central government especially in matters such as education or health which, under the constitution, come under the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces.

Therefore, why deny Quebec the right to have specific needs, when the premiers of Ontario and Manitoba have stated, following the last constitutional conference, that they had no objection to Quebec having special arrangements within the Canadian Confederation, in order to meet all the needs of that majority of French Canadians who live now in this beautiful country that we call Canada?

Mr. Speaker, that is the question that we must put to the government. Why this obstinate refusal of the fact that Quebec is not a province like the others? It is only a question of thinking of a new constitution in which jurisdictions will be negotiated and Quebec could be a part of a federation by playing in it a dynamic role and by meeting its own particular requirements. The federal government must not only allow Quebec to play a role in meeting its particular needs, but they should also, if they want to keep Quebec within Confederation, do all they can to enable Quebec to achieve its aims.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a concession that must be granted to Quebec and Quebecers are not asking the central government for gifts when they speak in this way. I say that Quebec has a right to demand these realities which enable Canada to be a great country because it is a bicultural and bilingual one.

Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point where a clear and precise decision must be made. We must no longer expect that time will settle things well because it will not do that from now on, in Quebec. Indeed, Quebec has been patient. It put forth its point of view on many occasions. It will keep on doing it for some time but there are limits to its patience—I repeat, there are limits to its patience.

It should be made quite clear that when Quebec is asking for special arrangements, it does not mean to deprive anybody in any way. We hope the federal government will show good will and understanding. In order to help it arrive at a fair decision, the members of the Progressive Conservative party again suggest to establish a parliamentary committee on the constitution which, in my view, should enjoy very extensive terms of reference, enabling it to consider the reform of both the Senate and of the Supreme Court.

It should also be entrusted with the task of considering the establishment of a constitutional court where the differences between the provinces and the central government could be better settled than by the Supreme Court of Canada whose decisions, in the past, have often been challenged by the provinces.

Moreover, a parliamentary committee on the constitution should study the whole question of the monarchy and that of the establishment of a presidential system. Those are questions asked by the young people nowadays. I am not saying this in order to promote one system more than the other, but to bring forward the ideals of the young Canadians who call for a constitution, not only for the present but for the future of those who wish to keep on militating in the Canadian Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, I see you are getting ready to tell me that my time has expired but I will take only a few more minutes.

Since 1965 we have called for the establishment of this committee but in vain. We are happy today that the government put that question before the House. We are ready to do our share so that a sound dialogue may begin between all parts of the Canadian federation, so that a new constitution may soon be drafted, which will meet all the needs and ideals of all the Canadian people.

• (9:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in 1964 Members of Parliament from the New Democratic Party proposed the establishment of a House of Commons committee to discuss and study the problems involved in amending or changing the constitution. At that time the proposal was rejected by the government and has consistently until today been rejected.

We endorse the idea of a committee to study the constitution and needed changes to it, because we recognize the tremendous difficulties which have occurred in this country since the constitution was written and adopted more than 100 years ago. One hundred years ago when the British North America Act was enacted, this country was essentially rural. Today, a substantial majority of the people of Canada live in the cities.

When the constitution was adopted, the federal government allocated to itself those powers and responsibilities which it considered important and left to the provinces those responsibilities which at that time it considered to be much less essential and important to the people. The judgement of the federal government at that time probably was correct, but the urbanization of this country has

made a tremendous difference. Therefore, we now find that some of the most important functions in respect of the day-to-day life of the people of this country have been left, under the provisions of the constitution, to the provinces.

The provinces, in turn, over the years have given a great deal of that responsibility to the cities which are entirely creatures of the provincial governments. This government and its Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) have until now taken the position that our constitution is essentially a good constitution; that if we are in trouble it is because the federal government has not stuck to its jurisdiction and the responsibilities given it under the constitution and that the provinces, similarly, have not stuck to their responsibilities under the constitution.

The major field in which the Prime Minister feels the federal government must have responsibility, and the one thing which he has wanted to discuss with the provinces in respect of changes in the constitution, concerns the French-speaking people of Canada. The Prime Minister feels that regardless of where they live, they must be given equal rights with English-speaking Canadians in the use of their language in all parts of Canada.

We in our party have agreed with that part of the proposition put forward by the Prime Minister. We have done so even though many of our constituents have not understood what the Prime Minister was talking about and what we were trying to do. We have agreed with this because we feel it essential that if this country is to survive as one country, the French-speaking people must be given the feeling they are equal citizens. However, the people in English-speaking Canada and in French-speaking Canada need more than the right to use the English or French language in any part of Canada; they must start dealing with the many problems of modern-day life with which they have not had an opportunity to deal.

If there is criticism of the approach of this government and the Prime Minister in many parts of Canada—and there is—it is not based on partisan, political reasons. I should like to point out to members of this House what I am sure they already know. There is no harsher critic of the government and the Prime Minister in respect of the approach taken to the constitution than the Liberal Premier of the province of Saskatchewan. If I were to use some of the language he has used, I am certain the Chair would call me to order for using language which is unparliamentary.

We all know that the former minister of transport and deputy prime minister resigned from the cabinet because of his feeling that if we accepted the views of the Prime Minister about the constitution in respect of problems such as housing, it would be impossible to deal with the problems of the cities and find a solution to them.

I could spend more than the time I have in putting on the record the point of view of the Liberal member for York West (Mr. Givens), a former mayor of Toronto, who outside this chamber has spoken repeatedly about the failure of this government and its Prime Minister to face up to the responsibilities which a federal government must assume if it is to meet the problems of the cities. It is because of my feeling that this government is taking too narrow and too legalistic a position in respect of amending and changing the constitution that I rise today to speak in this debate.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

POST OFFICE—ASSIGNMENT OF NEW PRODUCTIVITY EXECUTIVE

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, prior to the Christmas recess I asked a question of the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans), the Minister of Communications or whatever the father of our new jet-age postal system now styles himself. It went without answer, and that it is the reason I am discussing it at this time, because it touches on the sad state to which a fundamental public service has degenerated. The question had to do with the announcement that the minister had appointed a senior productivity executive to his staff. As I understood the minister's announcement of this appointment, the prime duty of this extra official would be to combat inflation in the workings of the Post Office Department.

This struck me as a classic example of putting the cart before the horse. The minister had set the process of unrestrained inflation in motion long before hiring someone to con-

trol it. I am talking about the minister's great reform, the imposition of primitive and crippling new postal rates on the Canadian public. His stated reason was to enable the Post Office Department to operate like a healthy private business concern at a profit. He has not yet explained from whence he received his mandate to turn a vital public service into a private money-making proposition.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Nesbitt: They ought to put him in the CBC.

Mr. Schumacher: What we need in his department is an official to bring back our fast and reliable postal service and to reduce excessively high postal rates, not a man to draw a very large salary for tilting at windmills.

Ever since 1840 when Sir Rowland Hill introduced the first cheap and effective public postal service in Great Britain, the Post Office and its work has been recognized as a basic public service for which the taxpayer was willing to pay something in support out of the public funds. It had two aims—to carry the mail as cheaply as possible and to be as reliable as possible. These have since been the aims of almost every civilized country in the operation of their postal services.

But this was P.K. I do not mean pre-Cambrian, but pre-Kierans. Now we have a new apostle and a new creed: To the devil with what people want and in support of which they are willing to pay taxes. We know better. We will make this service pay even if it means fewer mail deliveries, long delays, and much higher rates.

The minister worshipped too long at the shrine of private industry as president of the Montreal Stock Exchange, without learning anything. He is infatuated by profit for the sake of profit.

The questions I pose this evening are simply these: When will the Postmaster General stop destroying the identity of countless small localities by closing down post offices? When will he and his army of efficiency experts restore the reliability of our mail delivery system? When will he come to his senses and lower postal rates to make the postal service once more a public service and not a luxury? When will he stop trying to "snow" the public with science-fiction press releases, and get his department back on the track?

[Mr. Schumacher.]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) I must express his regret that for personal reasons he cannot be here this evening.

The purpose of re-examining the productivity of the Post Office is for the very reasons that the hon. member has stipulated, namely, to improve the productivity of the service is to bring the cost down—a simple economic fact. Any action which the Post Office takes to reduce over-all costs in any area of activity will naturally have an effect in rate-setting. The proposition seems to me to be as simple as that, and it seems to be the most direct answer to the hon. gentleman.

MANPOWER—ADULT RETRAINING AND EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS—ALLEGED WASTING OF MONEY

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, on December 5 I brought to the attention of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) the charges made in a report prepared for the Association of Colleges of Arts and Technology of Ontario that the manpower training program operated by the federal government was inefficient, wasteful, and was not doing the job of training people who are out of work, which it was set up to do. Manpower training began in 1961 under the former Conservative government as a joint program financed and administered both by the federal government and the provincial governments. In 1967 the manpower training program was taken out of the hands of the provincial governments. Schools coming under the jurisdiction of the provinces are used for the training of manpower, but the entire responsibility for the program now rests with the federal government.

Because the federal government has the sole responsibility, and because there has been a lamentable lack of co-operation with the provincial governments and the local schools in which the manpower training programs are conducted, the colleges to which I have referred made a report which deserves to be discussed and will be discussed in detail when the estimates of the department come before the appropriate parliamentary committee.

The report says that the manpower training programs have become not really training programs but primarily programs designed to put people to work as quickly as possible whether they have the training required for

permanent work and whether the available jobs are suitable or not. The main responsibility undertaken by the department seems to be to put a person into a job, a slot, if that can be accomplished. It is only after the person repeatedly fails on a job that the department considers an adequate program of manpower training. The report charges that the bureaucracy and red-tape have multiplied to such an extent that the people who need the training, simply become discouraged and give up.

What are some of the problems? One is the decision that no manpower training program may last more than a year, 52 weeks. But a large percentage of our population, the Metis people in particular but also people from many of the rural areas of Eastern and Western Canada, have only grade six or grade seven education. They cannot fit into existing training programs and apprenticeship programs. The one year for which they are paid a training allowance sometimes brings them only to the grade eight, nine or 10 level of education. What they need is the equivalent of grade 12. But for those unfortunate enough to live in areas that do not provide facilities—and this is all too true of many areas in this country, and probably in no province is it as prevalent as the minister's province of Nova Scotia—all the 52 weeks' training does is bring them to grade eight level. It simply does not give them the background necessary to take the technical training that they require.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the Manpower Department has built up its own organization and there is little co-operation between the department and the school facilities. There are counsellors working for the Manpower Department and counsellors working for the education authorities, but according to the report to which I have referred, the co-operation between them leaves a great deal to be desired. Those who suffer are the people taking the training.

One other aspect to which I have referred again and again in debates about manpower training is this: The counsellors employed by the Manpower Department have virtually life and death power in respect of the program. They decide whether a person shall take a job or shall take further education; they decide whether a person shall take the training in his own city or in another, and they decide how long he shall be entitled to the training. According to the report, the co-operation between the manpower counsellors and the school counsellors is minimal, to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons I would urge the minister to study the report made by educational people who have had long experience in working with those needing education and who are in day-to-day contact with this problem. I ask that the difficulties referred to in this report, which are dealt with in much more detail than I could hope to do, be studied objectively and without partisanship.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has referred to a report that was issued some time ago and he bases his statements on the contents of that report. At the time the report was issued, and before a copy had been delivered to me, there was extensive reporting in the newspapers. At that time I made a public comment indicating that in my view the report did not represent a very fair or balanced picture of the operation of the Canada Manpower training program. The report itself is under review in my department, and the findings up to the present time give us no reason for changing the original analysis or reaction to it.

My hon. friend has mentioned a relatively large number of issues which I cannot deal with in a couple of minutes. We co-operate with the provinces. The successful operation of our program depends on close co-operation and collaboration with all provincial governments. Last week my deputy had meetings with all the deputy ministers of the provinces to consider how the program could be improved and how the process of consultation could be enhanced. Also, the hon. member should know that recently we had a meeting with ministers from the province of Manitoba, and part of the agenda dealt with ways and means of increasing co-operation in order to make the program more effective.

I had a meeting with the Minister of Education of Manitoba and we reached a good understanding as to how the program might be applied in that province to meet the particular needs of various communities. So, to suggest that there is minimal co-operation is inaccurate. We could not contemplate spending so much money in training the large numbers of people involved without having the close co-operation of the provinces.

We have conducted extensive cost-benefit analyses of the results of this program. We

have followed up the employment histories of individuals who have taken the course. We know that while there are ways in which we can improve the program, the returns to the economy are about threefold when compared with expenditures made under the program. We know that the chances of employment of individuals are increased considerably and that their earning power is increased as a result of the training program. I shall welcome further questions based on the report at a later date when our review is complete, and we shall co-operate with the hon. member in finding ways and means of improving what I think is an effective program that can be improved and increased in respect of its services.

POLLUTION—DUMPING OF OIL AND OTHER WASTE IN GREAT LAKES

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, on December 5, almost two months ago, I directed the following question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene):

> Having regard to the fact that the United States government recommended two days ago to the Canada-United States International Joint Commission that a moratorium with respect to oil drilling in Lake Erie be imposed because of the dangerous pollution possibilities, would the minister indicate whether the Canadian government intends to make a similar representation to the International Joint Commission?

I welcome this opportunity to give a little more background to my question and trust that we will hear from the minister tonight whether the Canadian government has also recommended to the Canada-United States International Joint Commission that a similar moratorium with respect to oil-drilling in Lake Erie be imposed.

It seems to me that in the mad search for resources the various levels of government often failed to take into account any adverse effects which the development and use of the resource might have on our total environment. In many instances permits for exploration and development are granted without proper safeguards being insisted upon by the governments involved. Frequently we find that governments have completely overlooked the possibility of major ecological damage being done and certainly have not weighed these chances, however remote they may be, against the over-all return from any given resource. A good example of this lack of foresight is found in the oil-drilling permits which have been allowed in Lake Erie.

In a news story in the Toronto *Telegram* of December 4, 1969, the following report appeared:

> The United States government recommended to the United States-Canada International Joint Commission yesterday a moratorium on oil well drilling in heavily polluted Lake Erie.
>
> Kenneth Bigland, Director of the United States Federal Water Pollution Control Administration's Division of Technological Support, said both planning and methods of dealing with oil spills on the lake remained limited. He said the moratorium should extend to natural gas drilling where such wells are likely to produce crude oil above specified levels, but he said the moratorium would not necessarily affect gas production which is already under way on the Canadian side of the lake.

Other interesting points have been raised in connection with oil-drilling in Lake Erie. It has been pointed out that one of the greatest dangers posed by drilling would be an accidental leak of the salt brine used. Apparently experts have warned that a spill of salt brine from an oil well would be one of the greatest natural catastrophes that could strike the Great Lakes. However, this is one aspect of pollution about which we have heard very little.

The main point I would like to make this evening, is that the recent IJC hearings clearly demonstrated that we do not have the facilities in the Great Lakes area to deal with a possible major oil well leak, or a major spill of oil from a sinking tanker. It would be utter catastrophe if a major spill of oil took place in any one of the Great Lakes. The hearing has pinpointed the fact that there is conflict between the federal and provincial jurisdictions as far as responsibility is concerned.

It appears that we have no contingency plans to deal with possible major oil well leaks such as the one off the coast of California last January. It appears that the lack of proper co-ordination between the federal and the provincial authorities is very much in evidence. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this problem should be tackled without delay. I feel the federal government should also recommend that drilling for gas and oil in Lake Erie be suspended until we can practically guarantee that these recreational areas will not be permanently destroyed by a major oil spill.

We have huge reserves of oil all over this nation, and there is no need to jeopardize Lake Erie or any of the Great Lakes which go to make up the greatest body of fresh water to be found anywhere in the world. This is a precious heritage to be protected. We cannot afford to take a chance on it with the appar-

ent inadequate facilities and safeguards now available to us. I urge the minister and the government to re-examine this problem and, in this instance to go along with the United States government in recommending the discontinuance of drilling until adequate safeguards are available.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member. I had notice of the earlier question, but while my hon. friend was speaking I was writing. I was not aware I was expected to answer his question. I apologize and assure the hon. member that I will answer him at a later date.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We thought the minister was preparing notes for a speech.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.23 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, January 27, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—EXTENT OF LAY-OFFS OF EMPLOYEES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the growing number of lay-offs in the automobile industry and the great economic importance of this industry, I ask the minister what information he has from the automobile industry as to the extent of the lay-offs this winter in the Canadian aspect of this industry?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have recently had meetings with the heads of the automobile industry and reference was made to this in our discussion. It is well known that there is a levelling in growth in that industry at this time. The lay-offs that have taken place in the recent past have been justified either by internal restructuring or by the need to reduce excessive inventories.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister any estimate of the extent of lay-offs to be expected and has he any assurance that the lay-offs that are effected will be fair and *pro rata* under the automobile agreement as between Canada and the United States?

Mr. Pepin: I believe it is so, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot be very specific today. I will look into this matter more closely and will give a more precise answer Thursday.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister attempted to get an assurance from the heads of the automotive companies that they will give advance notice to workers who are going to be laid off of not less than two months before such lay-offs take place?

Mr. Pepin: I understand the practice has been to that effect in recent times in the automobile industry, but I will have another look at the record.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question. Will the minister take this problem into account in the negotiations in connection with the Canada-United States automotive trade pact and attempt to reduce the differential in prices in order to reduce inflation and provide for greater possibility of sales?

Mr. Pepin: All these factors and many others are being taken into account in our negotiations with the United States. If one is concerned with differentials, one should be encouraged by the progressive reduction in the prices of automobiles and in the reduction in the productivity differentials that existed between the two industries at the time the pact was negotiated. One should be rather satisfied with the progress made in these areas.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is on the same subject. In his examination of the problem, will the minister look at the agreement to see if there are any guarantees that the Canadian government could invoke under the agreement to prohibit the export of unemployment in view of the fact that there are many reports of very extensive lay-offs in the automotive industry in the United States?

Mr. Pepin: We have used all the guarantees that were available in the agreement and in the letters given by the companies to the government in 1965. The general idea is that these guarantees now constitute a floor under which production cannot be allowed to fall. However, as hon. members know, there is no guarantee as to employment; it is by increasing the Canadian value added that further employment is generated.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The minister will appreciate that since decisions in these matters are made in Detroit, the volume of production, either here or in the United States, is subject to decisions made outside Canada. That is why I am drawing the minister's attention to this question of a guarantee

in relation to the non-export of unemployment. May we have a statement on this particular aspect at the first opportunity?

Mr. Pepin: On this particular subject the presidents of the automobile companies in Canada have assured me that decisions being taken in this industry in Detroit or anywhere else are now made on the basis of economic returns. This is cheering information, because it was one of the purposes of the automobile agreement that decisions should be made on such a basis. The hon. member smiles, and I can understand why he does so. We try by every reasonable means available to us to make sure that decisions are taken on the basis of economic return; we insist as much as we can—sometimes even more.

AIRCRAFT—POSSIBLE LAY-OFFS—HAWKER-SIDDELEY APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I direct a supplementary question to the minister with respect to possible lay-offs in the aircraft industry. Has the government made any decision with respect to the application of the Hawker-Siddeley Company for financial assistance to enable them to put into production the DHC-7 which could put Canada in the forefront in exports of this particular type of aircraft? Has any decision been reached in this regard and, if not, when will one be taken?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): A decision was made some time ago, Mr. Speaker, and a program is now in progress in my department to encourage the next phase in the development of the DeHavilland and the STOL aircraft. However, the company has experienced some difficulty arising from the slow development of the use of the STOL aircraft in the world. As hon. members will appreciate, production has to be tied to the use of this aircraft, particularly in the United States; we can only go as far as markets are available for this aircraft. There is in my department now a rhythm of implementation of this program which ties in with the development of potential markets. I am well aware of the importance of this development in terms of the well-being of the aircraft industry in Canada.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Has the government decided whether or not to accede to the application for some part of the $50 million needed to put this plane into production if feasibility studies warrant it?

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Mr. Pepin: I say yes to that, Mr. Speaker, but the figure is wrong—it is not as high as that.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): May I direct a question to the Prime Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe the hon. member for Calgary North has a supplementary.

PUBLIC SERVICE

LAY-OFFS OF SENIOR EMPLOYEES

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): My question is directed to the President of the Treasury Board. Would the minister make a statement soon as to the number of senior people in the public service employed in western Canada in the national parks branch and other departments who have been laid off? Will he also tell us how many of these people will be transferred to other jobs?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I think the House is aware that there is a very active program in an endeavour to find alternative positions in the Public Service for those in particular jobs which have been declared redundant. This program is continuing and will continue. Whenever a man's position is declared redundant another position will be sought for him if one is available. There will be no termination of this program. Therefore from that point of view I am not able to say how many will be laid off or how many will be found alternative positions.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the minister's answer do I take it that his policy is to try to find alternative positions but if there are none then even these senior public servants who have served this country will be laid off permanently?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The supplementary question as asked appears to be argumentative.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase it. I did not mean to be argumentative.

An hon. Member: It comes naturally.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, could the minister give us a statement within the next few days as to the number of people who at this stage have not been placed in alternative jobs and have served as senior public servants in this nation?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, I can make a statement as to the number of senior public

servants for whom positions have not been found and who have been laid off if the hon. gentleman would indicate to me what he means by senior public servants.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONTRACTS AWARDED TO RCA VICTOR—INTEREST CONFLICT OF J. B. HOULDING

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence arising out of an answer he provided yesterday to a question which appeared on the Order Paper. The answer revealed that RCA Victor Corporation of Canada has received 493 contracts from the Department of National Defence since 1962. Will the minister assure the House that he will investigate the conflict of interest position of Mr. J. B. Houlding who is simultaneously the president of RCA Victor of Canada and a member of the Defence Research Board.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, technically speaking the contracts referred to here were not given by the Defence Research Board.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put my question to the appropriate minister who is responsible for awarding such contracts.

[*Translation*]

TRANSPORT

INQUIRY RESPECTING SALE OF ICEBREAKER "C. D. HOWE"

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Transport but in his absence I will ask his parliamentary secretary to give the answer.

Could he tell us if the ice-breaker *C. D. Howe* was sold to Marine Industries Ltd. or to any other company?

If so, what was the sale price?

Mr. Speaker: I would like to suggest to the hon. member that this question could easily be placed on the Order Paper.

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

The *C. D. Howe* is equipped with hospital facilities which cost one million dollars. Before scrapping her, it would be time for the minister or his parliamentary secretary to tell the House whether she has been sold.

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the information requested by the hon. member, but I shall ask the department and keep him informed about this matter.

[*English*]

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

BENEFITS PAID RETIRED COAL MINERS—PURCHASING POLICY

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the first minister. Has the right hon. gentleman received a written complaint from the retired coal miners pensioners union at Sydney Mines regarding the manner in which benefits are being paid? In view of the constant complaints, and knowing the Prime Minister has a particular interest in this problem, would he cause an investigation to be carried out into all the ramifications of this subject?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no indication that I have received such a complaint but it is conceivable that it has arrived at my office and has not been delivered to me. I will take the question as notice and if the complaint warrants such an investigation I will consider the matter.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask whether, when investigating this particular set-up in Devco, the Prime Minister would also investigate the purchasing policies of this crown corporation?

WATER RESOURCES

SURVEY IN NORTHERN ONTARIO BY U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Is he prepared to ask the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works to look into the activities of the United States Army Corps of Engineers in northern Ontario?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I do not control this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is asking a question which has already been asked in a number of forms in recent days.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Later:*]

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, because of the strong reaction in northern Ontario against the agency reporting on ice and water conditions, will the chairman of the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works undertake to call before the committee representatives of the United States Army Corps of Engineers to ascertain whether Canada can formally supply the information required?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Again I have the impression that the question asked by the hon. member relates to one asked before. I do not like to be unfair to the hon. member for Thunder Bay who asked a question which I suggested had been asked previously. The minister might like to reply to both questions at this time.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I do not control the procedures of the committee, but I certainly see no objection to the committee requesting their presence. I am sure that through the good offices of the Department of External Affairs we could determine whether or not the engineers would be willing to appear before the committee to clear up any problems that might exist.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, I should also like to ask the minister if he would be prepared to have called before the committee some of the persons who brought this matter to his attention so that further information might be obtained?

Mr. Greene: I would certainly have no objection to that.

GRAIN

RAPESEED—PROVISION OF BOXCARS FOR ADDITIONAL QUOTA

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I should like to direct my question to the Minister without Portfolio who is responsible for the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Wheat Board has recently announced an additional five bushel quota for rapeseed, have efforts been made to provide boxcars to handle this quota at places where rapeseed is available?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the program for boxcars involves the demands not only for rapeseed but other grains. Due consideration is given to the demand for cars for rapeseed at the ports in deciding the allocation of boxcars.

[Mr. Speaker.]

UTILIZATION OF LAKEHEAD TERMINAL SPACE

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister without Portfolio. Following the debate on available space at the Lakehead terminals in which the opposition pointed out to the minister the necessity of assisting farmers in their financial difficulties by filling the space as soon as possible, has the minister come to any decision in this regard?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the decision in regard to filling space was clear before the opposition made any point of the matter. The space will be filled methodically and effectively and is being filled at the rate of several million bushels of grain a week.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the Minister without Portfolio is a follow-up to the question I directed to the acting minister last week in the minister's absence. Has he now had any consultations with the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool in view of the concern expressed by that organization that space at the Lakehead would not be filled by the opening of navigation and that this would hinder the loading of boats for export?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I have been speaking to the president and other members of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool on other matters and we did give some attention to this issue as well, including the ability of the Wheat Pool to handle the number of boxcars programmed for it to the end of the period. It appears they are confident of their ability to handle cars in accordance with the schedule. Reports of loading indicate that the number of cars from Saskatchewan has increased rather markedly recently and this will be reflected in unloadings available for the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool terminal.

PROVISION OF ONE-BUSHEL QUOTA

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. How soon may all those points—nearly half of the delivery points on the prairies which are still on the unit quota—expect to receive a one-bushel quota?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I would not want to put a specific date on it but the movement of grain from the unit quota points is very rapid and I

would expect to see the opening of the one-bushel quota across the prairies very quickly, as well as a move to two fairly rapidly thereafter.

Mr. Horner: It could have been two months ago if you had filled up the terminals.

FINAL PAYMENTS FOR 1968-69 CROP YEAR

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is directed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of recent statements by the minister to the effect that "there is no reason at all for farmers to be optimistic about receiving a final payment", is the minister in a position to announce whether there will be a final payment and, if not, when will he be making this announcement to the House?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I do not have anything to add at this point to the discussion of a few days ago about the wheat pool. However, I think I should add, for the benefit of the hon. member for Crowfoot, that we could hardly fill the space available for grain before it was empty and 44 million bushels of grain were moved out in December.

UNITED NATIONS

WORLD FOOD PROGRAM—MODIFICATION OF CANADA'S EFFORTS

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister indicate what steps have been taken by the government to accommodate the request by the Director General of the World Food Program that Canada modify its $30 million effort in terms of the type of commodities to be provided to this program?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's interpretation of what Mr. Aquino said is completely inaccurate.

Mr. Lundrigan: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Despite my voice being a bit raspy I rise on a question of privilege. The minister has made the allegation that I have interpreted something inaccurately. I did not interpret anything. I simply asked the minister whether the government planned to modify its contribution to the world food program inasmuch as the Director General has been asking for a modification of Canada's efforts. The minister has implied that I am misrepresenting the facts.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

OIL

TYPE OF APPOINTMENTS TO ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLICY

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Does the government intend to make further appointments to the advisory committee on oil policy in order to offset the heavy representation of international oil companies on that committee?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, there is no intention at the present time of changing the make-up of the committee which has a balance of people who have very expert knowledge in the fields of production, transportation and marketing of oil products. It is a highly expert committee. Other interests will be considered, of course, outside the scope of the advisory committee, but we feel it is very well cut out to do the job required, that of giving expert advice from the private sector to ourselves in the area of possible policy-making.

Mr. Skoreyko: Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider appointing additional independents to that committee as quickly as possible?

Mr. Greene: There are, of course, representatives of the independent oil industry specifically nominated by IPAC on the committee.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, would the minister advise why six, I believe, of the ten members of that committee are citizens of countries other than Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think the question as asked is argumentative.

POLLUTION

ALLEGED OIL CONTAMINATION OF LAKE ERIE BY CANADIANS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. In view of the very serious differences of opinion between the United States and Canada regarding oil pollution by Canadians

on our side of Lake Erie, would the minister state whether or not he has been in contact with the United States authorities on this question?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

TAX RELIEF AS INCENTIVE FOR REMEDIAL PROGRAMS

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, since we are dealing with pollution and in view of the fact that many industries have announced programs involving millions of dollars in the battle against pollution, is the minister giving serious consideration to the granting of tax relief as an incentive for such programs? I ask the question particularly because in Hamilton an announcement has been made by Stelco and Dofasco that they are making commitments in respect of this type of program to the extent of $68 million.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest that the hon. member is asking the minister to make a policy statement which perhaps should be made on motions.

Mr. Alexander: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that I thought I had indicated in my question that I was seeking a statement on motions, I would ask now whether the minister would be prepared to make such a statement on motions?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I think that the policy of the government is very clear within the ambit of the Canada Water Act, that is, that the polluter must pay.

Mr. Alexander: No fines, no standards, no nothing.

Mr. Speaker: The minister cannot make a statement now.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS

REFERENCE OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL STUDY TO COMMITTEE

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): In the absence of the Secretary of State perhaps I may be allowed to direct my question to the Minister of National Defence. Has any decision yet been taken to refer to a standing committee of the House, either the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs or the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, the results of the study being carried out by the interdepartmental committee on distinguished service awards?

[Mr. Rynard.]

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): May I say, to reply to the question directly, that the answer is no.

Mr. MacLean: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the House that decorations of a given grade will not under any circumstances, solely by reason of being uniquely Canadian, take precedence over Commonwealth awards that have been awarded to Canadians in the past?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, may I say, to the extent that I can speak about the Canadian awards that are now granted, that they do not take precedence, for instance, over the Victoria Cross or the George Cross. I believe it is to be assumed that whenever the new awards are recommended a classification will be made. I am sure that the precedence of the awards now in existence and worn so proudly by veterans and military personnel will not be altered.

Mr. MacLean: I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and I will be very brief. In other words, the minister is saying that Commonwealth awards will not be categorized as foreign awards?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—ALLEGED MISTREATMENT OF BIAFRANS BY NIGERIAN SOLDIERS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of his exchange of views during the past few days with the British Prime Minister, is the Prime Minister in a position to confirm, deny or comment on reports of theft, looting and rape of Biafrans by Nigerian soldiers?

[*English*]

POLLUTION

ARCTIC WATERS—COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION RESPECTING HYDROCARBON POLLUTANTS

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Can he tell the House what action his department is taking in accordance with the report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and

Northern Development which urged immediate investigation and research into the action of hydrocarbon pollutants in the Arctic waters?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The research in respect of pollution in the north is carried out by my department, by the Department of Transport and by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Department of Fisheries. Certainly the subject matter to which the hon. member refers is very much under our surveillance at the present time.

Mr. St. Pierre: I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Can he advise us what action his department is taking as a result of that committee's recommendations?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will recognize that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources referred to the fact that a number of departments are concerned. I do not think it would be in order to direct a separate question to each minister concerned.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the questions that have been put by the hon. member for Coast Chilcotin and other hon. members this afternoon to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, would the Government House Leader consider bringing forward government order No. 62 with all due expedition, to wit, this week?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): I answered that question last week by indicating that we could undoubtedly deal with this matter more effectively in the form of legislation.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): In view of the fact that members of all parties are so anxious for this matter to be brought to a vote, would the President of the Privy Council reconsider his decision?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I have to bear in mind the fact that so many people in this country are anxious for us to get on with our legislative program.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This is our legislative program.

Mr. Baldwin: We dealt with seven bills last Friday.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There have been a number of supplementary questions on this subject and many members are anxious to ask questions.

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF LICENSING PROPOSALS RESPECTING SALMON

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I have a question for the President of the Privy Council which I am sure will not interfere with the legislative program.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): What legislative program?

Mr. Barnett: In light of the fact that the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry is holding its organization meeting later this afternoon, would the minister agree to an immediate reference to that committee of the licensing proposals with respect to Pacific coast salmon, to which proposal the Minister of Fisheries indicated his agreement last October 30?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): It seems to me that the first items of business to be dealt with are the three fisheries bills to which second reading was given last week. However, I will take the suggestion of the hon. member under consideration.

TRADE

REASON FOR LOSS OF ORDER BY DAVIE SHIPBUILDING COMPANY

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the loss of an order to build some 24 freighters worth $50 million, which involved the employment of 1,000 people by the Davie Shipbuilding Company Limited of Sorel, could the minister explain to the House why the Export Development Corporation could not provide the financing?

Mr. Speaker: I think this type of information should be given by way of a statement on motions.

Mr. Hales: May I reword my question, Mr. Speaker? Is it a fact that the Davie Shipbuilding Company lost this order for 24 freighters?

Mr. Speaker: I do not want to be difficult but certainly the question as asked is still not

in order. However, perhaps the minister might like to give the House the information sought by the hon. member.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): It is a difficult question to answer because the Export Development Corporation is very much master of its own decisions. In this particular case they have assessed the project and have found it impossible to accept on economic grounds as well as in view of "standards", on "prevailing philosophy" which exist in the world on matters such as the quantum of financing; the level of interest.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to have to interrupt the minister but the minister's philosophical reply makes it evident that my interpretation of the situation was correct and that the question should have been asked in some other way.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INCREASE IN TRUCKING RATES BY QUEBEC TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question for the Minister of Finance but in view of his absence, which I regret very much, I will direct my question to the Minister without Portfolio, the hon. member for Windsor West. Has he anything to report to the House following the undertaking by the Minister of Finance last week that he would check into the increase in Quebec-Ontario truck rates authorized last week to see whether any representations could be made by the government in light of the government's policy of restraint?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): I will take this question under advisement and attempt to provide an answer for my hon. friend at an early date.

HOUSING

INQUIRY AS TO ANNOUNCEMENT OF PUBLIC HOUSING POLICY

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. In light of recent reports that in Metropolitan Toronto alone some 15,000 families are on the waiting list for public housing and there are probably as many more in need of housing, is the minister going to announce soon the government's policy in respect of expanding the stock of public housing?

[Mr. Speaker.]

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): In 1969 through our two low-income housing programs we are committed to 27,659 self-contained units, which was twice the figure of any previous year's performance. If I can book time with the House Leader I will be making a statement on the 1970 capital budget of CMHC early next week. I can tell the House in advance that it will show even further emphasis on the provision of low income housing during 1970.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

MANPOWER

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS

Mr. D. Gordon Blair (Grenville-Carleton): My question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and it arises from answers he gave earlier when he indicated that the results of the summer employment program for students last summer were being studied. Is the minister in a position to say whether he can make a report on motions on this important matter and, if so, when we may expect to receive such a report?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I believe I promised the House some months ago that I would make such a statement, and I will try to make it as soon as possible.

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

GOLD MINING—POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Is he in a position to indicate to us whether gold mining grants will be renewed or increased in an effort to help mining regions attain economic and social stability?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, as this matter comes within the purview of my colleague the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, may I suggest that this question be directed to him.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not the minister has understood the question. Is he in a position to indicate to us whether gold mining grants will be renewed or increased in an effort to help mining regions attain economic and social stability?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, this matter is now under consideration by the officials of my department and I have not received a report yet.

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN—RETURN OF CANADIAN BOXCARS FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport who, according to the roster, was to have been present today; in his absence I will direct it to the acting minister. In view of current reports from the United States that the tremendous grain boxcar shortage may result in legislation to rectify the situation, can the minister advise the House what steps, if any, he is taking to make sure that Canadian boxcars now in use in the United States are being returned to Canada within the prescribed time limit?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice. The minister, who is presently in Newfoundland on business, will answer the question when he returns to the House, probably on Thursday.

[*English*]

Mr. Southam: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When the Parliamentary Secretary is advising the minister would he also transmit this question to him? Would the minister consider a materially increased daily rental or demurrage charge on Canadian boxcars being used in the United States in order to ensure the speedy return of our rolling stock?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION OF PURCHASING POLICY

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, since union correspondence with the government indicates that the purchasing policy of Devco in some cases is creating a safety hazard, if there is a responsible minister will he investigate this matter in view of the Prime Minister's lack of interest in his just society?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Churchill.

POLLUTION

ACTION RESPECTING CONTAMINATION OF SASKATCHEWAN RIVER BY MERCURY

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the minister's statements concerning the source of pollution in the Saskatchewan River, in which he attributed the source of the pollution to the Interprovincial Co-operative downstream from Saskatoon, and in view of the statements by a representative of this industry that it is not the source of the pollution—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should ask his question. We are running short of time.

Mr. Simpson: Has the minister anything further to add to the statements which he made?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen any statements attributed to company representatives. However, I have seen confirmation of my statements from other sources.

IMMIGRATION

REQUEST FOR POLITICAL ASYLUM BY POLISH SEAMEN

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Would the minister say if he is ready to report to the House as to the disposition of the Polish sailors who jumped their ship in Halifax before Christmas, seeking political asylum in Canada?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have examined these cases and in light of all the circumstances have decided to permit these seamen to remain in Canada under minister's permit.

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

Mr. Paproski: As a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member might wait until tomorrow to put a supplementary question because there are so many members of the House who wish to ask questions now.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Paproski: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to thank the minister.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, before asking my question may I also thank the minister very warmly for his decision on this matter.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—POSSIBILITY OF CANADIAN PEACEKEEPING FORCE

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. As the result of a government decision is the Department of National Defence now preparing a potential peacekeeping force for Nigeria from Mobile Command's complement at Camp Petawawa?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Forrestall: As a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North. I apologize to the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. I realize he has been trying to ask questions, and on reflection perhaps I should allow him a supplementary.

Mr. Forrestall: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would not have thought ill of you if you had not. May I ask the Minister of National Defence what was the purpose of the immunization process, the needle process, that members of this group were subjected to if it was not for them to go to Biafra-Nigeria?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of National Defence. It is related to the question of my colleague from Dartmouth-Halifax-East.

I would like to know whether the Canadian government has made or is making representations to the United Nations to have a peace corps formed and sent to Nigeria, more particularly to Biafra. If so, would Canada be a participant?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the matter has been considered and I must say that it does not seem necessary to me. To my mind, the civil war is really over.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*English*]

FISHERIES AND FORESTRY

RETENTION ON STAFF OF DR. K. J. KOLLER

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Has his department been able to find a method by which Dr. K. J. Koller, who came to Canada at the time of the Hungarian revolution and was a research scientist in his department, can be kept on staff?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question should be placed on the Order Paper.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

EFFECT OF CLOSING OF VETERANS LAND ACT OFFICES OUTSIDE BIG CITIES

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. It deals with the decision to close full-time offices of the Veterans Land Act administration branch which have been helping veterans in the field outside the big cities. Does closing the full-time VLA office at Drumheller, Alberta, and the drastic reduction of services there represent a decision by the minister to reduce the amount of help that the government is giving veterans generally across the country?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question should be placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Schumacher: Ten o'clock.

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

STE. SCHOLASTIQUE—APPOINTMENT OF WORKS CO-ORDINATOR

Mr. George Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Could he tell us whether the head of his Montreal regional office has recently been appointed works co-ordinator for the Sainte-Scholastique airport and would he give us a definition of the duties of this person?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question could also be placed on the Order Paper.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I would ask

you to repeat the reasons why my question was ruled out of order, since I did not hear them.

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion I made to the hon. member for Sainte-Marie was that his question should be placed on the Order Paper. If there is some urgency, the hon. member could notify me and the question could be discussed at the time of adjournment.

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

In my opinion, there is some urgency, because construction of the airport in Sainte-Scholastique is about to start, as recently announced by the government, and since it is quite an important item of the estimates, I think that the House is entitled to receive an answer.

[*English*]

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR REFERENCE OF QUOTA SYSTEM CHANGES TO COMMITTEE

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of the fact that the minister has established a committee to formulate changes in the quota system for grains marketed through the Canadian Wheat Board, will he refer the proposed changes in the quota system to the Standing Committee on Agriculture?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): I will certainly give consideration to that representation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre on a point of order.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the three fisheries bills which the Government House Leader had slated for consideration either tomorrow or Thursday were disposed of last Friday—parenthetically I might say that this happened when he was away; in fact, we did seven bills on Friday—could the minister tell us what we will be doing tomorrow?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, the first question that comes to my mind is how is it possible to do seven bills in one day but only one bill in six days?

Mr. Baldwin: It depends on the bill.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The minister was away.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May I remind hon. members that I was away on several of the other six days as well, but not—

An hon. Member: Not enough.

Mr. MacInnis: Why are you away so much?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am prepared to undertake to be away from the House if this is the only thing that prevents the opposition from getting down to business.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, for tomorrow we will call the second bill dealing with the Company of Young Canadians, and I understand there is a disposition to pass it in one sitting day. Following that I propose that we might call on Thursday—and it is for this reason I sent a note to the hon. member suggesting a House Leaders' meeting later today—government order No. 14, the report stage and third reading of the Railway Act amending bill, to be followed by government order No. 19, the amendment to the Canada Student Loans Act, to be followed in turn by government order No. 12, with respect to the Small Businesses Loans Act, and this to be followed in turn by the amendment to the Quebec Savings Banks Act. The business to follow would be the motor vehicle traffic safety legislation.

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

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and wish to direct my remarks to the Government House Leader. So that a number of hon. members will not have to spend unnecessary time and labour on reports, can the Government House Leader assure the House that, in view of the fate of the recent report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the forthcoming report of the Standing Committee on

Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, which is studying the proposals of the Minister of Finance, will not suffer the same fate?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I must say—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate rising on a point of order?

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, perhaps it is a point of order. When replying to a question earlier today about the world food program the Minister of Agriculture, perhaps inadvertently, left the wrong impression with the House, that impression being contrary to what has been stated by the Director General of the World Food Program. I am wondering if the minister would make a statement on motions in order to clear up the situation so that the House may be aware of the actual truth?

Mr. Olson: Replying to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the question I raised had to do with whether or not Canada had been specifically requested to change the content of its aid. That, of course, refers to commodities. The reason I said there had been an inaccurate interpretation was that there was no specific request to Canada to change the content.

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that perhaps we should go on with orders of the day, but if the hon. member wishes to rise on a point of order I will recognize him.

Mr. Simpson: Mr. Speaker, my point of order has to do with the very important matter of pollution of the Saskatchewan River.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I trust that the hon. member will indicate to the Chair the point of order he proposes to raise. Perhaps he ought to refer to the Standing Orders of the House.

Mr. Simpson: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is based on the fact that the minister responsible assured the House that in the opinion of his officials the particular plant referred to is the principal, if not the only, source of mercury pollution in the Saskatchewan River. Reports indicate that the plant has denied—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot, with respect and after allowing all charitable considerations, to prevail, allow the hon. member to pursue that matter as a point of order. If every hon. member who disagrees with a reply given to him by a minister raises a point of order we could spend the better part of our time discussing such points of order. To my mind this is a matter for debate and should not be raised as a point of procedure, or if the hon. members wishes to he can raise the matter again at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Simpson: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE

The House resumed from Monday, January 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau:

That a Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That twenty members of the House of Commons, to be designated by the House at a later date, be members of the joint committee on the part of this House;

That the committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House;

That the committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

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

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes at my disposal yesterday evening I tried to make the point that we are having tremendous difficulty in amending our constitution partly because of the fundamentally different approach to the matter adopted by this government under the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the provinces, and this remark applies to all provinces

regardless of the political party that forms the provincial government. There is an impression abroad that the Prime Minister is interested in changing the constitution only so far as that change will spell out the rights of French speaking people of Canada and give them an equal opportunity to use their language in all parts of Canada. It seems to some that that is the only aspect in which this government is interested. The provinces are tremendously interested in a whole range of priorities and in financing programs for which, under the provisions of the BNA Act, they are responsible.

The hon. member for Palliser (Mr. Schumacher) who spoke last night suggested that in amending the constitution we might consider limiting the taxing powers of the government and the amount of money it can spend. In his introductory remarks yesterday the Prime Minister pointed out that between 1954 and 1964 the expenditures of the federal government had increased only by about 56 per cent, while the expenditures of provincial governments increased by some 204 per cent. The expenditures of my province, Manitoba, between the years 1958 and 1968 rose, under a Conservative government, from about $80 million annually to over $350 million annually, an increase of about 400 per cent. I am not criticizing the former Conservative government headed by former Premier Roblin for being a spending government. The money had to be spent simply because the Conservative government of Manitoba realized that it was necessary to bring Manitoba into the twentieth century in such fields as education, health and welfare, the building of roads and other important fields under provincial jurisdiction.

Not many years ago most young people in this country, and particularly those living in rural areas, did not attend high school. Today, the program under which young people may attend high school extends to almost all parts of Canada. Indeed, there has been a fantastic increase in the percentage of our young people attending universities. In this field the provinces must play an important role and face tremendous expenditures. I am certain that most provinces would be more than happy if the federal government were prepared to take over either the responsibility of financing university education or make available sources of taxation which the provinces could use to finance education. As yet, however, there is no indication that the federal government is interested in even discussing this matter with the provinces.

We have seen an astronomical increase in provincial expenditures and responsibilities in the fields of health and welfare. Every province of Canada now has a provincial hospitalization program under which hospital expenses are paid by the province and not the individual who must go to hospital. Similarly, in the very near future every province in Canada will be participating in the medicare plan proposed by the federal government and financed jointly by the federal government and the provinces. All this has meant, and will mean, a tremendous increase in provincial spending. The provinces will need more money and they cannot help but be disturbed by the almost casual announcement the Prime Minister made, an announcement that was echoed by some of his ministers, that the federal government is thinking of getting out of programs in which it persuaded provinces to participate. There are similar problems of urban blight, urban renewal and the provision of housing for people in the low income brackets, people on welfare and, indeed people in middle income brackets who are finding that their incomes today are not sufficient to enable them to purchase a house using the normal methods of financing.

• (3:00 p.m.)

A few moments ago, in answer to a question put by my colleague the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) in charge of housing reported that last year the federal government had financed the building of approximately 29,000 public housing units. That, Mr. Speaker, is just over 10 per cent of the total number of houses built last year. Only 10 per cent of the houses built last year were for the people who needed them most. People earning $6,000 or $7,000 a year cannot purchase a house and must rent accommodation. These are the people who require public housing, yet the minister has announced that just over 10 per cent of the houses built last year were of this type.

I suggest the people who are in the income bracket between $12,000 and $20,000, and sometimes in excess of that, can wait for housing. They already have adequate housing. The people to whom I am referring are earning under $6,000 a year and are living in the central cores of the cities in dilapidated housing. These people require more than 10 per cent of the total housing being built in this country. How will this requirement be met when the federal government under the present Prime Minister, believes that the prob-

lems of the cities are a provincial responsibility, that the federal government should not take a leading role in such problems as building homes and rapid transit systems so that people can move to the centre of the city where they work. How can we get the federal government to accept this responsibility? Because the provinces do not receive the required leadership from the federal government, they are not too concerned about constitutional conferences to be held in the future. They are not interested because the federal government is not dealing with the problems which are of primary concern to them.

One problem which has come to the fore and is being discussed in the press, on television is pollution. The problem of pollution is one in which the jurisdiction is divided between the federal, provincial and municipal governments. During the question period today, the hon. member for Churchill (Mr. Simpson) directed a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) about the pollution problem in Manitoba. Fish in Manitoba lakes have been found to contain mercury poisoning. This mercury was dumped into the rivers in Saskatchewan, carried into lakes in Manitoba and is now poisoning the fish in Lake Manitoba. This is an interprovincial problem which requires participation by the federal government. Even though a couple of weeks ago the minister made a very good speech when introducing the bill on water control, there is not much indication that the federal government intends to move into this field.

The provinces are concerned about air pollution which can vary from one province to another. They are also concerned about pollution of our rivers and lakes by the cities which have not provided for the adequate treatment of the water dumped into these rivers and lakes by their sewage disposal systems. I spoke of this problem a few days ago, Mr. Speaker. I again want to put on record that the city of Montreal, with a population of 2½ million, dumps 93 per cent of its sewage into the St. Lawrence River in an untreated state. Quebec city, which is represented by one of the leading ministers of this government, dumps 100 per cent of its sewage into the St. Lawrence River in an untreated state. Halifax follows a similar procedure. I am certain the municipal authorities of the cities to which I have referred are just as concerned about polluting the waters surrounding them as the mayors and representatives of other cities in Canada.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

These cities are faced with tremendous financial problems. The proper treatment of sewage in the city of Montreal would cost approximately $100 million. We are all aware of the financial crisis being faced by the city of Montreal. This city has tremendously high local taxes and cannot afford to do the job which is required. This government has not shown any signs of introducing a program of grants or low cost loans to the city of Montreal to finance adequate sewage treatment facilities. I feel this is an illustration of this government's approach to the problems of the cities. No matter how important their problems are, they must be kept at arm's length from the federal government.

I was amused when I listened to the hon. member for Etobicoke (Mr. Gillespie) last night. He suggested that representatives of the municipalities should be present at these constitutional conferences. I think this is an excellent idea, but the hon. member should consider how that suggestion fits in with the Prime Minister's view that the cities are solely the creatures of provincial governments and, therefore, they have no right—indeed there is no need—for them to be present at federal-provincial conferences. Of course, they can attend these conferences if the provinces make arrangements for them to be part of their delegation, but the municipalities have no constitutional right as far as the Prime Minister and the federal government are concerned.

The problems which concern the people of Canada are the day to day bread and butter problems of work, housing, environment and a better life, qualitatively and materially. These are the problems which this government has put into the background. Although the legislation that we are being asked to deal with is important, it is not designed to improve the living conditions of the people of Canada. It is for this reason that there has been a lessening of interest in the constitutional problems of this country.

I urge the government to reconsider its position and to come to the constitutional conferences with the provinces with specific proposals. The people of Canada are not concerned whether the problems are solved by the federal, provincial or municipal governments. They are desirous of their problems being solved, their needs being looked after and not being put off to another day or year because one government or the other disclaims responsibility.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) told us yesterday that we have to talk to each other quite frankly. I hope to follow his guidelines and speak as frankly as I can about the constitutional position which he put forward yesterday on behalf of his party and, to use his words, to do so without offence.

I must say that the performance of the Leader of the Opposition yesterday was curious and unconvincing. As a statement of his party's policy on the constitution, it was contradictory and self-defeating. Indeed, at times his contradictions verged on the brink of incoherence. He complained that Parliament had not been consulted on the constitutional reforms, the revision of the constitution. Well, Parliament is being consulted now. After he spoke, the nation was no wiser as to where his party stood on the great question of the constitution. It is regrettable from the point of view of reaching a consensus in the House that, having heard the Leader of the Opposition, no one is any wiser as to the stand taken by his party on essential constitutional issues. What has happened to the party of Sir John A. Macdonald, of Borden, Meighen, Diefenbaker, when it is silent in this great debate and has no stand to put before the House?

• (3:10 p.m.)

We thought this debate would afford us an opportunity to hear the views of the opposition. We thought the Leader of the Opposition would grasp the occasion to outline the position of his party. The fact is, we now know less than we did before. We thought we knew where he stood before he spoke, but after he spoke we were no longer certain. At one point he stated he was "not as confused as all that". His followers seemed to be grateful for this assurance, because that remark brought the first burst of applause from the opposition benches.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I don't hear the Prime Minister applauding you.

Mr. MacEachen: In spite of the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition or, indeed, because of it, I am convinced the government has followed the right course, first, in opening up the subject for debate at the urging of the provinces and, second, in seeking a national consensus, as well as in its assessment of the results achieved to date.

The debate has been going on for two years. It has been made a public debate because of the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) insistence that the people be made aware of what is going on. The Leader of the Opposition shouts: "Bring in the people." Well, the people have been in on this debate from the very beginning through the medium of television. For some reason, the Leader of the Opposition seems to be unaware, not only of the significance of the constitutional process, but also of the fact that the debate itself has been an open and continuing one. Now, he is showing a curious reluctance to grasp the fundamental issue before the House.

Parliament is being asked, or it will be later in the committee, to pronounce its views on vital issues concerned with constitutional reform and affecting Canadians from coast to coast. This is an opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition and his party to put on record their stand on these great issues.

All we heard from the Leader of the Opposition was a lugubrious lamentation. No doubt, this statement of his will be known as the "our days are numbered" speech. Matters of language rights, social rights, the distribution of powers, relations between senior levels of government, shared-cost programs, powers for dealing with regional disparity—these, together with a multitude of other considerations, have been brought out during the debate in a search for a national consensus. Surely, the process of bringing these issues before Canadians on the part of the Prime Minister should not, in the name of constructive criticism, be arbitrarily described, as it was by the Leader of the Opposition, as a total failure. The hon. gentleman stated that the federal-provincial meetings had demonstrated practically no progress.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: The Leader of the Opposition made an important statement yesterday. He said important things—important and wrong things. Anyone who has attempted to follow the progress of the constitutional discussion is bound to reach the conclusion that progress has, indeed, been made.

Mr. Baldwin: Backwards.

Mr. MacEachen: I want to place on record for the benefit of members of the House and, I hope, of the public a list of what I believe to be important areas of progress since this process began.

Canadian Constitution

1. There has been agreement between the Government of Canada and the provincial governments to enter upon a complete review of the constitution. At the first conference, in 1968, there was agreement to examine highly important questions including the official languages, fundamental rights, the distribution of powers, regional disparity, amending procedures, the mechanism of federal-provincial relations, and so on. Later, at the second conference, it was agreed to undertake a comprehensive review of the constitution of Canada, including the possibility of adopting an entirely new constitution.

2. A second step, and one which I believe to be of great importance, was the establishment of the machinery necessary to undertake this review. It was brought about by setting up a continuing conference composed of the Prime Minister and the premiers, together with a continuing committee, or secretariat, of officials to assist them.

3. The third item I would place before the House is the adoption of a firm position on language rights. Hon. members will recall the atmosphere in which the conference of February, 1968 was held, and I was relieved, as, indeed, many people were, including the participants, when the conference agreed to recognize, as proposed by the Commission on Biculturalism and Bilingualism and as a matter of equity, that French-speaking Canadians outside Quebec should have the same rights as English-speaking Canadians in Quebec. The late Daniel Johnson attended that conference and I remember his comments following the adoption of that principle by the conference.

4. There has been agreement that reduction of regional disparities is an objective of confederation. There was agreement that the federal government should have the power to alleviate regional disparities as they affected the income of individuals, the quality of economic development and the standards of public services. Undoubtedly this agreement for the inclusion of the objectives of the elimination of regional disparities should be made part of the preamble to the constitution. There was an agreement further, as I read the proceedings, that if the difficulty of effecting the supremacy of Parliament and judicial review could be overcome, there would be an obligation imposed to achieve the goal of the elimination of regional disparity.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Remember, too, what the premier of Nova Scotia said of the conference when he discussed this issue. I looked it up last night. He was debating, at the conference, the inclusion of this objective in a new constitution. He said as follows:

> I believe the inclusion of a type of statement in the preamble we have been talking about, (namely the eradication of regional disparity) as an objective of confederation is a great step forward, accompanied by providing powers which would enable that objective to be followed and pursued. We have certainly got something in the constitution we have never had before or will have when we have that new constitution.

That is the view of the premier of Nova Scotia and his colleagues from the Atlantic provinces as well as elsewhere in Canada who felt that the inclusion of this goal in the constitution was an objective of paramount importance. When it was achieved, the premier of Nova Scotia said it was a great step forward. I wonder how he feels now that his one-time colleague from Nova Scotia describes his efforts as practically no progress at all. That is number four.

5. Number five was an agreement at the constitutional conference that the national capital should reflect the two cultural groups of Canada. That is rather important to many people, including members of this House of Commons. It was agreed in February 1969 that steps must be taken to ensure that the two official languages and the cultural values common to all Canadians were recognized in the capital region, so that all Canadians may have a feeling of pride, participation in and attachment to their capital. This was a step forward.

6. Number six was agreement in principle on powers of taxation. This has been totally ignored in the debate so far, but the working session of the constitutional conference in June 1969 generally agreed on the principle of access by both federal and provincial governments instead of the principle of allocation. There was general agreement on powers of taxation reached at this conference.

7. Number seven was agreement in principle on the spending powers of Parliament. It is surprising that the Leader of the Opposition did not speak of the very definite movement toward reconciliation on this important issue of the use of the federal spending power in fields of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

I read the proceedings again. There was a definite movement towards a consensus and it was agreed, even by Quebec, that Parliament should have the power to make conditional grants to provinces, subject to a formula to determine a consensus and for compensation to non-participating provinces.

Mr. Baldwin: Even a glacier has movement.

Mr. MacEachen: Well, that is a very important movement. No wonder the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) is so sensitive because he, too, joined last night in the unfounded allegations of his leader that no progress had been made. Even that progress would justify these conferences because it does provide a developing consensus on one of the issues that has bedevilled, at least in the minds of many, the whole field of federal-provincial relations.

The federal government, through its spending power has moved into fields of exclusive provincial jurisdiction with shared cost programs. Here is a method proposed by which a consensus could be reached before that power would be used. That is number seven.

8. Number eight was at the last conference, an initiation of consideration of income security and social services. That began with the third conference in December 1969 and will continue. I want to come back to the question of social services and income security. It is surprising that the members of the NDP would suggest that there has been no attention to social needs when the first document in the field of the distribution of powers was directed to the whole question of how the power in the field of income security and social services should be exercised between the government of Canada and the governments of the provinces.

The NDP accuses us of not dealing with social needs at the constitutional conference. The Leader of the Opposition asked, "why have you chosen welfare?" We have chosen it, however, and I want to say something more about it.

9. The ninth achievement that I would lay down is that, as in all processes involving bargaining, there have been a lot of issues clarified and a lot of positions placed on the table. Positions have been taken by the provinces and by the federal government. The federal government insofar as issues already dealt with, had made its position fully known, the Quebec government has made its position known totally, and many of the provinces are laying their positions on the table as well.

To suggest, as has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Peace River, that no progress has been made in this effort is to fly in the face of the facts and to take a position that can only be based on total misinformation or blind partisanship. No one else has done that. Certainly no premier. Most certainly, the premier of Nova Scotia, would not line up behind the opposition and say there has been no progress at all.

The Leader of the Opposition came close to suggesting that the federal-provincial conference, as an instrument of constitutional revision, should be junked altogether, that the provinces should be left out. This seemed to be what he suggested in one or two places in his speech. It may be, he said, that the committee will decide that the method chosen by the Prime Minister and the government is not working and that another method of approach, perhaps one quite substantially different, might well produce results. It is evident to all of us, he said, that the method of federal-provincial conferences is not working, and he invited the committee to junk it and find something else. I read the speech not once, but twice, and it left an area of doubt as to whether the Leader of the Opposition really believed that the provinces should be included at all in this whole process of constitutional reform.

I conclude this part of my speech by asking the Leader of the Opposition if he believes that the nine areas I have discussed are meaningless, useless and trivial, and that no progress at all has been made?

The Leader of the Opposition moved on to ask why we selected welfare rather than pollution, for example, for discussion at the constitutional conference. I am sure that if we had selected pollution as the first item in the field of distribution of powers, he would have asked why we had not chosen the important field of social welfare.

I want to move into the subject a little bit by asking the Leader of the Opposition whether he is an adherent of the school of the instant constitution, and that someday there will arrive on his desk by some miracle a full blown constitution with all subject matters delineated perfectly for him. Does he believe that the re-writing of the Canadian constitution involves a consideration of each subject matter, a discussion of each power and a decision on each power as to whether it ought to be exercised exclusively by the federal or provincial governments, or concurrently, or in some other manner? If that is the answer, as I think it is, then one must start somewhere and choose among the many important and complex areas such as income, security and social services, economic growth, pollution, housing, urban transportation, the credit system, the financial markets, education,

resources management, labour relations and manpower, culture and communication, to mention some of the issues that have to be resolved in this process.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. minister but I am afraid his time has expired. Is there unanimous consent to allow the minister to continue?

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, let me say on a point of order, as one who has become involved with the number of speakers for today, that we are going to run into extreme difficulty. We have a long list of important speakers. May I suggest that each speaker be allowed to take one or two minutes to complete his remarks or finish a sentence or two, but no more. I appreciate that this courtesy was granted yesterday, but I feel we will be in trouble if we allow more than an extra minute or two.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All I can do at this point is ask whether there is agreement to allow the hon. minister to continue. The minister might bear in mind the recommendations of the hon. member.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I agree that there is a time limitation. I thank hon. members for their courtesy in granting a minute or two, but I believe I should rest my case at this stage and let other hon. members, possibly some of the leaders in the opposition, indicate what their position is on some of these points.

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, when one enters the debate at this stage one finds himself in the rather unenviable position of having to discuss matters which have already been very thoroughly discussed by the speakers who have preceded him, all of whom are very knowledgeable on the subject matter of the resolution. I am not quite sure at this point whether I should include the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) in that category. I must say I was very disappointed because I thought, as a minister of the crown, he would make some valuable contribution to the subject matter of this resolution rather than devote all of his time to a criticism of the points put forward yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

I listened yesterday with a great deal of interest to the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). As he led off this debate, I was forced to come to the conclusion that this resolution is on the order paper today and is being debated in this house now, not because the Prime Minister of Canada has any burning desire to present a revised constitution to the people of Canada, but rather and perhaps only because oppoisition parties in this House and many of the premiers in Canada have been pressuring him now for many years to do this very thing. It is only now, at this late date, that he has got around to doing it. Let me quote in support of that proposition from his speech of yesterday. We find at page 2811 of *Hansard* that he is recorded as having said:

> Indeed, parties of the opposition have pressed the government for many months, and even over a period of two sessions, to set up this committee. I believe that this reflects on the part of hon. members a very great desire of participating in the constitutional debate taking place in this country.

He does not point out that he has any great desire to press this matter or to take part in this debate.

Again, at page 2812 of *Hansard,* in speaking of the conference called by Premier Robarts, the Prime Minister is recorded as stating:

> Not only did we not participate in the 1967 conference, but in the years prior to that we had taken the very clear position that the constitution was not the most urgent thing to be dealt with, that there were many problems facing Canadians which could be dealt with under the British North America Act. Although we were not prepared to discuss the subject, we urged the provinces and the public at large to regard these exercises with a certain amount of deliberation.

To me, that is a very clear indication that had it not been for pressure put on the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada by opposition parties in this House, and had it not been for the pressure put on him by the premiers of Canada, this resolution would never perhaps have appeared on the Order Paper, or at least not for a long time. I suggest that the Prime Minister of Canada need not be afraid of constitutional amendment as such, and he particularly need not believe that by introducing amendments to the constitution he is breaking new ground.

History tells us, if we examine it, that during the years from 1774 to 1867, during the period that Canada was under British rule, the British Parliament saw fit to adopt four different constitutions. From 1774 to 1791, we had the Quebec Act. From 1791 to 1840 we had the constitutional Act. From 1840 to 1867 we were governed by the Act of Union, and from 1867 to the present time we have been governed by the British North America Act. Let me point out to the Prime

Minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that since the British North America Act was enacted in 1867 we have had at least 30 constitutional amendments.

The constitution is not an eternal document and it was never intended as such. It is indeed an important document, and certainly one which we must adhere to and respect while it is in effect. But there is nothing so sacrosanct about it that it cannot, and indeed should not, be changed when it ceases to fit in with the needs of the times, or when it ceases to do the job it was originally intended to do. Things have changed since 1867. For example, the relationships between the federal and provincial governments have changed, and at least certain elements of the constitution by reason of these changes are now in need of review.

Yesterday the Prime Minister said that a great deal of preparatory work must go into this matter of constitutional change and amendment. I agree with that statement. This is certainly not a job which can be undertaken lightly. All aspects of constitutional change must be looked at and looked at very carefully, but they need not all necessarily be looked at at once. I suggest that priorities should be set up.

I agree that the British North America Act is a rather closely knit document and that one section of it is more or less interrelated with the other, but that does not necessarily rule out the advisability of first considering those parts of the document—and there are some—which already have been the source of discontent between the provinces and the federal government. One of those sources of discontent, and perhaps one of the more prominent ones, is the spending power of the federal government—the power of the federal government to make grants of any kind in areas considered exclusively provincial jurisdiction.

For example, I have in mind health and welfare, education, roads and things like these which are ordinarily considered to be matters exclusively within provincial jurisdiction. There is an element of uncertainty as to whether or not the federal government has the power to grant money to the provinces for these particular things. This uncertainty must be clarified as quickly as possible in respect of any constitution which may be drawn up. I suggest that the spending powers of the federal government must be clearly and unequivocally set out so that there can be no question but that the government of Canada constitutionally is free to help the poor provinces financially.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration said this is now mentioned in the preamble. He made a great to-do about how much had been accomplished so far. I would point out to the minister that these matters have been pressed on the federal government by the premiers of the provinces of Canada now for some three or four years, and up until now no concrete action has been taken by the government of the country to bring these matters before the House of Commons. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration even bragged about how much this government has done in the line of constitutional amendments. It must be very definitely set out that this Parliament will have the power constitutionally to make grants to the poorer provinces of Canada even in those areas which are now considered to be areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

Sections 91, 92 and 93 of the British North America Act enumerate the respective exclusive powers of the Parliament of Canada and the provincial legislatures. Sections 92 and 93 specify and detail the matters upon which this Parliament may not legislate. Section 91 sets out those matters upon which the provincial legislatures may not legislate. Section 91, for example, reserves to the Parliament of Canada—and this is specifically written into the section—such matters as post offices, defence, fisheries, banking, the criminal law and so on. As a matter of fact, there are some 28 items enumerated in that section as being the exclusive right of the Parliament of Canada. Sections 92 and 93, on the other hand, reserve some 20 or more items to the provincial legislatures only. Right now the battle between the provinces and the federal government—and there is a battle—is over the distribution of federal subsidies to the provinces. I suggest, in the interest of the provinces, especially the poorer provinces, this is a matter which must first be clarified; that is, whether or not the government of Canada has the right to divert money to the provinces in respect of matters which under the British North America Act are now matters of exclusive provincial jurisdiction.

Section 91 1A reserves to the Parliament of Canada the right to make laws respecting public debts and property. This has been interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada as giving to Parliament the power to grant

sums of money to the provinces. That decision was appealed to the Privy Council. The Privy Council cast some very serious doubt as to whether, under our present constitution, the Parliament of Canada may divert money for these purposes. I should like to read very briefly from the judgment delivered by the Privy Council. It is found in 1937 Appeal Cases at page 366. This is what the Privy Council said:

> But assuming that the Dominion has collected by means of taxation a fund, it by no means follows—

Listen to this:

> —that any legislation which disposes of it is necessarily within Dominion competence. It may still be legislation affecting the classes of subjects enumerated in Sec. 92 and, if so, would be ultra vires. In other words, Dominion legislation, even though it deals with Dominion property, may yet be so framed as to invade civil rights within the Province or encroach upon the classes of subjects which are reserved to provincial competence.

Interpreted strictly, this decision means that Parliament absolutely cannot legally make grants of any kind in areas of exclusive provincial jurisdiction. This is what the Supreme Court decision says.

Mr. Lewis: Surely not; that is not what it says.

Mr. McQuaid: That is what it says. It says, for example, this would mean, if we go by the provisions of the British North America Act and the decision of the Privy Council, that strictly speaking federal funds cannot be diverted, for example, to education, welfare, highways and civil rights. I agreed that this is being done, and certainly the provinces are not taking any exception to it. I am afraid, however, that if this is not clarified immediately in our constitution, some day some government—I am not suggesting this government—may say, "We do not need to give you any money because the constitution says that, strictly speaking, we should not give it to you". This would be very much to the disadvantage of the poorer provinces of Canada.

Let us not forget that today we live in a federal state. All of us, no matter in what province we may happen to live, are Canadians. Each of us is entitled to enjoy the same essential public services that are being enjoyed by other citizens of Canada in the richer provinces. Unfortunately, however, the tax raising potential of our provinces differs greatly and this difference arises out of the marked difference in the level of income across this country.

[Mr. McQuaid.]

I should like, if I may, to cite one or two examples to show that this is actually the case. Listen to this. The average weekly wage in Canada is $114. In the Atlantic area it is $91.37. I wonder how many members know what it is in Prince Edward Island. In Prince Edward Island, it is $75.97, which is $38.06 below the Canadian average. This compares to the Canadian average of $114. Every winter in my province between 15 per cent and 20 per cent of the people are unemployed. These figures are from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Half the farmers of Prince Edward Island have a gross income—not net—of $2,500 a year. As an indication of how heavily dependent we are on Ottawa I wish to point out that right now 62 per cent of our gross provincial revenue comes from the government of Canada.

Certainly, as one of the poorer provinces of Canada we cannot take any chance in respect of whether or not the Government of Canada has the constitutional right to transfer funds to the extent of 62 per cent of our revenue in order to help us. We have a total direct and guaranteed debt in Prince Edward Island of $107,635 thousand. That is a per capita debt of $970. This is one of the highest per capita debts in Canada. I suggest, in considering amendments to the constitution, the preservation of linguistic rights, revisions of the Senate and Supreme Court, the incorporation into the constitution of a bill of human rights and all such things are tremendously important, but there is nothing more important to the constitution than a guarantee that all the people of Canada will be able to enjoy the same essential public services irrespective of the provinces in which they happen to live. Canadian society must have no second class citizens. We cannot afford to have second class citizens in this country.

• (3:50 p.m.)

In the examples I cited I set out very clearly I think that we in the Atlantic area, by reason of the fact that we do not have the same means of earning income as people in other parts of Canada,—not that we do not want to or are not anxious to work—cannot contribute to our provincial treasuries to enable them in turn to provide us with all our essential public services. We must have financial help from Ottawa, and I say that this help must be guaranteed in our constitution. Let us leave no doubt about it. I would suggest also that in considering amendments to the constitution we must give high priority to ensuring that there is absolutely no doubt

that the Parliament of Canada has the right to transfer to the provincial governments money that can be used for things which are ordinarily matters under provincial jurisdiction. This is part of regional development.

We hear the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) making a big to-do about all that this government will do on behalf of regional development, but nothing has been done yet. Action must be taken immediately by his department or by some department of the federal government to reduce the gap between the rich and the poor provinces of Canada. This is a national problem and there is need for a national program to correct it. This is the reason I say that one of the highest priorities must be given to amending the constitution in such a way as to allow the federal government unequivocally, and without any doubt, to transfer moneys to the provinces. Therefore, I say that in any new constitution the spending power of the government of Canada must be clarified to provide, without any shadow of doubt, the federal government with the right to help the poor provinces. The federal government must retain that power to help the poor provinces.

As I said before, there must be an equalization of opportunity for all Canadians, irrespective of the province in which they live. There is no room in our Canadian society for great disparities between the opportunities available to individual Canadians no matter where they live. Reasonable standards of living for all Canadians must be maintained, and in amending our constitution we must make sure of this.

This principle was recognized by our former prime minister, the Right Hon. Lester Pearson when in 1968 he addressed the federal-provincial conference. This is what he said:

> We believe that the government of Canada must have the power to redistribute income, between persons and between provinces, if it is to equalize opportunity across the country. This would involve, as it does now, the right to make payments to individuals, for the purpose of supporting their income levels—old age security pensions, unemployment insurance, family allowances—

There is no question about that because they have been provided by the constitution. He went on to say:

> —and the right to make payments to provinces, for the purpose of equalizing the level of provincial government services. It must involve, too, the powers of taxation which would enable the federal government to tax those best able to contribute to these equalization measures. Only in this way can the national government contribute to the equalization of opportunity in Canada, and thus supplement and support provincial measures to this end.

The whole point I am attempting to make is that our constitution must guarantee to the federal government the right to do these very things which the Right Hon. Mr. Pearson outlined to the conference in 1968. This is a matter of immediate urgency, one that must be attended to at once. I, therefore say, despite what the Minister of Manpower and Immigration said a few minutes ago about all the preambles in the constitution and about how much debate there has been on this matter, let us get on with the job immediately. Let us draft a constitution which will ensure both a strong federal government and also strong provincial governments, each with access to sufficient fiscal resources—and this is important—to meet their proper responsibilities, and each operating in a fashion that does not impair the freedom of the others.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilles Marceau (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, among the tasks we have to perform and the challenges we shall have to meet in the years to come, finding solutions to constitutional problems is of paramount importance. I have deemed it to be normal, and indeed my duty as a French-speaking Canadian, to participate in this debate, without claiming to bring final solutions, but solely with a view to offering my services.

As a federal member from a Quebec riding, I have long been interested in constitutional matters, and although I have had the honour of sitting in the nation's Parliament for less than two years so far, I believe it is possible for us to sit at the same table and, notwithstanding our political affiliations, to find a harmonious and effective solution agreeable to all Canadians.

Institutions are, in a sense, the mirror of the times when they are born and brought into operation. They reflect the various forms that man gives to society, according to his concept of organized life and of the objectives which should be aimed at. Because institutions reflect ideas and needs more or less linked with certain periods in history, they are constantly exposed to changes, as are the realities which inspired their creation.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Federalism does not escape that law of evolution. One can even assert that owing to the greater participation of citizens in public

affairs, which is demanded by the complexity of its structures, the federal system is, more than any other type of political society, aware of the economic and social evolution, and it is also more apt to find the necessary solutions.

Federalism varies with times and countries, offering a wide variety of solutions consistent with its basic needs. The 19th century, which saw the rise and strengthening of the first modern federal systems, offers more than one form of federalism.

At the present time, a score of states, among which seven of the eight largest countries of the world are to be found, live under a federal system. There are only two with an identical constitution. However, it is a fact acknowledged by all: namely that Germany and the United States, which at present have a federal system, enjoy the world's highest standard of living. It is therefore easy to conclude that, by itself, federalism can be a source of wealth or poverty according to whether people accept or refuse to apply it as it should be applied.

Federalism is certainly not beyond the reach of violent crises because some federations have broken up during the last decade. However, thanks to the close relationships which the parties to a federative state normally maintain between themselves, they can generally find before it is too late the solutions likely to prevent the downfall of their association. As long as an institution is successful in adapting to new realities and operating efficiently, without going against its character, it has every chance of overcoming internal conflicts and surviving changes imposed by circumstances.

I believe the time has come for us to stop throwing words around and to take concrete action. As Canadians of various ethnic origins, are we willing to co-operate and to accept each other as equal partners? It is not incumbent only on me or on my colleagues to answer, but on the whole population.

For some time, I have been hearing from some opposition members innuendoes which would indicate that they do not look favourably upon French-speaking Canadians actually assuming their part in Parliament. I would like to know what they think exactly. I wish they would stop talking about Quebec and French-speaking Canadians. What I am interested in is what they think and what means they are ready to take to save national unity.

We French-speaking Canadians have given clear proof of our willingness to work to the limit of our strength to preserve this country, but we are not ready to go on unless we are regarded as first class citizens. I feel that most hon. members, on the government side or in the opposition, would like such effort to be made by all equally, but I do not appreciate the innuendoes of some of my colleagues in the opposition, who should speak their minds. If they are not satisfied with this government, if they take offence because French Canadians are playing a leading part and if they do not trust them, they should say so. But if, on the other hand, they are really willing to work, they should give us some proof to that effect.

Yesterday, my hon. friend the member for York South (Mr. Lewis) mentioned, as an example, an incident which occurred in Quebec and from which certain people might draw erroneous conclusions. He said that the Quebec government had refused English-speaking Canadians another English school. I wish to say to my hon. friend that if, following his example, I tried to find out how the minorities of other provinces have been treated, I would have a lot to say. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend, for whom I have great respect, is intelligent enough to recognize that, in Quebec, the minorities are better treated than anywhere else, and that, if all minorities in Canada were treated like the ones in Quebec, the problems facing us today would not exist.

It may not be wise to be forever looking back to the past instead of looking forward to the future, but one must remember that confederation, as history teaches us, has not been, like the Proclamation of Independence of the United States, the dramatic result of a fight for liberation, but rather the outcome of hard discussions carried out during more than three years by parliamentarians who were not threatened by any war, either at home or abroad.

In Upper Canada, which was the inspiring centre of the system inaugurated in 1967, people had been complaining for a long time about the powerlessness of the two majorities system created by the Act of 1840. They were complaining all the more bitterly since the population of Upper Canada, indifferent to the rights of the majority as long as its population was lower than that of Lower Canada, suddenly awakened, as soon as it had the majority, to the democratic seductions, that of the greatest number. The political leaders of Upper Canada were also concerned about the rise of the American power. They could not think of any other way to face this peril

except by uniting in a single Dominion all the British colonies scattered in North America.

As a matter of fact, what presided over the drafting and the signature of the confederative pact? On this point, history does not say much, but I think that I am expressing the truth in saying that English-speaking Canadians felt that on the main points they had kept what was essential to them, especially the guarantee of a strong central government. French-speaking Canadians on the other hand were convinced that they had preserved for the future what in their view could not be left to the care of a central government.

To both sides history has brought many disappointments. Those who had dreamed of an all powerful central government were to be deceived for instance by some decisions of the Privy Council which tended to confirm and to extend the sovereignty of the provincial governments and by the everlasting vitality of a strong autonomist movement in Quebec.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Those who had dreamed of a central government respectful of the authority of the provinces and of the rights of minorities often had to face one which dared not fulfil its constitutional duties towards minorities and which much too often was unscrupulous regarding the sovereignty of the provinces.

The present government is the first one, it seems to me, that really concerns itself about the protection of the rights of minorities, the recognition of biculturalism and bilingualism and the defence of provincial rights. If the present government seeks to protect those fundamental rights, we must not be satisfied with temporary conditions.

We want—and I think that I am thus expressing the views of the majority of French-speaking Canadians—those conditions to become permanent, we want them to be written down, in order to prevent the recurrence of past events.

It was the wish in 1867 to merge two separate wills in a new one. Sir Georges-Etienne Cartier had spoken in this connection of a new political nationhood. The strongest community invited to unite its political destiny did it unreservedly. The weakest community, however, did not adhere to the new plan without some reserves, being almost equally divided between two currents of thought. The tendency in favour of a full commitment in the federal experience has generally won during the past century the support of French Canadians at federal elections.

The other tendency, with various degrees of intensity, has found its main center of action in Quebec. This ambivalence has certainly been detrimental to Quebec and often delayed progress in Canada.

I am the first one to recognize that Quebec has failed to appreciate federalism. Hon. members from Quebec have the responsibility to show federalism under its true light and to make French-speaking Canadians understand that this system is in a position to help them provided they accept it fully and not half-heartedly.

It is well to blame those who do not try to make federalism better known but I think that it is up to us as members of political parties and members of the House, whatever our political affiliations, to make real federalism known.

That is what we are doing now in the province of Quebec. Hon. members from Quebec are touring the province to explain, to the young in particular, the advantages federalism is likely to bring them.

We agree that federalism is not perfect. I was listening recently to a member from the Ralliement créditiste talking about the Liberal party. I wish to point out to him that this idea has not been authored by the Liberal party and that if he wants to join us, he would be welcomed, but on one condition—if he is able to accept it—that he will not turn the future of the country into a political issue and that he will truly deal with the things that unite us instead of the ones that divide us.

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member for Lapointe allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. Marceau: Gladly, Mr. Speaker, provided it is not too long.

Mr. Dumont: Would the hon. member give the names of those who travel throughout Quebec and Canada explaining the nature of the constitution?

Mr. Marceau: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, whom I hold in high esteem, does not read the papers, although I see one before him just now. If he looked for information, he could easily find out that there is nothing secret about what we are doing. Good Liberals travel throughout the province in order to inform people and if he wants to find out their names, he can easily do so.

Mr. Dumont: How many of these people are there? What are their names?

Mr. Marceau: Mr. Speaker, I feel that it would not be appropriate to mention the names right now but after my speech, if the hon. member wants to come to me I shall be pleased to give him the names of those involved in this work.

Mr. Dumont: They are all Liberals.

Mr. Marceau: Naturally.

Mr. Dumont: Naturally.

Mr. Marceau: Mr. Speaker, we are in power and naturally, we are supposed as a responsible government to come to the aid of the population, and that is what we are doing. My hon. friend cannot blame us for that situation, and hon. members of the opposition cannot rail against the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) because he has personal views on the constitution. Were the members of the opposition to have views as original and as constructive as the Prime Minister's, the problem would perhaps be settled more easily. I find it somewhat odd to see people blame a man for showing leadership, expressing views, and building something, by saying precisely that he has no inventive ideas.

Of course, when one has no original ideas to offer, one can merely criticize those who have.

In the few minutes at my disposal, I would like to outline what our constitution should hold and express briefly a few basic ideas.

To my mind, the preamble to the Canadian constitution should outline a certain number of principles typical of its spirit and define its nature and aims so as to facilitate its interpretation. The main purpose of the constitution of a country is not merely to establish political structures and a form of government. It should also have an educational value. It must instil in the whole population feelings of pride and loyalty, be conducive to understanding and friendship, and favour full cooperation in the pursuit of a common ideal. It should be founded on certain essential premises—

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

Mr. Marceau: Mr. Speaker, I regret, of course—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member cannot continue his remarks, unless he gets unanimous consent of the House.

[Mr. Dumont.]

An hon. Member: Go on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is it the pleasure of the House that the hon. member be granted leave to continue his remarks?

An hon. Member: For two minutes.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Marceau: I thank my hon. colleagues. I wish I could discuss this subject at length. I hope I shall have the opportunity to do so in the proposed committee I would like to see established.

Before concluding I should like to say that I have faith in the new committee, that will be set up to offer my full co-operation and, above all, to ask my English-speaking colleagues, whom I trust entirely, to have talks with us and to work for the unity of this country of which we are proud and which, we must recognize it, is envied by many others.

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, in early fall when the session began I had the opportunity of asking that a debate be held on the constitution during this session. Today I am very glad to take part in this debate.

I have no hesitation at all in telling the House that I am in favour of a constitutional review. This is also an excellent opportunity for any member to voice his opinion, make suggestions and shed light on the problems and the difficulties confronting us. Having a better knowledge of these problems, I think we shall be more likely to solve them.

• (4:20 p.m.)

First of all, I should like to mention that the constitution of 1867 is at times not satisfactory. It therefore has too often been a source of misunderstanding and conflict rather than an instrument of cohesion and harmony. It seems to us that respect for the fundamental law of the country is one of the first requirements of Canadian life. But the constitution must be such as to command this respect, as well through its nobility of thought as its clarity.

For the first time in their history, Canadians are undertaking to give themselves a wholly Canadian constitution, made in Canada, for Canadians. From this great undertaking must result, not only government institutions and regulations that are perfectly adapted to the present needs of our country, but also a new spirit and new habits of co-operation and solidarity.

As a member from Quebec, I might be inclined to speak more particularly of the Quebec responsibilities or difficulties within

that federal system. I hope the other members do the same for, to my mind, it is their duty to do so.

Quebec, which in our vast country is considered by the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission as the home of the French Canadian nation, has not only the right but the duty to find means of emancipation. Just as the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) did so brilliantly a moment ago, I invite all the members from Quebec to express their views that there might be a better understanding of the wishes and aspirations of Quebec as well as the means to which Quebecers can resort to feel secure in this large country and confident they are first-class citizens.

There have also been some things said about federal-provincial conferences. I believe such conferences are necessary even if they have not given so far the anticipated results. I hope their number will increase as they give the provincial premiers an opportunity to meet one another, to know and understand each other better and to accept more willingly the disparities that exist between the various provinces and regions.

Our position in the province of Quebec shows easily enough the special situation of French culture in Canada and in North America. If the French Canadians were a minority everywhere in Canada, including Quebec, cultural equality would be difficult to reach and the present concept of French Canada would be much different from what it is now.

The fact that 83 per cent of French-speaking Canadians are living in Quebec, where they represent 81 per cent of the population, allows them to develop their own institutions as well as an environment that suits their particular culture. That is where the chances for achieving cultural equality spring from, as indicated in the report of the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission, namely in subsections 83, 89 and 90.

Such equality is possible since a French Canadian society managed to be born, to thrive and to develop and also to acquire the distinct traits and institutions which contrive to make a true people—which cannot be said of any other ethnic minority in Canada.

While all governments should, to various degrees, do their best to bring about such equality, the demographic reality and the political and historical development of Canada will still invest the government of Quebec with special responsibilities in this respect, whether we like it or not.

Obviously, the fact involves, for the future, recognition of a special status for the province of Quebec. However, Quebec should have all the necessary powers and means of action to go on assuming its responsibilities towards the French Canadian nation.

Nonetheless, Quebec does not object to the other provinces enjoying the same powers and means of action if they wish. The notion of a special status will appear only if the other provinces or some of them prefer to entrust the central government with or to discharge jointly with it the tasks that the province of Quebec must take upon itself by reason of its particular situation.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said yesterday that courage, patience and dedication will have to be exercised. I think that all hon. members are courageous. Patience, in the case of some of them, has limits. Dedication is called for, I think, when such a question is under discussion.

I have nevertheless the courage to talk about a certain political climate and to deal with the dissatisfaction of the people in my province. Dissatisfaction could also exist elsewhere.

On account of the economic conditions which are sometimes unfavorable, unemployment in Quebec has done great harm and is the cause of some discontent. It must be frankly said that such discontent is perhaps due to the reluctance of the Canadian Parliament to bring in certain amendments to the constitution.

This wavering on the part of Parliament has, in the last several years, prompted a number of Quebecers to believe that the separation of Quebec from the rest of the country would be advantageous for their province. I am not convinced of that, but I think it is necessary to tell things as they are, and we are already assured, on account of the dissatisfaction that prevails in Quebec, that when the next provincial election comes around, 10 per cent of the people will vote in favour of separation. This position reveals the extent of the need to review the constitution in order to enable the people of Quebec to believe in a better future and opportunities for emancipation, for the French Canadian nation and for all other Canadians, because such a future can be found in confederation.

The committee will certainly have to assume responsibility for making this Parliament aware that special arrangements will be necessary for Quebec, and for other regions as well. I feel sure that the committee, after

consulting with representatives of all the provinces and with people who carry heavy responsibilities within certain municipalities, will recognize how important it is to obtain the participation of the people of Canada in order to determine the kind of constitution best suited to meet the requirements of all Canadians.

Hon. members should be asked not to be shocked when they hear from time to time that the province of Quebec intends to retain its French character.

Actually, they should stop being concerned when they hear that Quebec wants to establish French as its working language.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I readily recognize, as do all other Quebecers, that in Ontario English is the first language because the situation in that province demands it. French is being recognized as a second language.

The same situation prevails in Quebec where we want to keep our French language and increasingly to improve it. We are also prepared—as many Quebecers have proved it—to accept English as a second language.

These things must be said in the House, and I think that with a great deal of sincerity, we will finally convince not only most Canadians but all of them to accept the fact that the province of Quebec represents the French element in our bicultural country and that the other nine provinces will always keep English as their first language but will accept French as a second language, which makes me very happy.

The hon. member for Lapointe mentioned earlier that the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) had made about us what I would call an unpleasant reference. Having taken note of it I realized that I had not been the only one to notice it. Yesterday, the hon. member for York South said that in the province of Quebec, some people were concerned about the fact that, next year, 3,000 English-speaking students will be unable to be admitted to CEGEPs. I object to that statement and I cannot help but state my views in that respect.

The hon. member for York South stated, and I quote:

> I deliberately cited this example of retrograde behaviour on the part of the government of Quebec to underline the difficulties which are now being created—

Certainly there are difficulties in the province of Quebec but they are surely not due to any ill-will on the part of the government.

[Mr. La Salle.]

I know the present premier of Quebec too well to say that he can be charged with preventing, through ill-will, the English-speaking students of Quebec from being admitted to CEGEPs.

Of course, since 1960, there has been in Quebec, in the field of education, such a rapid expansion that the government has been unable to build enough schools. But, in my opinion, if some English-speaking students of Quebec find it difficult to be admitted in the schools, the French-speaking students have as many difficulties when they want to register at the universities.

I have to make these remarks about the speech of the member for York South because I am convinced that the province of Quebec does not intend to do any harm whatsoever to the minorities. Far from it. Indeed, the past shows that Quebec always had much respect for its minorities and that it has always proved that all the minorities were welcome in Quebec.

I would like to mention especially that the committee should not forget to consult, first, the provinces. This practice of appointing commissions or committees for various inquiries has shown too often that the provinces were not taken into account and the central government has often been blamed, unfortunately, for taking decisions without previous consultation with the provinces.

The relations the government of Quebec has entered into now and then with some foreign countries, are also causing concern, as was mentioned yesterday.

To my mind, since Quebec is the home of the French Canadian nation, it must absolutely have contacts with some French-speaking countries. I suppose this could be done in co-operation with the central government, which should show some understanding in this regard and recognize that a province such as ours ought to negotiate and sign agreements with the other French-speaking countries.

For years, members from Quebec and the government of that province have been asked what they really wanted. I think that for quite a while Quebec has been clear and precise about its intentions and its needs. In its recent brief on the constitution, it explained why it considered essential that the provinces have sole responsibility over social security. The coexistence of two governments prevents efficient planning in the field of social security, gives rise to the establishment of incon-

sistent programs and leads to administrative overlapping and wasting.

The whole social security provisions bear a direct relation to the culture of the people and enable them to express themselves collectively. The Quebec community can no more be deprived of its social security system than of its legal or educational systems.

The assigning of the entire responsibility of social security to the provinces can, through proper financial mechanisms, be consistent with a fair redistribution of income and the mobility of workers throughout Canada as well as with efficient economic policies.

The mechanism for the delegation of powers, the establishment of which has been proposed, will enable the provinces wishing to do so to entrust the central government with the discharge of some of those duties.

Quebec has no right to commit its future according to the wishes of a majority. Besides, I was blaming its authorities for leaving to the central government all responsibilities for the future of the French Canadian people.

The principles which must guide the originators of a healthy federal constitution are first the rational allocation of powers, then a joint action, with the possibility of exceptions, when the jurisdiction is not readily obvious, or when the motives of the various member states do not result from the same requirements or the same priorities.

That implies, on the one hand, a review of the allocation of exclusive jurisdictions under sections 91 and 92 of the present constitution, and, on the other hand, the establishment of a concurrent list on taxation and the distribution of public funds, with the possibility of exception for any province.

It will be enough to mention that such a notion of a federal constitution, while safeguarding almost the whole list of present federal powers, institutionalizes certain practices adopted until now by our governments, practices which, under foreseen conditions, seem to be much better juridical formulas than those found elsewhere, because they recognize, on the one hand, the principle of autonomy and, on the other, the principle of participation. Proving this would be beyond the scope of that section and, to be sure, only an entirely new constitution can reach this objective.

The constitutional documents of certain countries contain first class texts on the various subjects that have been mentioned. Germany, a federal state, has adopted a basic declaration of great interest. Italy, a unitary country with deeply-rooted regionalism, enshrines the principle of decentralization in her constitution. The USSR, a federal country with centralizing aims, grants her federated republics the acknowledgement of their cultural values in a manner probably unequalled in other texts. Australia, a federal country, offers an original formula for financing the states. The treaty of Rome, which may give rise to a federation, provides, from an economic standpoint, arrangements mostly derived from federalism while others represent interesting progress.

Mr. Speaker, I see that you are about to remind me that my time is up, but I still have one minute left.

The big advantage of a major overhaul of the constitution is that we shall be able to benefit by everything that has been done elsewhere, to digest it, to shape it to our own liking and to submit it to the nation for approval while adhering to the best principles and to the most efficient procedures. If Canada is not able to make very soon this effort of reflection and adaptation, it will have betrayed its past and gravely jeopardized its future.

The constitutional amendments which the committee will have to examine more closely may be classified into four categories of reforms: a clarification of the fiscal powers, in the light of the tasks with which the Quebec government must deal; the cultural equality between Canada's two linguistic communities both within the federal institutions and within those of the various provinces involved; the new distribution of powers between the government of Canada and that of Quebec which will enable the latter to fulfil its mission as the collective mainstay of the French Canadians and, by that very fact, to find once for all the link between Ottawa and Quebec; the formal acknowledgment of the rights of Quebec to conclude international agreements, after consultation with the government of Canada, in fields of provincial jurisdiction, and to participate in the work of the UN institutions specialized in those fields.

In reviewing the text of our constitution, we should take advantage of the occasion and express in modern language the general objectives of Canada, the jurisdictional basis for its administration and the distribution of powers between the two levels of government.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will effect these constitutional changes immediately which would contribute, if we act wisely, to the building of a fantastic country with well

organized provinces where the emphasis is on co-ordination rather than federal centralization.

So, as the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau) has pointed out, let us stop talking but let us work together and build a beautiful country.

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

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. John Roberts (York-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, like other members who have already taken part in this debate I welcome the establishment of this committee. I welcome it particularly because it marks the recognition that constitutional reform is above all a political question and it must ultimately be settled by political processes. Constitutional reform is not simply a question to be left to bureaucrats, to legal experts, or even to governments. It is a process which must involve the participation of the Canadian people as a whole. At the root of this question is the formation of our political institutions, the decision-making institutions of our government. That involves elaboration of the kind of values which we wish to have guide our community in taking decisions. It is pre-eminently a political question and not one that can simply be left to experts.

When I say this is a political question, that is not to say it must necessarily be dominated by partisan political considerations. I was a little dismayed yesterday in the House when it seemed to me there was a disposition on the part of some members taking part in the debate to look for fault, to try to find out where errors were, to search for places where they could stick something unpleasant on the government or opposition as the case might be. It seems to me that if the committee is to work well it must search for the common ground. It must pursue the question of the constitution with attempts at understanding rather than by making points in a partisan way.

Nevertheless, it is the political system which must represent, and the parties which must represent, the various views which can be taken of constitutional reform. This is the way in which the question must be taken to the people.

It is understandable that we should now be considering this question very seriously. It is platitudinous, but nevertheless true, that after 100 years the British North America Act is not particularly suitable to the needs of this country. It has been a constitution which has been less flexible in adapting to changing circumstances, partially because it has no formal amending procedure and partially because it has been subjected to court review, or constitutional review—taking place in a context far from this country—which has often led to decisions which could, at best, be described simply as bizarre.

We now face, at least in my part of the country, some impatience with the process of constitutional review. I think this is eminently understandable because, in an age of instant coffee, and instant television, people often demand instant solutions to complex problems. We must explain, and I think it is the obligation of political parties to explain, that these are rather complex questions, that there are divergent views in various parts of the country on how they are to be resolved and that there are no quick and easy solutions to complicated problems.

I hope the committee will get down to involvement with people. It is, I understand, to travel throughout the country and I hope that political parties will take this opportunity of clarifying where they stand on some of the fundamental questions. One of these questions is often described in short form as the question of "special status", but more accurately should be described as a question of whether one province or some provinces are to have substantial legislative and administrative powers which are different from those of the other provinces. I think the government party has taken a fairly clear position on that. The other parties, it seems to me, have not. There is the whole question of what the relationship of the federal government should be to the urban communities, the urban governments in our society. It seems to me the government party has not taken as clear a position, and has not explained as clearly as I would have liked, its position on that constitutional question. Obviously, that is going to be of enormous importance as we go throughout the country and find out how people in the cities regard the role of the federal government in relation to the municipal governments.

There is also the question of the Bill of Rights which, it seems to me, we often simplify enormously by pretending it is only a question of protecting the fundamental rights of our citizens. In fact, it is a question of transferring to the jurisdiction of the

Supreme Court an enormous power of interpretation in many areas of fundamental political importance to our society. We must ask ourselves, as men in public life, whether it is the proper function of the courts to come to a determination on what are essentially political questions. It may very well be so, but we should be clear in our minds that in discussing a Bill of Rights we are also discussing a transfer of political power to the Supreme Court.

Yesterday, as always, I was interested in the remarks of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) who described the participation of the various politicians who took part in the constitutional conference as participation of men of good will. He went on to say that really we were wrong in looking at this question as one of competition for power between the provincial governments and the federal government. It is not, he said, a question of power between the federal government and the provinces that confronts Canada. In all respect, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the question. It is a question of the basic distribution of powers between the federal and provincial governments in this country which is at the root of the constitutional question. And in the constitutional conference we discuss these powers not simply in the abstract; it is not powers in some void about which we are talking. It is the powers which the politicians who are discussing the issues themselves hold at this particular point in time.

It is very difficult in those circumstances to have politicians not suspicious about the presentation of points of view by the other politicians who are sitting around the table. There is a story, Mr. Speaker, of two Renaissance cardinals, both great schemers. One of them was unfortunately carried away by the plague. When the news was reported to the other cardinal he said: "Dead; I wonder what his motive was". Now, politicians are not quite as suspicious as that, Mr. Speaker, but they are nevertheless very suspicious of the kind of powers and the claims to powers which other politicians make. It seems to me, this fact redoubles the emphasis we must give to this committee, to the involvement of the public in the question of constitutional reform. For in the end I suspect that the politicians, naturally sensitive to their own position, are not going to come to any easy agreement about what the proper distribution of powers among them is. It will take involvement of the public, and a view by the public as to what those powers should be—and eventually some attempt to find out what the public feels in an explicit way,—to give the moral authority to constitutional change which we require. It is, in other words, a process that cannot be left simply to politicians. We must in an active way find out what the viewpoint of the public is.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should not face this task, which is a long task and an arduous task, a difficult task, with any sense of dismay. To my mind this country has, through the decade of the sixties, been going through a process—not so slow,—of the real birth of the Canadian identity and the Canadian community. It is a decade in which the country has begun to come to terms with itself. During our past 100 years we have often been able to escape our political problems. We have been able to concentrate on the development of our resources, and when groups and classes in society have been frustrated they have been able to move to other parts of the country and start life anew. But in the last ten years we have had a coming together, and a recognition therefore of the problems that we face in the coming together. We are, it seems to me, finally developing a really sound political structure, one which takes into account the necessity of reconciling the views, often divergent views, of the various parts of our country.

The formation of a new constitution is part of this process, a process which will give perspective and form to decisions of government, one which will ensure that in coming to its decision the government will take into account various viewpoints and various parts of this country. That is the task in which the committee will be engaged. It is a task which they should pursue with optimism and hope.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, if we had been discussing the constitution as short a time as a year ago, I might have found myself in agreement with those who lean toward amending the constitution to make a strong central government even stronger. I would probably also have been among those who felt changes in the constitution were unnecessary. But since that time I have seen the government's intent spelled out in legislation, and heard it expressed in speeches and statements of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and others. I have seen something of the economic confusion and hardship that has followed upon a strong, aggressive

central government determined to force its will upon the various regions of this country.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I saw at first hand, as an official observer for my party at the recent federal-provincial conference, something of our Prime Minister's purpose. It is obvious that he wants a strong central government—not strong in the sense commonly understood in the past, but strong in the sense of a dominant and domineering central government that would control, not only the various regions of Canada but individual Canadians to a great extent in every aspect of their social and economic life. This is apparent from the federal government's demands and its reaction to the attitude of the provinces at recent constitutional conferences. It is also apparent in legislation passed and pending in Parliament.

It appears to me to be a strong possibility at least that, using the combined provisions of the Estate Tax Act already passed, and the proposals in the white paper on tax reform yet to come, the government will effectively reduce individual Canadians to easily controlled and easily manipulated economic units. The net effect of such a combination of legislation will be to eliminate small businesses and small businessmen, and to prevent the creation of any reservoirs of individual capital so necessary for small business and power.

Other legislation, notably the proposed measure dealing with investment, will shackle business to government so that business decisions, even decisions concerning future investment, would be at the control of the central authority. When that day comes, Canada may well be, in everything but name, an authoritarian socialist state. There will be little purpose then debating the constitutional balance between Ottawa and the provincial capitals. Canada will be a monolithic unitary state, no matter what the constitution says or provincial governments may claim. To phrase it bluntly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the plans of this government are realized we will have a very strong central government authority verging on dictatorship.

To achieve this, Parliament may be progressively downgraded and pushed aside and the provinces bound even more closely in Ottawa's web by means of forced economic dependency, while individual Canadians would be reduced to ciphers. The country is to be governed by a small group of non-elected and non-responsible people, dominated by the Prime Minister of the day.

[Mr. Ritchie.]

There has been some talk recently about our adopting the United States form of presidential government. If we are not careful, we will be beyond the point of being able to exert a choice. Before we know it we could end up having a president, with all the powers of the United States president but without any of the checks and balances that restrain the holder of that office from exercising wilful and tyrannical power. I have said I believe this is the aim of the government. I would like to emphasize that I did not mean this was necessarily the aim of the government party as a whole. I speak only of the executive.

It has been obvious, almost from the time of the 1968 election, that many members of the government party were unhappy with the manner in which they were being led. Today, we are hearing more and more the voices of dissent from government ranks. In the circumstances, this may be the very worst time at which to discuss constitutional change. We may find ourselves asking who speaks for whom? However, if it is the will of the House to establish a committee to study this question, there are two areas that I would like to see given priority. These are constitutional safeguards against excessive assumption of power by the executive and safeguards to ensure the provinces the means and the exclusive right to deal with matters within their stated jurisdiction.

Such safeguards should also ensure that never again can a central government in Canada use economics as a means of imposing its will on defenceless provinces. We must make it impossible for the federal government to use financial coercion and turn the weaker provinces into financial peons. The unfortunate fact today is that the federal government, in one way or another, has saddled the provinces with a variety of welfare, health and educational programs that are poorly framed, ill-timed and vastly expensive to operate.

This might be one thing if our national economy had continued on the up-beat without soft spots or pauses. But with inflation ravaging the national economy, trade in many basic areas in the doldrums, unemployment and the cost of living soaring, the provinces are in trouble. Today, we are seeing the law of the jungle operating in the field of public finance. The battle, as ever, goes to the strong. The federal government has grabbed the lion's share of tax revenue, leaving the provinces and their dependent municipalities

committed to huge expenditures and payments with only an over-burdened and inadequate share of the tax base upon which to raise the funds necessary.

I believe our constitution should provide safeguards against such dog-eat-dog economics and ensure fair shares for all levels of government commensurate with their degree of responsibility to the people of Canada. The more I see of our country today and the more I consider our current problems, the higher goes my regard to the Fathers of Confederation. They were shrewd, practical men who brought a minimum of emotion and a maximum of ingenuity and common sense to their task of providing a constitutional base for a new nation. Their assessment of Canada holds good today in my judgment. It was a nation of regions then and it is a nation of regions today.

Because they appreciated this fact, they provided that matters of the greatest regional concern be administered by regional or provincial governments. This was no accident. This was no compromise. This was not something confined only to the much smaller Canada of that day. This was an inspired method of providing flexibility in the constitutional and political field. I am convinced it is more of this flexibility that we need today, not less. The federal government has become progressively more involved in such fields as health, welfare and education, all of which are exclusively within the ambit of the provincial administrations. I believe they were deliberately placed there—and rightly so. They should be allowed to remain there now.

The federal government should confine itself simply and solely to providing what assistance is needed by individual provinces to keep their health, welfare and educational standards at or near a national level. I believe it is essential that the provinces have sufficient financial resources to enable them to establish and support their own set of priorities. No strings whatever should be attached to the financial assistance they are given. Their own citizens may be relied upon to police them. We may be sure, in these days of almost instantaneous information, that the people of any given province will know what others are receiving and will compel their government to give them the same, if they judge that their ability to carry such services is great enough.

If the people—the taxpayers—do not think that they can carry the load, it should not be imposed on them. It should not be imposed on them particularly by pressure exerted by some group of public servants who happen to cherish enthusiasm for some specific plan of social welfare. It seems obvious to me that democratic government must be a vehicle whereby people can govern themselves as they wish. In a country of widely differing regions such as ours, this means freedom of choice at the regional level. In a democracy there cannot be a mandate for any small group to tell the people what they should have.

It should not be difficult to arrive at an acceptable formula within the constitution that would provide unconditional federal grants as a matter of right to provinces requiring assistance in discharging their constitutional responsibilities. The financial status of any province and its potential for tax and other revenue can, today, be forecast with reasonable accuracy. Balanced against its requirements under the constitution, a figure for unconditional federal grants could then be calculated. Such a system, protected against manipulation or abuse by the constitution, would permit both levels of government to do their job without the continual bickering and bargaining that goes on today. It would effectively prevent the federal government from encroaching upon provincial fields of responsibility and leave full initiative and decision in these fields to the appropriate authority.

The massive sums of money now involved in this question of the Canadian provinces discharging their constitutional responsibilities greatly aggravates the situation and this aggravation will grow rapidly in the years immediately ahead. In 1967, the total expenditure of all governments on health, welfare and education was in excess of $10 billion. The Economic Council of Canada has estimated that, by 1975, this expenditure will have risen to about $19 billion annually. On the basis of these figures it is clear that, in 1967, the Canadian government spent about 16 per cent of the gross national product in areas strictly within provincial jurisdiction. If, as is forecast by the Economic Council, the GNP reaches the $100 billion mark by 1975, this percentage will have risen to the about 20 per cent of the GNP at that time. This gives you some idea of the magnitude of the financial question in relation to the constitution about which I have been talking. If we consider it wise that government expenditure not exceed 35 per cent, or so, of the gross national product then I think you can see how important this is.

• (5:00 p.m.)

In 1967, the federal, provincial and municipal governments spent a little better than $4 billion on education. According to the Economic Council this amount will more than double by 1975. The most important feature of these figures, however, is that the overwhelming proportion of these education costs will be for elementary and secondary schools, the principal educational responsibility of the provinces. If they are not provided the financial muscle to handle this responsibility and are permitted to sink to the level of puppets of Ottawa, then it will be the central government that will direct educational policy and administration in the provinces despite any facesaving formula that might be devised to give the illusion of continuing provincial autonomy. In existing circumstances only two or three of our ten provinces are in a position to carry this burden. The remainder are dependent on help from the federal government. Caught between the constitutional compulsion to provide adequate educational facilities and the staggering costs involved, many provinces are helpless to resist federal encroachment by means of conditional financial aid. It is often carefully hidden, but the federal initiative is a positive force in today's health, welfare and education programs.

This situation is directly contrary to the spirit of our constitution. There is little prospect of such provinces as Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Newfoundland, Saskatchewan or Manitoba being regarded as independent and resolute regional units within the Canadian confederation when inadequate resources make them subservient to the central government. A healthy and workable confederation demands a constitution that will restore the ideal measure of regional autonomy envisaged in the British North America Act. It may well develop that the old regional groupings, are outdated. Some measure of regional consolidation may now be required. But this would, in no way, change the conditions and demands of confederation. If, for instance, a union of the maritime provinces takes place and the three prairie provinces amalgamate, this would not change the essential nature of the new union regional governments in relation to our constitution. We would then simply have one regional government for the Atlantic area instead of four and one for the prairies instead of three. The requirement for regional administrations to answer the needs of the people would remain the same as ever.

[Mr. Ritchie.]

I should like to mention what is common talk these days, the alienation of the west. Everyone assumes this is a new situation. But it has been around for a long time. It is not just related to lack of sales for wheat. It is a natural outgrowth of the long history of federal governments who have regarded western Canada as a mere appendage to central Canada. Only in the years 1958-62 did western Canada assume any real significance in the affairs of the nation. Since then, it has reverted to its role of exporting its natural resources to fuel the economic machine of central Canada. The present government, schizophrenic in its central theme that Canada extends only a stone's throw from Montreal, has immeasurably strengthened the very strong suspicion that western Canada will receive no support from central Canada. If the country has developed on an east-west axis, now so far as the west is concerned the flow is north-south. If Canada is to remain a confederation, then it must be recognized that it is a nation of regions. Otherwise, if nothing else, it may fracture off at the Lakehead. The federal government, with its preoccupation with its central Canada outlook, must revise its thrust if Canada is to remain a confederacy in the next 100 years.

There are many other arguments for entrenching the rights of the provinces under the confederation agreement. These, no doubt, will be brought out in detail in the discussions of the committee should it be established. But, as I suggested earlier, I believe first priority should be given to consideration of ways to curb the power of the executive by constitutional safeguards. If we do not do this, if we do not find means of restraining the small ruling clique, we may be sure they will never allow any meaningful amendment of the constitution with regard to provincial rights. I hope the committee will be established. I hope it will be based broadly enough to take in all shades of opinion, both within the recognized political parties and without. I hope, too, that discussion will not be confined to a narrow agenda drawn up by the government or that the committee itself will be emasculated by a government majority and government chairman whose thoughts and actions are dictated by the executive.

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I find that when elected to the House of Commons we all seem to become instant experts. I gather it is inherent in politics that we be all things to all men and there is a tremendous compulsion to display

full knowledge on any number of subjects in a very erudite fashion. I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will forgive me if, from time to time, in the course of my remarks, I indicate that I am somewhat unencumbered by a profound knowledge of constitutional politics, history and the law. But I do not apologize because in the last year and a half, and sometimes in this House, we have seen the political gods of this nation show an equal ignorance and lack of profundity. So, unimpeded by humility, I should like to reflect on two particular aspects of the resolution. The first is the method used to bring about constitutional change. Then, secondly, I should like to put forward some concept of what we might consider should be proposed in order to solve our chronic Canadian malady, the constitutional headache.

I think it is generally agreed that constitutional change is necessary. The constitution, being the root of all political and legal power, is the foundation upon which and within which our legal system operates. It must be flexible and at the same time unequivocal. The modern state, being complex, infringes tremendously at all levels of government on the rights of the individual. We must have a constitution which equally benefits and protects the citizen. The constitution adopted in 1867, as a result of judicial interpretation, the development of the double aspect theory, the water compartment theory and the restrictions on the peace, order and good government clause, is often interpreted by men out of the country with little knowledge of the nation or the nation's future. Coupled also with the evasion of the constitution by federal-provincial agreement, and a tactic of downright invasion by governments of other governmental spheres, we are left with a constitution which is at times almost impossible to decipher, which is obscure and which on many occasions cannot be determined.

Modern Canada is very different from Canada at the time the constitution was formed. In addition to that, I notice there are two distinct attitudes toward our constitution, largely dependent upon the region of the country from which one comes. Easterners generally consider the federal government to be the child of the provinces and therefore believe the provinces should be given appropriate powers. Westerners look at it in reverse. They consider their provinces to be children of the federal government and tend to accept more readily the centralization and consolidation of power in the federal authority.

I believe the government is to be complimented for proposing the formation of this committee and also for giving the priority it has to constitutional change. Although it might be criticized in the sense that it will interfere in an immediate solution to some of our problems, I think in the long run it will certainly simplify and expedite answers to these problems. The method adopted is the federal-provincial conference. Any method has drawbacks and any method can be criticized.

It is difficult to constructively criticize a method and suggest good solid alternatives. But having adopted the method, I believe those who are engaged in the conference perhaps should accept a little constructive criticism, even though it comes from an hon. member who is not an expert on it. At the outset, it appears to me that some of the observations made in the House yesterday by members of the opposition are quite justified. I get the feeling that I, as an average taxpayer and citizen, am a bystander to a confrontation between big governments whereby the governments squabble over the power to tax, the power to control my destiny, the power to infringe upon my rights and all too often drift away from the concept that it is not what is best for the federal or provincial governments with which I am concerned but rather what is best for me as an average citizen. The suggestion that the provinces should have more taxing power, it seems to me, should have been coupled with the suggestion that there should be an over-all control over taxation at all levels of government before such a suggestion is put forward.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I say that no matter what office you might hold, the problems must be considered from the point of view of the individual citizen first and what he might need and want as a citizen of this country. It should not be a squabble between two governments trying to determine which politician shall have the most power. Politicians are always loth to surrender power once they get into office, and they have a tendency to want more and more of it, rationalizing their demands from time to time without approaching the matter in a rational and objective manner.

It is regrettable that no mechanism was set up in these conferences whereby individual citizens and groups could be heard. Constitutional change should not be the prerogative of politicians—I agree with some of the speakers

who have expressed that view. Party dogma, party philosophy and the more or less temporal tenure of political office should not be factors that warp and distort the validity of the results of constitutional conferences. It is certainly pleasing to see that this committee will be empowered to call witnesses and hear the views of the Canadian public.

Another criticism that might well be put forward about the method that was adopted is that there is too much parochialism. Premier Bennett, the great ringmaster of the Social Credit circus in British Columbia, suggested at one conference that the northern boundary of British Columbia should be extended to include part of the Yukon, if not all of it. But if he had been looking at this matter from the point of view of the national interest, he could equally well have suggested that the southern boundary of the Yukon should be extended down into British Columbia and that a new province should be created. I must say I do not think that Premier Bennett is known for his concept of nationalism and for thinking in national terms, certainly not in British Columbia.

I think that there has been a rather blatant display by people who came to perform and not to confer; people who, mindful of the fact that they are wearing their television makeup and are on national television, sometimes drift a little away from the fact that they are there to consider what we want to have in a new constitution. I suggest that the conferences have been used for the blatant, chauvinistic purposes of political gain in the old home town. I refer here to the attack on the white paper. I do not know what that had to do with the constitution. It is certainly contemporary in the political sense, but it is not part of the constitutional conference.

I am gravely concerned about in camera sessions. I think that secrecy in government affairs is dangerous, and I suggest that the political climate greatly differs now from what it was at the time of the Quebec and Charlottetown conferences which were held in camera. Perhaps there was far greater reason for secrecy then that there is now. I am worried about the tremendous influence that can be brought to bear by bureaucrats at in camera meetings, and the great tendency of politicians to accept decisions made by bureaucrats as being very erudite and cogent. I think we should all warn the delegates to these conferences that this country is unlikely to accept a constitution that is a *fait accompli* by decisions made in camera.

[Mr. Hogarth.]

I am rather disappointed that the terms of reference of this committee are confined to those declarations that have been made public. I look forward to seeing the person who is going to be able to confine that committee to its terms of reference. It will be a very interesting job indeed, but I do not think that the delegates will ever get away with presenting to the Canadian people a *fait accompli* constitution in the mêlée of a general election. The confrontation method leads to the intrusion of partisan politics in an approach to a new constitution. Provincial premiers, or perhaps even a prime minister, facing an election might take a rather different view if they did not have an election in the offing. For instance, the change in government in Manitoba brought about little change in attitude from the people in that province, and I do not think the people in that province really changed their minds so substantially about the constitution.

The criticisms I have made perhaps have more or less validity and cogency. I do not suggest that there is any adequate alternate way, but I am surprised that somebody has not given some consideration to the creation of a constitutional parliament, entirely objective in its deliberations, free of confrontation, independent of existing governments, representative of all regions, and empowered to listen to the people as well as to all levels of government.

Mr. Baldwin: And free of law professors.

Mr. Hogarth: Yes, and free of a few lawyers, too. This might not be a very valid alternative, but you have to admit it is a hell of a lot better than a revolution.

In dealing with these proposals for a new constitution, two matters of great importance should be noted: first, the entrenchment of civil rights in the constitution—I certainly welcome that suggestion—and second, the consideration of the division of powers, which are so essential in a federal state. I do not propose to dwell a great deal on the entrenchment of civil rights in the constitution. It is going to bring about a wholly new attitude toward legislation at all government levels, and certainly the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in the Drybones case, which was recently handed down, adds but a slight tremor to the earth shaking judicial decisions which will be handed down when civil rights are entrenched in the new constitution. It will be a money-maker for lawyers.

In dealing with the division between federal and provincial powers, we have to concede at the outset that the central or federal government should have the major instruments that are necessary to formulate the economic policy of the nation. The federal government must always be in a position to have its hands on the throttle of the economy of Canada. For instance, the attack on inflation should be primarily and exclusively something within the power of the federal government because it is a national problem.

Similarly, all problems that affect the national interest should rest with the federal government, and I would mention specifically foreign affairs. There should be adherence to the original concept that local governments should look after local and regional problems. The problem which arises, as I see it, is what happens when the local problems become so intense that they become of national concern—problems such as pollution, urban affairs, housing, consumer affairs, and standards of health. These things which were essentially local problems at one time have now become so national in their scope that they are considered to be problems of the whole of Canada.

For instance, according to the Hall report on medicare the reason the federal government entered the medicare field was, as the honourable judge suggested, that standards of health in Canada should be applied all across the country and therefore the federal government should act in this area. But the result has not been particularly satisfactory. It has not been what it would have been if the government had been able to act in a direct fashion without going into extensive consultations with the provinces. Sometimes such problems are very small in their subject matter and do not lend themselves to great, big, over-all reviews of the constitution. For instance, for years the Canadian Bar Association has been trying to set up a central registry for encumbrances and mortgages on aircraft but were continually met by the statement from the federal government that this would be unconstitutional.

In connection with all these problems, there must be a way in which the powers can be transferred from the provinces to the federal government and vice-versa, should the occasion in the contemporary scene demand it. Similarly, we are devoid of any throttle on the amount of taxation that can be imposed. The provincial governments have unlimited taxation powers in their own field, and so does the federal government. The result is that nobody can say, "wait, there is too much taxation now". There is no way in which that can be controlled.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The question is how can these problems be solved? My suggestion is that we give some consideration to that venerable company of old Canadians who share this building with us, and who respond so quaintly, so quickly and in such numbers to the tinkle of their little bell. I have never argued that the Senate should continue to exist in its present form. I think it could be reformed and changed into a very viable body. This baby-blanket of Parliament Hill could be of tremendous use by becoming the arbiter between the provincial and the federal governments of this country.

I think we should propose to the Canadian people that the Senate take on new functions. I suggest, first, that it should be appointed by a constitutionally entrenched formula, getting representatives from the provinces and the federal government, and that its objectivity, its independence from both governments should be entrenched in that formula so that it cannot be manipulated by either the federal or the provincial governments.

Secondly, it should have no legislative powers at all in the direct sense.

Thirdly, it should be empowered to determine when a transfer of legislative power should take place from the provinces to the federal government, or vice versa, depending upon the applications made to it by either of these levels of government. It should have the staff and the structure to investigate where the national or provincial interests might lie, in a broad sense, throughout the nation. For example, the pollution problem could be put before such a Senate, and it could decide which government and to what extent which government should be responsible for it. It could say that the federal government should take the responsibility entirely, or that the federal government should take certain aspects of it and certain other aspects should be left to the provinces.

Fourthly, it could be used to control the over-all imposition of taxation. For example, it could advise a government when it was imposing a new tax that it had gone too far in certain regions of the country because the provinces concerned had already taxed those regions to a certain level. That would be a

powerful political factor in preventing the imposition of too much taxation.

Fifthly, it could serve as a fact-finding body for the federal and provincial governments, and thus abolish the necessity for royal commissions. It could even inquire as to what has happened to the Royal Commission on the Status of Women.

Sixthly, it could be the arbiter of intra-provincial disputes, and seventhly, it could serve as a national law reform commission and concern itself with the uniformity of laws throughout the country.

Eighthly, it could have a judicial arm to solve disputes arising out of constitutional matters. I would not suggest that the Senators all be selected for the same purpose. You might have a general body of Senators selected, and then have some selected because of their specific knowledge to serve for a certain purpose or for a certain term of years.

I have just about exhausted my time, Mr. Speaker. Whatever happens to this committee that we are now forming, I think we all look forward to watching its progress in helping to shape a new constitution. Above all, I hope that when it finally reports to this House it will have more luck than the Standing Committee on Northern Affairs did.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert) for his courtesy.

[*English*]

I should like to give a very warm welcome to this motion, Mr. Speaker. For many years I have been convinced that the elected members of Parliament, representing as they do every region in Canada and many different groups and interests, are pre-eminently suited to deal with the future framework of the Canadian political system, and that, after all, is what the constitution is.

I am personally interested because I pressed this idea of a parliamentary committee on the constitution in correspondence and in conference on the former prime minister, Mr. Pearson. He always agreed with me, but it was never the appropriate time to do anything about it. The present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) may remember that I urged support for this idea upon him a few weeks after he became a member of this House. Yesterday, he introduced the motion to set up such a committee, and it would be most ungracious of me not to acknowledge that fact with gratitude.

For myself, I am profoundly convinced that the committee can play a vital role in the constitutional development necessary to the future needs of Canada. Whatever the utility and necessity of continuing committees of civil servants and other experts, whatever the role of federal-provincial constitutional conferences, I am confident that in the ultimate analysis this Parliament is and should remain the major guardian of a strong but flexible federal system.

I do not share the attitude of those who regard the process of constitutional revision with impatience and who call for action on economic bread-and-butter issues. There is a false division here. Modern governments, of necessity, deal with economic issues. They must be concerned with full employment, housing, health, pollution, urban problems and even recreational facilities. They are called upon to improve the quality of life as well as to maintain economic growth. But governments either perform these functions, or fail to perform them because of the constitutional compact within which they must all work.

In a country with regions widely separated from each other by language and cultural divisions, as well as by distance and different economic conditions, as in Canada, agreement as to the constitutional structure is essential. Constitutional improvement and clarification are required for the smooth functioning of our system of government; indeed, for its existence. Constitutional revision, therefore, is of great practical importance and not an exercise to be reserved for constitutional lawyers and experts, but the very stuff of politics and the concern of all elected members.

I can sympathize with provincial premiers who speak out about the ancient and modern problems, such as freight rates and regional inequalities. I am sure much can be done within the existing constitution and by an intensified process of co-operative federalism to deal with some of these problems, but this does not absolve us from considering the constitutional framework of our whole constitutional system.

I am not one of those who think that the revision of the British North America Act is unimportant. The Prime Minister, in his speech, referred to cliches about the constitution. Perhaps I shall be guilty of some of the cliches to which he referred. But however

obvious some of these remarks may be they need to be repeated from time to time.

The British North America Act is a colonial statute, passed by the British parliament in Westminster more than a hundred years ago. It is obsolete in form and uninspiring in style. It deals with the needs of small and mainly agricultural societies. Today, we are called upon to deal with vast urban conglomerations. It would be miraculous if the dispositions of a hundred years ago did not require review.

I am personally not iconoclastic about some of the basic provisions of the British North America Act. Some of those provisions, namely, those dealing with division of powers between the federal and provincial legislatures, may remain basically sound and require little change. It is to me, however, quite unthinkable that with the development of new problems of housing, pollution and renewal it does not require a new look.

The federal Parliament, as we all know, has employed the spending power to intervene from time to time in fields regarded as exclusively provincial. This has been bitterly resented by some provinces, notably the province of Quebec. Such a use of the spending power is nowhere explicit in the British North America Act. The limits of consequences of the exercise of the spending power need to be spelled out in the new constitution.

• (5:30 p.m.)

There remains in our constitutional set-up one crucial problem that must be resolved if Canada is to continue to be united. Federations, if they are healthy, are based on the consent of all regions, but there is in Canada a bone of contention which threatens to destroy consent. I refer to the difference of opinion about the degree of centralization in respect of legislation on social issues which is acceptable to different parts of Canada.

The Prime Minister of Quebec, at the last federal-provincial constitutional conference, made it quite clear that whatever other provinces might do, Quebec was not prepared to see the federal government interfere by use of the spending power, shared-cost programs or any other device, in fields such as social services and housing; such centralization would be resisted. In saying this he was repeating what had been said by his predecessors of all parties. I do not doubt that he speaks for Quebec in this regard, but I believe that the other provinces are willing, and in some cases anxious, for federal intervention in these fields. They do not wish to be hampered in securing national action on some of these matters because of Quebec's reluctance.

It was for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that some of us used the phrase "special status for Quebec". Perhaps it was an unfortunate phrase. It seemed to some to smack of condescension and concession. I emphasize, nevertheless, that the basic problem which remains is: How are we to organize our constitution so that Quebec can retain autonomy in fields in which her special culture demands it, without forcing upon the other provinces a decentralization which seems to some of them excessive?

I believe this is the crux of our constitutional problem, and I think that perhaps M. Bertrand was on the right track when he suggested that the device of delegation might be used by other provinces desiring it. It would have to be a refined process of delegation and be terminable only after an agreed period. The British North America Act says nothing about delegation. I believe the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—perhaps the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) will correct me if I am wrong—has said that there is no power of legislative delegation within our present constitutional system.

I suggest that the committee ought to explore this avenue, because I believe that by following-up the matter of delegation and by studying the implications of some sort of permanency of delegation, we might find the answer to what I call the dilemma of our constitution.

There are three more subjects upon which I wish to touch lightly, Mr. Speaker. The first is the charter of human rights or a constitutional bill of rights. I hope that this Parliament and government will not flag in their determination to bring such charter into existence. There has developed an academic school of thought which downgrades the importance of such charter or constitutional bill of rights. I am afraid that some members of our provincial governments have paid undue attention to this school of thought. These people claim that to enshrine basic fundamental freedoms in a constitution is (a) to limit them, and (b) to hand over the protection of these fundamental political rights to the tender mercies of judicial review rather than to the protection of politically-elected governments and Parliaments.

I think neither of these objections is valid. Such declarations in our fundamental consti-

tutional law have an immense educational value. They clarify for all the human and individual basic rights in a free democracy and, in addition, they provide useful and needed instruments to strike down the overzealous exercise of legislative interference with fundamental rights of the citizen. I know this statement to be valid because of my career at the Bar. I suggest that nobody familiar with history will say that leaders of nations do not from time to time attempt to interfere, sometimes with the best intentions in mind, with those fundamental rights which we all should have.

I should now like to say a word about the amending formula which is essential to any successful rewriting of the constitution. This party has opposed, and I hope will continue to oppose, any rigid system which would give to an individual province the power of veto, no matter how small, in the field of constitutional revision. We successfully opposed, and continue to oppose, the unlamented Fulton-Favreau formula. We think that certain provisions of a fundamental nature could be enshrined in the constitution in such a way that the unanimous consent of the federal and provincial legislatures would be required for any change.

Examples of what I mean might be found in a charter of human rights, language rights and the right to free and regular elections. For instance, the constitution might contain various provisions which could not be changed without unanimous consent, whereas economic matters could be amended by a more simple and less rigid formula.

Perhaps the most recent federal-provincial constitutional conference was very close to the mark when it suggested that three out of four senatorial districts or three out of five such regions, including British Columbia—this was a suggestion of the Premier of British Columbia—might provide a consensus justifying federal interference in the provincial realm of shared-cost programs. I suggest to the House that a formula similar to that suggested to be applied to shared-cost programs might be applied to the amending of the constitution. Something of this sort is essential.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words about the role of municipal governments in the constitutional process. The time has come for the senior levels of government to recognize that if the human problems of Canadian citizens in the latter part of the twentieth century are to be solved, it must be done as a result of planning, consultation and co-operation with municipal levels of government. I remind the House that the populations of Toronto and Montreal exceed those of all the individual provinces except Quebec and Ontario. Immense environmental problems involving pollution, renewal, recreation, housing, etc., cannot be solved except by the combined efforts of federal, provincial and municipal governments.

The British North America Act makes the municipalities entirely the creatures of the provinces. I submit that in this decade the mutual problems of the federal government and municipal governments require consultation. We have heard in the House from time to time, when these matters have arisen, that such consultation is not possible under our constitution. I do not think this is so. Even if it is so, we must make it clear in the new constitution that it will be so no longer.

The 1969 conference of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities demanded a commitment from the federal government as well as provincial governments to consult with municipalities—it being their right—on matters of mutual concern. If members of the committee which will be set up as a result of this motion are to do their job properly, they must, as must we, listen to those who represent our cities. So long as we remain a federal country, co-operative federalism must be practised to deal with urgent social needs such as housing and urban development generally. Such co-operative federalism must be both more thorough, deeper in its content and wide enough to take into its breadth of participatory democracy those who represent our cities and towns. Mr. Speaker, I look forward, as I believe other members of the House do, to Parliament asserting its proper role in determining the future fundamental law of this country. I will therefore support the motion before the House.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, this House has before it indirectly, in the form of a motion to establish a joint committee on the Constitution of Canada, the question of creating a new constitution for Canada. This is not the task for a day or even a year, but a task of great magnitude which will consume a proportionate amount of time.

In a formal sense, the process of creating a new constitution may be said to have begun at the first constitutional conference in February of 1968. I was privileged to be a partici-

pant in that conference as a delegate from the province of Prince Edward Island, and I would like to recall a phrase used by Premier Campbell of Prince Edward Island at that conference as a description of what those who participated in it were about to undertake. Premier Campbell said that if the men who in 1864, 1865, 1866 and 1867 worked out the Constitution of Canada could be called the Fathers of Confederation, he believed those who embarked on this new task in 1968 could be called the foster-fathers of our country.

In a sociological sense, however, the process of constitutional review and re-creation may be said to have begun with the quiet revolution of 1960 in Quebec and all the consequences which that led to, not only the great attention subsequently devoted in the province of Quebec to constitutional matters—not that Quebec had been entirely quiescent in this field before that time—but the response engendered in other parts of Canada, and of course the aspirations peculiar to all regions of Canada which partly as a result of the quiet revolution, partly as a result of Canada's first centennial and partly as a result of the national fervour engendered by Expo, began to find expression.

Why is it necessary to draft a new constitution a century after our first one? Perhaps the short answer is that the world is a very different place: great external changes have occurred; we have seen world wars with great dislocations in empires, trade patterns, economies and the movement of people. These world wars have had a great effect on Canada. We have had a great depression and we have had recessions.

In the 1960s many moral authorities have spoken of seeing new views of morals coming into being which may perhaps cause greater changes in our society. There have been changes in transportation and communications which were completely unforeseeable a century ago. Our closest neighbour, the United States, has emerged as the superpower of the world, with important consequences for Canada.

Internally we have evolved from the state of 1867 which was still, in effect, a colony despite the fact that we had responsible and popular government through our participation in the conferences after World War I to the Statute of Westminster and eventually the abolition of appeals to the Privy Council in criminal and civil matters, to the point where we are now a fully independent country. The only limitation on our freedom of action now is the fact that our constitution can still be formally amended only in Great Britain. This, of course, is part of the reason why we need to re-think and re-create our constitution.

There have also been forward and backward shifts in the balance of power between the federal government and the provinces in this century. We have seen the role of the government in the economy increase. We have seen changes in ethnic composition, especially as a result of the heavy immigration in the early part of the twentieth century. The immigration which followed the Second World War also changed considerably the character of our country. In 1867 we were largely a country composed of people from England, France, Scotland and Ireland. We could hardly begin today to name the nationalities of those who have come to our country. Moreover, there has been a quiet revolution in Quebec, and urbanization has continued to the point where 65 per cent of our people now live in urban centres. All these changes have been great social changes. I believe the changes have made it necessary not only to take a new look at our constitution, but to re-create and redraft it.

It is often thought our constitution is simply the British North America Act, but this is a somewhat oversimplified view. There is a vast conglomeration of statutes and practices—including, I think, the rules of this House and certainly the practices of the government of Canada—which in a very real sense can be considered to be part of our constitution.

I wish to dwell for a few moments on the most obvious part of our constitution, the British North America Act. I would quote a brief description of it by Dr. MacGregor Dawson in his book "The Government of Canada":

> The British North America Act, however, does not pretend to be a comprehensive document, such as, for example, the constitution of the United States; and there is thus little of the well-rounded, balanced description and enumeration of authorities and functions which so frequently characterize those written constitutions which aim to cover all the essentials of government within a limited number of carefully articulated sections. There are many vital things about the government of Canada (to say nothing of the provincial governments) which are not stated or even hinted at in the British North America Act, and even those matters which are dealt with in some detail are frequently given in such fashion that they become ambiguous and sometimes misleading.

A less neutral description of the British North America Act is given by Dean Jean

Beetz. It is reprinted in the book edited by Crépeau and Macpherson, "The Future of Canadian Federalism". I wish to quote several sentences from this succinct description by Dean Beetz which I think poses in a few French words the dilemma of our constitution:

[*Translation*]

The 1867 constitution is a paradoxical document. Its character as fundamental law, the difficulty one finds in amending it, should normally command the use of a broad, liberal, analogical method of interpretation. On the other hand, its wording has all the character of restrictive interpretation statutes. The legislator modestly hides his principles behind it:—In other respects, the 1867 constitution, except perhaps as regards the provisions dividing the legislative jurisdiction between the central power and the provinces, is written in a jargon fit for painstaking lawers, completely indifferent to aesthetics, even on a legal level; it is a highly technical document which is therefore abstruse, misleading for the jurist who is not familiar with our laws, beyond the reach of the layman, the average man. Such wording normally leads to a purely exegetical and literal interpretation, the only one in which the Victorian jurists who gave a statutory form to the London resolutions likely believed.

This divorce between the nature of the 1867 constitution and its form may be one of the reasons for the variations of jurisprudence as regards the use of an appropriate method of interpretation for its implementation.

[*English*]

This divorce between the nature of the constitution and its form, between the broad nature of a constitution and the restricted, limited horizons of the form in which it was cast, has always posed a great problem, not only for the legal interpreters of the British North America Act but for the Canadian people. It has meant that their most formal document, the one which should best express all their aspirations, merely expresses the legalistic jargon, the technical views of the drafters of that document. It is still a legally serviceable document, but as living law it is inadequate. It is not a constitution of today for tomorrow, but a constitution of yesterday for yesterday.

• (5:50 p.m.)

How are we to proceed in attempting to create a new constitution? Professor Cheffins, in a new book entitled "The Constitutional Process in Canada", expresses in the following words grave reservations about the likely success of this task:

For Canada's political leaders to sit down at a constitutional conference and attempt to redraft completely a new constitution for Canada would, in my opinion, be a dangerous and difficult step.

I agree that it would be dangerous and difficult, but I do not draw the author's conclusion that it should not be done. This is a task upon which we have embarked, and I believe it is one we must now complete. There are, it seems to me, four ways in which we could proceed. First, there is the method of holding federal-provincial conferences, the one which is being most actively used. I do not share the disillusionment of some hon. members as to the outcome and pace of these conferences, although I believe that as public conferences they have probably gone as far as they can in enlightening the Canadian people by making them aware of the problems we face.

The second method is that of the constitutional convention, which means calling representatives of the people, perhaps members of the federal Parliament and the provincial legislatures among others, and inviting them to approve the draft of a new constitution as a document upon which our future history would be based. This conception is along the lines of the United States model; it would probably be awkward to employ in a country such as Canada which has no tradition of such constitutional conventions, but at least it is a possibility.

The third possibility is the holding of a referendum—the submission of a draft constitution to the people of Canada for their approval or rejection. I need hardly say that such a course would encounter serious difficulties of communication. It is hard enough for law professors to explain constitutions to their law classes. It is almost too much to expect the contents of such a document to be readily ascertainable by all the people of this country. However, in any new Canadian constitution we must achieve a better balance of the technical and the popular than was achieved in the last one.

A fourth method of constitutional change is by sending a joint address of both Houses of Parliament to the British Parliament. In any event, this is the course which will probably have to be followed eventually. It may seem to be a last resort and, legally, it can be taken in the absence of any of the steps to which I have just referred.

We have embarked upon a course of federal-provincial conferences which has perhaps served its day as far as public sessions are concerned. But the conferences are valuable because they are producing a series of documents which the Government of Canada is presenting to the people and to the provinces,

and which will be the primary texts, if I might use that term, for the new committee to consider.

We must involve the public in this process, and we must also involve Parliament. Parliamentary and popular debate is important in connection with all the courses I have mentioned. Debate might not in itself be a method of constitution-making, but it is at the very least a concomitant; perhaps one might say that it breathes the breath of life into the other forms.

I believe the people of Canada want to be involved in the making of a new constitution. In the first of the federal papers there are a few sentences which read as follows:

> There is a Canadian personality. We are not carbon-copy Englishmen, nor carbon-copy Frenchmen, nor carbon-copy Europeans. Each of the founding societies and each of the cultural groups in this country has achieved in different ways its independence from its past, and none really wants to go back. Nor do Canadians want to become carbon-copy Americans, friendly and strong as our ties are with them. We have our own values, our own attitudes to life which are not British, nor French, nor American.

A constitution must be a popular document. It is, as Aristotle once said, the way of life of a citizen body; or, as we might prefer to say today, it is the embodiment of a consensus of popular feeling about our life. Another philosopher, Savigny, referred to the two elements which he said were necessary in any constitution, the political or popular element on the one hand, and the legal or technical element on the other. Our first constitution was predominantly legal; the legal element assumed almost total importance. In our new constitution I hope the stress will be laid on the political and popular element.

We shall not achieve a new constitution in a short time; the process might take a number of years. The most important conclusion we can reach at this point is that to help us obtain this new constitution we need new vehicles for popular and parliamentary participation. I believe the proposed parliamentary committee would provide such a vehicle. I believe it would enable us in Parliament to share in the work of creating a new constitution and I believe, too, that it would enable the people of Canada to take a more vital part in this task than would otherwise be possible.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Carleton-Charlotte): Mr. Speaker, we are presently discussing what I consider are the preliminary steps toward action relative to the constitution. Nothing could be more important, in my opinion. As all hon. members know, the motion is to appoint a joint committee of this House and the Senate "to examine and report upon proposals, made public"—I draw Your Honour's attention especially to the words "to examine and report upon proposals, made public"—"or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the provinces in February 1968."

My reason for reading the motion almost verbatim is that I feel there are some portions of it which might be emphasized which, I submit, might not be in the general public interest. I do not propose to make much comment on the suggested detail of the basic principles embodied in the motion, nor on the set-up of the suggested committee. My remarks will be general in character and I will refer to the principles involved.

In considering the duties of the committee to examine and report upon the proposals already made to the public by the Government of Canada, it seems to me this is somewhat restrictive and I immediately question why there appears to be a restriction upon the studies and examinations to be made by the committee. The only flexibility that seems to be in the motion is that proposals to be made public later by the Government of Canada may be examined and reported upon. Again, I submit there is a degree of restriction here which, considering the comprehensive nature of the study, should not appear in the motion. At least there should be some indication by the government of what they have in mind, and that information should be given to members of this House.

I am not sure whether the motion was framed with the idea of restricting the committee, or if it will be given plenty of latitude by subsequent reports of the Government of Canada. I hope the committee will have comprehensive references made to it later. In this connection I cannot help feeling that this

committee of our central Parliament should be able, in its deliberations, to consider representations made by the provinces as well as those made by the Government of Canada. If the committee is to render a service, and surely that is the objective, it must of necessity consider the views and representations of the provinces, the municipalities, organizations and citizens in general because by the motion it has been asked to undertake an all-embracing, comprehensive job.

Mr. Speaker, let us examine the question of the constitution and ask ourselves what it is. On reference to the dictionary I find that the definition of the word "constitution" is as follows:

> The fundamental principles of government of a nation, state, society, or other organized body of men, embodied in written documents, or implied in the institutions and customs of the country or society concerned.

I especially draw the attention of the House to the following portion of the definition, "embodied in written documents, or implied in the institutions and customs of the country," because in my opinion this suggests a degree of flexibility which has perhaps not been adopted by all people in their analysis of constitutional responsibility. I now wish to consider the constitution under which we have been operating for over 100 years.

Yesterday and today we listened to some very good speeches made in this chamber. In some cases the House was urged not to forget the British North America Act which, after all, has been our constitution for over 100 years. I am quite prepared to agree that our constitution, which has been in existence since 1867, should be brought up-to-date in light of the progress made, but I am not prepared to agree that the constitution under which we have operated should be completely ignored.

I am not prepared to admit that we should discard the constitution under which great progress has been made. I think it has a basis for improvement and that we should retain all that is constructive in it and all that tends to contribute to the creation of a new constitution, and make the necessary changes in light of changing conditions over the last 100 years.

In this chamber we hear many members express great satisfaction, and quite properly so, with the progress that this country has made in 100 years. Then why discard the constitution under which that progress was made? It is not suggested that it should form

the basis of a new constitution. It seems to me that the fact that is ignored suggests something which will be rather harmful in the preparation of a new document.

For several years various Prime Ministers and Premiers have been discussing constitutional questions. Only now is the Parliament of Canada being asked to take action and examine the matter. I well remember attending federal-provincial conferences as Premier of New Brunswick. I remember very well the attitude of the Prime Minister of the day, Mr. St. Laurent. I believe that very capable and considerate Prime Minister had great respect for the rights of the provinces. On many occasions he stated his view that conferences between the provinces and the federal government on questions of jurisdiction should be co-operative. It always seemed to me that he deplored any conflict between the provinces and the federal authority.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I have always considered Mr. St. Laurent to be a great constitutional lawyer and a great Prime Minister. He mentioned conferences very frequently, but to my knowledge he never suggested the need for a brand new constitution. Perhaps the influence of this great man has made me very sensitive to the need of preserving in the old constitution all that is beneficial, important and near and dear to many Canadians, while at the same time adding to it where it appears wise to do so and amending it where it appears desirable. The next Prime Minister with whom I was associated is the Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker, the hon. member for Prince Albert. To my recollection, his attitude with reference to the constitution was much the same as Mr. St. Laurent's.

I do not think we are discussing a matter about which there should be great political or partisan differences among the various groups in this House. I think we are discussing a document which deserves attention, which perhaps deserves amendment and some additional sections. I think the constitution in general needs to be dressed up and fixed up so it will serve us for the next 100 years, or even more, in a better way than the old one served us in the last 100 years.

I belong to a party that subscribes to the general political philosophy that we should preserve and conserve all that is good in established institutions and formulas that have been in operation for some time. We should make those changes which appear

likely to strengthen these institutions; we should make any amendment which seems desirable.

Everyone will acknowledge that we live today in a world very different from that of a century or even half a century ago. From horse and buggy to automobile, aeroplane and now trips to the moon, is a great-deal of progress in half a century. It would be very unwise after half a century of experience to suggest that the rules and regulations under which we operate, or in other words the constitution, should not be reviewed and changed to suit changing conditions.

I do not believe, however, that the constitution should be left entirely in the hands of constitutional lawyers, together with the executive heads or civil servants of 11 governments. I am in favour of a revised constitution, but I am also in favour of using the present constitution—the British North America Act—as a foundation upon which to build.

In the process of changing a constitution it is well to remember that there are countries which change their constitutions from time to time. This applies to the United States of America. I respectfully draw the attention of the House to the fact that a change in the constitution of that great country calls for more than just a majority vote. Changing the constitution of the United States is a long and laborious process. It calls for much discussion, examination and consideration and is only done by a two-thirds majority vote. In other words, it is a very serious matter to change the constitution of any country.

Therefore, the action we are asked to take today, namely, to set up a committee to examine and report on this question is not especially contentious and I have no reason to think it will not receive general support. I would be concerned, however, if I was not thoroughly satisfied that the constitution under which we have been operating will be completely ignored.

I do not believe that all the factors involved in the making of a new constitution are recognized by many people. A major revision is far reaching in its consequences. Countries which have freely changed their constitutions provide us with examples we would do well to avoid. This is why the procedure we follow in arriving at a new constitution is of the utmost importance.

I am somewhat concerned about the point of view of the provinces. The statement was made yesterday that we cannot leave a matter as important as the changing of the constitution to 11 people who by accident of election happen to be prime ministers or premiers of the provinces. Because at one time I qualified under one of those categories, I am prepared to acknowledge that there is something to be said for this argument. However, I ask this question: If you do not listen to elected representatives entrusted with responsibility of office by the people of their native province—people who know them well—to whom do you listen? In my opinion, in the final analysis one must realize that provincial governments have the needs and views of their people very much at heart. At the same time, I think they are quite prepared to recognize that in matters of jurisdiction there must be a strong central government in respect of matters which pertain to national acts. I am sure that is obvious to all concerned.

It is the reconciliation of these divergent views, and embodying them in written documents, that the committee we propose to set up will have entrusted to it. I believe in the principle of responsible government. It is all right to talk about listening to the views of the average citizen, but after you get the views of the average citizen, how much nearer are you to getting unanimity of view? All you get is a variation of opinion from a lot of different people. If this were done, would we be any further ahead as a country than if we accepted the general principle that provincial governments, answerable to their people in the next election, are reasonably accurate in communicating the needs and wishes of the people regarding a common, uniform constitution?

Provincial governments have prestige to maintain. The heads of those governments are answerable for every opinion they express. I have the feeling that conferences between federal and provincial governments which are televised and exposed to the public greatly restrict expressions of honest opinion. In the machinery of conferences there must of necessity be a degree of give and take, of argument and consent, and the opinions of the people participating might sometimes be influenced by the fact that their expressions and reactions are capable of being misrepresented and misconstrued if they are exposed ruthlessly through television. I say it is ruthless because it brings out all the weaknesses.

When we attend such conferences we are all obliged to consider that we have political opponents at home. They are there, and

they are watching. They are watching in the wings for the slightest slip that might be considered a deviation from the general public interest. If such a conference could be held in which the only topic to be discussed was the constitution under which the country was to be governed, I wonder if it would not be possible to have representatives of political parties in all the provinces meet so the matter of constitutional change might be considered on a strictly non-partisan basis.

In this connection, surely there is one area of political activity in which we are all united with one objective and one result, that is, to improve and continue the progress of this great country called Canada. Surely that is paramount. This requires unity of action, and I see no reason why it should be lacking. I likewise see no reason why there should be any restriction of matters to be examined and reported upon by the committee. The motion says it shall be confined to subjects raised by the federal government or by other governments at past constitutional conferences. This reference should be enlarged. The committee should not be hampered, hamstrung or restricted. There should be complete flexibility and movement of action so that members of the committee may decide for themselves what they should study in light of the need to come up with a document in respect of which they can take a great deal of pride as the constitution for the next 100 years.

• (8:20 p.m.)

At the outset of these remarks I stated that I intended to speak only in general terms concerning the motion. I wish, however, to refer to the observations made in the House last evening by my hon. friend from Palliser (Mr. Schumacher). In his reference to what constitutes the Parliament of Canada he quoted section 17 of the BNA Act, which states there shall be one Parliament for Canada consisting of the Queen, an upper house styled the Senate, and the House of Commons. I happen to be one who believes very much in recognizing as part of our formal Parliament the presence of someone who shall be entirely above any political controversy. I am quite prepared to acknowledge that I have a sentimental attachment to our Queen.

While I do not quarrel with anyone who does not possess a similar sentiment, I believe it is instinctive for all people to desire a symbol which they agree is a most desirable and precious one. I also agree with my hon. friend when he speaks about the need for decentralization as the only apparent way of adequately protecting regions and minorities in this country. But there are, of course, very good reasons for a strong national government. I think of the question of transportation. When this country came into being in 1867, the result of a conference among the representatives of the two central provinces and those of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret that I must interrupt the hon. member to bring to his attention that his time has expired, unless he has the unanimous agreement of the House to continue his remarks beyond the allotted time. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Flemming: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House. I shall not continue much longer. At that time a commitment was made on the question of transportation. That commitment was that two provinces in the east which made confederation possible would be protected by the building of the Intercolonial Railway which would make it possible for their producers to be placed on the threshold of the markets of central Canada. I do not propose to proceed with a discussion of this matter, especially in light of the fact that my time has expired. I submit, however, that this commitment has not been carried out, and the more transportation acts this House passes, the more Parliament seems to forget the commitment ever existed.

As one who has had some experience both in the provincial and federal fields of responsibility, I welcome this motion. Action to initiate steps such as are envisaged by this motion will not, I believe, receive any great degree of objection. I would argue that the terms of reference of the committee should be made more flexible than now is the case. The basic principle which should be kept in mind is the protection of the individual. That is really what a constitution is for—the protection of the individual. This is really the only means by which we can make sure there is a limit beyond which our rulers cannot go; I care not to which party they belong. There must be something to hold them down.

As Canadians we have a great degree of freedom. So long as we use that freedom properly and for the general good of all Canadians, we have a right to insist that it be maintained. In practice we are a very fortunate people. In a practical aspect, emphasis

upon the abstract, the legal as well as theorizing and philosophizing will lead us nowhere.

The question of the constitution must be brought into the open, in plain simple terms, so that all will be able to see what it will mean to him or her. Let us take it away from the plodding experts and the lawyers. Let us have a new instrument which will embody all that is good in the old, which will contain amendments of improvement and additions where necessary in light of present conditions, all of which will be designed to result in improved and continued progress for Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Ouellet (Papineau): Mr. Speaker, let me express my satisfaction that the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) yesterday introduced a motion to appoint a joint Committee of the House of Commons and the Senate to review the Canadian constitution.

I trust this motion will be passed unanimously by the House, and that it will be a preliminary step to the drafting of a brand new constitution, a truly Canadian and modern one.

The last Special Committee on the Constitution was established by the House in 1935. It is of interest to note that such prominent people as the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe, the Hon. Ian Mackenzie, Onésime Gagnon, and G. L. Ralston, as well as Mr. G. S. Woodsworth and Mr. Henri Bourassa were members of that Committee.

I hope each party will appoint to the Committee their most prominent members and that the Committee will produce as many good results as the one of 1935.

At the time, one of the most interesting witnesses was Dr. Maurice Ollivier, lawyer and Parliamentary adviser of the House of Commons. Dr. Ollivier who was my professor of constitutional law at the University of Ottawa, had suggested a very comprehensive amending method which might well still be applicable today. In an article published in the Canadian Journal of Economy's Political Science Mr. Eugene Forsey set forth Dr. Ollivier's recommendations as follows:

[*English*]

He divides the BNA Act into five categories: (1) sections "spent" or not requiring amendment; (2) sections which should be alterable simply by two-thirds vote of both Houses of the Dominion Parliament (or, on a second presentation, two-thirds of the Commons and a majority of the Senate); (3) sections requiring in addition the consent of one province; (4) sections requiring consent of a majority of the provinces; (5) sections requiring consent of all provinces. The third category comprises sections 69-80; the fourth sections 8, 12, 51, 58-68, 81-92, 94-101, 118, 128, 132, 146, 147; the fifth, sections 5-7, 93, 133, 92, heads 12-14. In respect to section 92, head 13, however, Dr. Ollivier attaches the notable proviso that "in the case of social services . . . for the general advantage of Canada" majority consent would be enough.

• (8:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Unfortunately, the economic recession and the war put an end to this hope for constitutional amendments. It is therefore extremely important that the parliamentary committee that we want to create today should really get down to business and do the work our predecessors tried to do 35 years ago already.

At that time it seemed important to adopt our constitution to the new circumstances. It is all the more so for us now to adopt a constitution suited to our times.

The young of today wish to change society so as to adapt it to their aspirations, to make it more genuinely Canadian, less artificial and much more in agreement with their ideal.

The centennial year of Canadian confederation was marked by numerous merry celebrations. Canadians from all over the country fraternized and lived through a common and exciting experience and were moved together by the same feelings.

It was felt then that there was a common and unmistakable wish for co-existence, but the euphoria has died out. The year 1967 has now gone by and our national pride has faded away almost simultaneously, which was hardly surprising.

On the other hand, how could a young English-Canadian who is suffering from regional disparities be proud to call himself a Canadian?

How could a young Canadian of French origin who is compelled to speak English to obtain services from his government be proud to be a Canadian?

How could a young Canadian of Polish descent who must swear allegiance to the Queen of England in the service of Canada be proud to be a Canadian?

How could a young person visiting Parliament be proud to be a Canadian when seeing the Speaker and the sergeant-at-arms of this House walking along wearing costumes and hats so obsolete and ridiculous—if I may say so—belonging to a bygone era and a foreign country?

How could a young student have pride in Canada when watching television during federal-provincial conferences and seeing

politicians who are more interested in their own image and political advantages than in the seriousness and the urgency motivating those conferences?

I am happy to note that one of the clauses of the resolution moved yesterday by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) provides for granting the committee authorization to travel across Canada.

It is obvious that steps will have to be taken to promote in Canada a real national sense of pride. Workshops held in different cities of the country by the parliamentary committee seems to me an efficient means of bringing the population to contribute to the constitutional review.

In my opinion, the Canadian population must take part in the dialogue and to that end, it appears important to me at this stage that no government, either federal or provincial, claim that certain elements of the constitution are endowed with a sacrosanct quality which can automatically shield them from a free discussion.

The Prime Minister has already stated that the federal government is henceforth prepared to discuss any constitutional reform whatever.

I therefore think that the monarchy is one of the subjects that will have to be considered openly and without passion.

In a document published in February 1969, *The Constitution and the People of Canada*, the federal government explained how the aspirations of Canadians can best be expressed when establishing the objectives of the constitution, how their democratic rights can be guaranteed and how their interests as citizens of a specific country and region can be protected under the federal regime.

I readily subscribe to all the recommendations made in this document, except for the views on the monarchy. However, I agree that some proposals should be discussed long before we come to the monarchy, which will have to be examined in due time.

Finally, I sent a questionnaire to all my constituents. I am proud to say to the House that I represent a riding which reflects well our country's characteristics. I represent French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians, immigrants who are trying to understand the Canadian mentality and make a new and happy life for themselves, old citizens who are faced with insecurity and inflation, young people looking for reasons to be proud of their country and who are wondering if Canada is really their country. They all live in relative harmony. In brief, I represent a riding where good people live, who talk of themselves as Canadians, but who would like to have reasons to be more so.

In the questionnaire, I asked my electors if they were in favor of the progressive disappearance of royal symbols. Well, 80 per cent said yes. Of all the questions I asked, this was the one on which there was the greatest unanimity; only 9 per cent were against and 11 per cent undecided.

This is an interesting sample of public opinion. Therefore, it is important to leave the door open to discussion, because the new constitution will be worthwhile only if the population wishes it to be.

That is why I advocate dialogue with the people, because I believe the committee that will be established should hear experts in political science, representatives of provincial legislatures, of intermediate bodies, of municipalities and any other person capable of making a useful contribution. With the help of all those people, a report could be prepared and presented to the House of Commons and the Senate for the approval of a new constitution. The only thing remaining to be done would be to have it accepted by the Canadian people through a national referendum.

The people are sovereign. It is useless in 1970 to apply to London, in order to amend the constitution. Let us draw up a new constitution which we will submit to the people. Let us show our national pride and settle our own affairs in Canada.

On page 408 of his book entitled "Problems of Canadian Sovereignty", Mr. Maurice Ollivier wrote, and I quote:

[*English*]

Two classes of people have been the enemies of Canadian unity; those who have placed another country above Canada in their love, affection and admiration, ever stressing the alleged superiority of that country over our own, and secondly those nationalists with a narrow provincial concept who have constantly attacked the federal power just as if the provinces were not represented at Ottawa and were not part of the federal system but separate entities fighting a foreign government—

All we need to do is to place Canada first and consider this fair country as our home.

[*Translation*]

This is what I wanted to say at this stage. The time available to me does not allow me to specify what provisions should be included in that new constitution. I will surely have the opportunity to bring up that matter again in committee, if the resolution is carried.

It is obvious, however, that this constitution will have to ensure the necessary means in order to afford the two founding nations equal chances to develop fully and respect each other. The very survival of Canada as a nation as we know it at present is at stake; the survival and free development of French Canadians is also at stake.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of the debate has such serious implications for the future of our country that it must be treated with the greatest objectivity.

Reading over the speeches made so far, I have come to the conclusion that everyone is anxious to do his share in order that Canada may have a constitution that will fulfil the needs of all Canadians and of all provinces.

I congratulate my colleague the hon. member for Roberval (Mr. Gauthier) for his speech yesterday, and I shall continue expressing the thinking of our party through a study of another aspect of the problem.

For a layman like myself, it is perhaps daring to take part in a debate on such an important and sensitive subject. However, since my youth, I have been interested in the constitutional problems of our country and I have often wondered why when there has been general agreement on the terms of a contract, conflict should inevitably result when it comes to its enforcement.

The motion now under consideration reads as follows:

> That a joint Committee . . . be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada, during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in Febuary, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

I had the opportunity in 1969 to attend the federal-provincial conference. I followed the proceedings with great interest and I concluded that the most delicate matters on which the participants disagreed most strongly had to do with finance and taxation.

It is quite obvious that we need to reform or to amend our constitution so as to meet the needs of our times. But why amend or rewrite our constitution, if both sides are not prepared to respect it afterwards?

I think the constitution governing us at the present time would not have been so bad after all if it had been and were still respected by the central government. In my view, the time has come to improve it considerably and even to rewrite it. Perhaps some will reply that certain provinces do not respect it to the letter either. Personally, I do not think so, because we all know that when the central government felt that the constitution had been violated by a provincial government, the federal government would soon resort to the competent tribunals to get a ruling on whether the province concerned had violated the constitution or not.

In Canada, there is perhaps a particular constitutional problem since confederation is made up of nine English-speaking provinces and of one French-speaking province. In other words, Canada has two cultures, one is English and the other French and, in my opinion, it is a happy circumstance. Since 1867, Canada has enjoyed other cultures.

For the past century, Canada has been discussing its constitution. All governments, to whatever party they belonged, one after the other established commissions to conduct studies and inquiries into the matter, and their reports were made public; however, they have not settled the problem.

The British North America Act has created a federal state and distributed powers among the central government and the provincial governments, but it hardly described the federal parliamentary or the provincial legislature machineries. At any rate, the Act specified that the British parliamentary institutions and the existing laws should be maintained. That provision, altogether too general, introduced in Canada all the British constitutional and parliamentary practices, rules and standards, and they were to be an essential part of the Canadian constitutional procedure.

The Canadian government is based on the federal system, which involves an assembly of autonomous provinces enjoying some exclusive rights, and a central government that looks after the matters of prime concern to the whole population.

Under such a system, powers are divided between the federal and provincial governments. To operate properly, it needs the cooperation of everybody and must apply the give-and-take principle. We are fortunate in

having inherited this form of government which is more suited to our character than an arbitrary system. The federative system does more than suit us; it is a must. Differences in race, language, religion, regional economies and social activities make it more pressing than in 1867 to distribute the administrative powers. Because of its constitutional machinery, federalism is more likely to safeguard provincial prerogatives, while enabling a common discussion on basic issues, even though such distribution of powers gives rise to endless problems.

The British North America Act united initially the provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; the other provinces joined confederation later on, one by one. The purpose was to unite the country under various agreements, which brought about problems respecting the distribution of powers. The reasons why federalism must be maintained in Canada, namely the differences in race, wealth, resources and religion, are the same ones which make distribution of powers necessary.

For complete understanding of the details of the distribution of powers, we need only turn to section 91 of the British North America Act, enumerating federal powers. This section empowers Parliament to:

> make Laws for the Peace, Order and good Government of Canada in relation to all matters not coming within the Classed of Subjects assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the Provinces.

One can thus wonder whether a subject which at first sight might appear to fall within provincial jurisdiction does not come within federal authority, and vice versa. The section goes on to list the subjects exclusively assigned to parliament. The purpose of the enumeration is to ensure greater clarity and not to limit the scope of the general authority mentioned earlier. It includes classes of powers within federal jurisdiction such as the regulation of trade and commerce, defence, currency, the raising of moneys by any mode or system of taxation, postal service, navigation and shipping, and weights and measures.

Section 92 confers powers on provinces including the right to amend their constitution (excepting with regard to the appointment of the lieutenant governor), to raise direct taxes to meet their own expenses, to manage and sell Crown land, to pass legislation concerning municipal institutions, civil rights and property.

Canada and the provinces share powers in respect of agriculture and immigration, but in case of conflict the federal law prevails. This article should be immediately and completely revised.

Education was considered so important that it was dealt with in a separate section. Section 93 confers on the federal parliament limited legislative powers in education matters in order to protect the rights of minorities who attend denominational or separate schools. The provinces have the exclusive power to legislate in the field of education. The federal government should make a very serious soul-searching effort in that respect.

Most of the difficulties which oppose the federal and provincial governments derive from the fact that there could not have been a provision for everything at the time of confederation and that a judicial interpretation of section 91, from 1867 to 1945, tended to increase provincial powers and decrease federal powers. Another important factor was the tremendous increase in provincial expenditures. Those difficulties also result from the fact the federal and provincial authorities must increase their taxation powers and levy new taxes in view of the people's demands for expensive welfare services such as pensions, health insurance, etc. Being limited to direct taxation, the provinces find themselves continuously fighting competition from the federal power which has taken over the taxation fields opened to it. Several of these difficulties, such as those concerning family allowances and unemployment insurance, have been settled by agreement.

Since family allowances are very closely related to the family, I personally think that they should come under provincial jurisdiction.

With regard to the limited powers and obligations of the provinces, since they are always faced with financial difficulties, I shall quote an article which appeared in the January 26 issue of *La Presse*. This article reads as follows, and I quote:

> The President of the Teachers Association of the Gaspé Peninsula regional School Board, Mr. Gaston Dubé, states in a telegram addressed to the Quebec Teachers Corporation that the union is considering the possibility of resorting to work-to-rule and even to an all-out strike, because of arrears from $300,000 to $400,000 in the payment of teachers' salaries.

It would seem needless today to attempt to prove that the fathers of confederation wanted to create a strongly centralized federal system in which a central government would enjoy limitless powers.

However, carefully are divided the powers within a federal system, difficulties inevitably crop up when an attempt is made to apply this distribution to the various and complex aspects of social life.

• (8:50 p.m.)

We have evidence that during federal-provincial conferences, the great problems which opposed the federal government to the provinces were of an economic and financial nature.

It is not only the province of Quebec that does not agree with the federal government on this issue. During those conferences, the Premier of Newfoundland, Mr. Smallwood, was perhaps the one who complained most bitterly about the injustice suffered by the eastern provinces. He added that Canada is divided in two economic areas: a poor one and a rich one. I think he is right.

The central government taxes and overtaxes, and then it says to the provinces: if you need money, it is your turn to go and get it in the pockets of taxpayers. You must discharge your responsibilities by increasing taxes. The taxpayer has become overtaxed because of this misunderstanding between the federal powers, on one hand, and those of the provinces, on the other.

I hope that the committee that will be appointed will look fully into all the aspects of the taxation problem and that during the hearings it will hold throughout the country, there will be people and organizations able to see the problem in its true light in order to prove that above all, what divides us and prevents us from respecting our constitution, is the need for additional financial resources of the provinces to enable them to meet their commitments.

Last week I met here, in Ottawa, the Premier of Manitoba and I asked him how things were going in his province. He replied he had to cope with serious financial problems and added: I have the economic potential to do many things but I do not have the necessary funds. So I suggested he demand help from the Bank of Canada for his province, through interest-free loans. He must have thought my suggestion was worthwhile for he replied that he was considering it seriously.

It is not the province of Quebec alone that disagrees with the present constitution, as far as economic and taxation questions are concerned. Ask Mr. Robichaud, from New Brunswick, or the other provincial premiers for their opinion and you will get the same answer. But to my knowledge, there is not a single one who had enough courage, during the federal-provincial conferences, to suggest a favourable financial reform for Canada as a whole.

In my opinion, even if the proposed committee on the constitution were to make just one recommendation, asking the sovereign government of Canada to use the Bank of Canada to finance the public sector in the departments involved in capitalization, in capital expenditures, such as the Department of Public Works, for instance, it would allow the provinces a wider scope for taxation. The committee would thus prove its usefulness.

As long as the federal government and the provinces will wrangle over the right of being the first to despoil the taxpayer, this country will remain divided, whatever constitution we may have. We are more divided over this question than over the language issue. I have travelled extensively across the country and discovered that Canadians are now much more concerned about economic problems than about the question of the constitution, however important it may be.

In conclusion, I am willing to support the motion to establish a committee and I demand a fair deal for the province of Quebec. We are not begging for rights, we only want them to be acknowledged. If we do not take action while it is still time, we shall witness the disintegration of Canada.

As for me, I am a Canadian and, as such, I have a claim on the heritage of my entire country, no matter in which area I live, the language I speak or the religion I practice.

When Jacques Cartier, erected the cross at Gaspé, he brought on the American soil the symbol of christianity. And when he hoisted the flag, it meant the beginning of a new civilization on this continent. Thus did Cartier found Canada which we have so many reasons for being proud of.

But within Canada, there are territorial subdivisions known as provinces, each of which has its own characteristics; we should take them into account in a new constitution, so that each province might be true to itself, and be strong within a strong Canada.

Even now, one can guess that the fathers of confederation recognized that diversity. Let us hope the authors of the new constitution will recognize that even more, that each one of the provinces, including Quebec, might

develop socially, economically and culturally, while retaining complete financial autonomy.

This is a critical time: there is unrest, unemployment, dissatisfaction, and the governments disclaim all responsibility.

Let us go back to the people to see for ourselves what is going on. Then we can think, speak and act according to the needs of the whole country. Let us go back to the fountain-head, and have the courage to make the necessary constitutional and financial reforms before it is too late.

[*English*]

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, on June 25, 1968, Canada opted emphatically for one nation, with each region, each province enjoying the same rights in the Canadian Confederation as every other region and province, and with no region and no province denied rights extended to the others—in short, a Canada with a full status for all and special status for none.

Since that time the executive branches of our federal and provincial governments have engaged in what appears to us on the outside to have become an increasingly frustrating and decreasingly productive dialogue as attitudes harden and the message delivered by the voters in June, 1968, becomes less and less immediate in their memories. Nowhere was that message delivered in more emphatic terms than urban Canada, and nowhere is the need for constitutional reform more evident than when we relate the existing constitution to urban Canada.

Surely, if the agricultural community was of the importance over a century ago to merit the concurrent jurisdiction of the federal and provincial governments—and it unquestionably was—the draftsmen of the constitution, taking into the account the realities of Canada today, would not leave our great urban municipalities in the position they now find themselves, creatures of largely rural-oriented provincial governments, creatures whose resources, founded on the base of the real property tax cannot even remotely be related to their responsibilities.

• (9:00 p.m.)

If I am correct in inferring from this resolution a decision by the government to again take the constitutional debate to the people of Canada, I am all for it. It will take much more than the reminder of occasional elections to keep these governments and their leaders firmly on the course of constitutional reform which is so necessary and which the people have emphatically endorsed.

An improvement I suggest is that the legislatures of our provinces be invited to have members on this joint committee, and that it be made a constitutional commission with a firm mandate to achieve the kind of results which seem as far as ever from realization through the processes being pursued from time to time before the cameras at the old Union Station.

There are certain rather tired and trite truisms which seem necessarily to come up in debates of this nature, if for no other reason than that each participant wants his own offering to be a thing of literary beauty, complete in itself and independent of other contributions to the debate. I trust that I shall be neither more nor less guilty than others who participate if I yield to this common offence and observe that since we are a nation of vast geographic dimensions and disparate social and economic situations, we are necessarily a federation. It is impossible to see Canada as a unitary state. Circumstances compel us, if we are to be a nation at all, to find the means of being a workable federation. Failing that, the long-term trend will be to fragmentation, not centralization.

The difficulty inherent in the search for this solution is compounded by the concentration of our population in rather narrow limits. With the exception of artificial considerations dictating the representation of Prince Edward Island, the Yukon and Northwest Territories, membership in this House is a pretty fair profile of the population distribution of the nation. Of every five Members of Parliament, three represent constituencies lying in a strip 100 miles deep running from Windsor to Quebec City. There are more Members of Parliament from metropolitan Montreal than from the entire province of British Columbia. There are more Members of Parliament from metropolitan Toronto than from any of the three prairie provinces. There are more from Ontario alone than from the three prairie and four Atlantic provinces together.

One of the very fundamental questions which must be asked is whether any federation so dominated by one or two of its constituent members is workable. Looking at the problem from the other end of the pipe, would anyone, considering Canada today and concluding, as he must, that it is too cumbersome an entity to govern as a unitary state, subdivide in such a manner that over 60 per cent of its political muscle, expressed by

sheer weight of numbers in this House, was concentrated in two of its ten subdivisions?

The further subdivision of Ontario and Quebec may very well be a necessary prerequisite, not only to a workable Canadian federation but to the satisfaction of the conflicting aspirations of those who live in the great cities of those provinces and those in the rural areas. The rural residents still hold the power in the provincial legislatures through inequitable distribution of seats, but this situation cannot last for ever. When it does come to an end, it may very well be found best for all that the fact of the new city state be recognized and that metropolitan Toronto and metropolitan Montreal be given provincial status in Canada rather than dominating the provinces to whose rural electorate they are presently subordinated.

Atlantic union is already a topic of conversation in the Atlantic provinces. At the University of Lethbridge, in May of this year a conference entitled "One Prairie Province? A question for Canada" will be held. I wish to read briefly from the invitation sent to participants in that conference by the university and the Lethbridge *Herald:*

> The conference "One Prairie Province? A Question for Canada" is designed to explore the issues, debate the pros and cons and discuss the idea of uniting Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba into "One Prairie Province".
>
> We hope that this conference will develop a better informed public with regard to the understanding of constitutional relationships and the stresses on our present federal structure and thus strengthen our national cohesion. We feel this is the time for frank discussion and for searching for ways to improve our federal system.

To this I say, amen. A second basic question that arises from this great concentration of population in a relatively small area, about 60 per cent of Canada's people on about 4 per cent of its land mass, is whether the effective federal legislative power ought fairly and properly to be committed entirely to this chamber; whether, in a federal state with Canada's particular characteristics, the transparently fair approach of "one man; one vote" is indeed as equitable as it sounds.

That, of course, is what the Senate is supposed to be all about. With the possible exception of certain members of that august chamber, you will get little argument on the proposition that it has not worked; that it has not fulfilled the expectations of those who called for it in the Quebec resolution and created it in the British North America Act. More to the point, why has it failed to be an effective entity in the bicameral legislature of Canada? Is it the manner of selection of its members? Is it the fact that once appointed they are, for all practical purposes, answerable to no one? How could it be made more effective without at the same time detracting undesirably from the rights and responsibilities of this chamber?

Another institution central to Canadian federalism is our Supreme Court. Had that court exercised a creative role, it is possible that this resolution would not be before us today. But it did not, through no fault of its own, during the first 80 years of confederation and by then, when appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were finally abolished, it was probably too late. But for the future the question remains, how can our Supreme Court be constituted so as to fulfil a creative, on-going role in the Canadian Confederation?

It is not an unusual spectacle in this chamber to witness a member opposite, trembling with poorly-simulated rage, genuine sanctimony dripping from every pore, charge the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) with attempting to impose a presidential system on Canada. The bait has been taken by some columnists and during the dog days in Ottawa when the House is in recess an occasional speculative article on the subject appears.

I, for one, oppose any move to eliminate the monarchy from our constitution; but there is nothing really inconsistent in having a presidential system in a monarchy. The president would merely be the head of government, popularly elected, rather than the head of state elected as a substitute for the monarch. It may very well be that for the next century of confederation, Canada can best be served by a less powerful head of government than a prime minister is under the present system. After all, a prime minister controls not only the executive but the legislature. He holds in his hands, relative to his country, far more power than does a president, who controls only the executive.

Another complementary reform which might be considered is whether the system of responsible government is really best suited to the needs of a federal state, or whether Canada might not be better served by the congressional system. While members on this side as a rule find themselves in agreement that government policies are, on balance, best not only for the nation but for the regions they represent, this is not invariably the case.

We have our opportunities in caucus; they are good opportunities, and frequently the fight is won there—although having fought and won the good fight, it is a matter of some regret to the victor that his efforts will forever go unnoted by his constituents as the secrecy of caucus prevails. I suspect that the overriding obligation to support the ministry, imposed on government Members of Parliament by the system of responsible government, has led the voters of the generally disaffected region I represent to send platoon upon platoon of opposition members of this House. I do not think the prairie voters have necessarily served their best interests by doing this. I do not think that the system which has impelled them to do it has necessarily served the best interests of Canada.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Other speakers in this debate have expressed concern about particular aspects of our constitution. The hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) concentrated on questions affecting its amendment, the hon. member for Etobicoke (Mr. Gillespie) concentrated on the powers necessary to manage the economy of this country, and the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) dealt at some length with the subject of the monarchy.

There is much more I should like to say, but I have tried to limit my observations to a few fundamental areas wherein I see a possibility of basic reform in the interest of better accommodating our federal institutions to the fact of western regionalism. Again, the University of Lethbridge seminar in May will point to another way in which these regions can obtain proportionate power in the Canadian union.

Talk of separatism is not unknown in western Canada. It is increasing in frequency. Studies as to the economic feasibility of a separate western Canada are being openly conducted and discussed. Some people seem to have adopted this approach for tactical purposes on the basis of an assumption that it has been highly successful in achieving more for another region than they deem to be its fair share.

I hope I have indicated that very little of the past or of established institutions is sacred to me when it comes to seeking a workable constitution for the future. But I draw the line at separatism wherever it is proposed. It is high time the Prime Minister stood in this House and told all Canadians that the federal government is open to all ideas concerning the way in which Canada can best continue as a nation—but that we are speaking of Canada, not some fragmentation of Canada; separatism is not an option for Canadians.

It is high time the leaders of the opposition parties endorsed this view without equivocation. The sooner we reject the options which would patently destroy Canada, the sooner we can get on with the job of choosing among the options which would preserve Canada. It may be that this rejection will require an intervention of the heart rather than of the mind, but being a Canadian is not entirely an intellectual exercise; there is something visceral about it, too. Let no Canadian be ashamed to show that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): We have had a very good debate so far, Mr. Speaker, and there are many aspects which could be dealt with in speaking on this subject. One matter which has not been dealt with at any length concerns the great difficulty which Canada experiences in subscribing to international agreements, dating back to the labour conventions of the 1930s when we found we could not sign a treaty in connection with an agreement on labour legislation, and continuing until recent days at the United Nations.

I recall that when I had the honour to represent Canada at that body for a number of years, we were constantly faced with this problem when resolutions were presented having to do with education and other matters. Canada was obliged to abstain from voting. Countries with unitary government could not understand Canada's position. They could not understand why a country such as Canada, a forward-looking country, could not support resolutions concerning human rights, education and the like. It was almost impossible to explain to them why Canada and Australia, for instance, could not fix their names to these resolutions. This is something which must be dealt with when constitutional reform is carried out.

I was most interested in the speech this afternoon of the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen). This minister is one of the ablest debaters on the government side of the House. Today he made a very loud speech. I find that when people make loud speeches it is usually for the purpose of covering up a weak case. In this instance, if I recall correctly, he was telling us

that the government was seeking a national consensus with regard to the constitution.

I can understand his point of view. I can understand the tortoise-like pace the government has been setting in this regard. It is understandable when we realize that among the hon. gentleman's colleagues there is no consensus at all about what the constitution should contain.

I have here some reports from the press which reflect the thinking of members of the cabinet with respect to the constitution. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) may close the debate, and perhaps he will take the opportunity to explain the position he took about a year ago as reported in the Toronto *Telegram* of March 22, 1968, when he said:

> Provincial governments should be permitted the same right as private broadcasters in operating radio and television networks, Liberal leadership candidate John Turner said last night.
>
> The new distribution of power should empower the provincial governments to establish their own radio and T.V. networks, provided all technical control and all apparatus was maintained by the federal government to prevent anarchy. This indicates that consumer affairs minister Turner supports demands by Quebec to set up its own radio and television network.

Then we have the view of the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) as to what should be done in connection with the constitution. I refer to the *Globe and Mail* of March 27, 1968, where the following appears:

> Warning that bilingualism and biculturalism are not the whole answer to Canada's unity problem, Eric Kierans yesterday staked out a constitutional position which would open the door to a special status for Quebec.

Now I come to another quotation from the Minister of Justice. This appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of March 2, 1968:

> Among social security programs which could be transferred to the provinces were federal family allowances and old age pensions, but the unemployment insurance program should remain a mixed field of jurisdiction.

Then there is the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). I refer to the Toronto *Star* of March 22, 1968, in which the following appears:

> Sharp said Canadians must be ready to accept sweeping constitutional changes to satisfy Quebec's aspirations.

I could dwell at length on this aspect; it seems to me I have even juicier quotations in front of me. I was interested in the minister's statement that the government was seeking a consensus with regard to the constitution. All I can say is, they had better find a consensus among their own members before starting on anybody else.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nesbitt: We heard this afternoon from the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney). He began his speech with a quotation—"Common status for all; special status for none". It must be difficult for the hon. member for Calgary to believe this when his seniors in the cabinet hold such a diversity of views as to the form the constitution should take. None of them appears to agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), which is very odd.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration spent most of his time this afternoon making cracks at the expense of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). He referred to his speech as one which would be called the "our days are numbered" speech. All I can say in this regard, Mr. Speaker, is that one might regard the minister's speech as a "head-in-sand" speech, or "pretend that the provincial opposition to the government's proposal is not there, and maybe the objections will go away". The minister took particular objection to the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion that the proposals of the government were not meeting with success even though the government had a nine-point program.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing we must be quite clear about. It is that despite what was said by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration this afternoon, I have not been able to find agreement on any of the major constitutional problems of this country. It is true that the question about the administration in Ottawa being bilingual was mentioned, but that is not a constitutional problem. There has been no major agreement on any of the major constitutional problems that were before the conferences already held. As far as I could find out, the only agreement has been to put a certain number of things on the agenda for further discussion; that is about all it amounts to.

We have only to look to the minister's colleagues to dispute what he said, Mr. Speaker. I refer to a prominent member of cabinet who not long ago said that the Prime Minister was not having much success with his federal-provincial conferences. If my memory serves me correctly, this matter was brought before the

House by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) not long ago.

Unfortunately, in this House we are all limited in time, and there are still one or two matters I should like to deal with in some detail. I should like to turn my attention briefly to the latest federal proposals made at the constitutional conference some weeks ago. I hope that my remarks will illustrate why the federal proposals, in themselves, provide a most unsatisfactory base upon which to found the discussions of the special parliamentary committee. The Minister of Manpower and Immigration said this afternoon that matters of social welfare had not been dealt with. I propose to deal with them now.

First of all, the proposals make very few changes of any substance in the constitutional status quo in so far as they relate to income support and social service programs. It appears to be essentially a reply to the position of the government of Quebec, a position which is explicitly rejected. The proposal asserts that the federal government must have an equal right to make payments to individuals in income support programs and the like. I find nothing remarkable in this, in that it represents the status quo and I would think it intolerable to deny the federal government such a role. The only rationale one can find for the statement is that it is simply another rigid reply to Quebec.

We find a similar situation with respect to the proposals which relate to the control of health and social services. Here the provincial position is again affirmed while the federal right to involvement in these areas, wherever there is a national need, is maintained and justified through the spending power. This is but another example, of which there are many in this document, of the federal government seeming to propose something new but in fact merely asserting the status quo.

Unfortunately, there is nothing in the proposals which suggests that the federal government might be planning badly needed consolidation of the federal welfare program; neither is a change in the constitutional division of powers suggested. The document explicitly leaves the field, as it relates for example to the idea of a guaranteed income, to both levels of government. It says nothing about which level would have priority, or how conflicts would be resolved. That problem, however, may be an entirely theoretical one because, as I suggested, there is no indication that the federal government plans to use its present powers, or any future powers it might acquire, to do anything about welfare.

In general, I welcome the assertion that the federal government has a wide range of power to act in order to alleviate the unhappy situation of individuals and provinces through the constitutional spending power. Since the Second World War, use of the practically unrestricted federal spending power has enabled Canadian governments to do as much as has been done to create more equal opportunities in the less favoured regions of the country. We must recognize, however, that the federal spending power has been abused at times and that extreme care must be used in the future. It may now be desirable, in fact, to spell out the provision that the federal spending power should not be used as a means of getting around any agreed constitutional division of powers.

The document tries to make a distinction between what are called income security programs, income insurance and social services. The distinction is very unclear and fuzzy. The definitions used are often circuitous. I find it difficult to say whether I agree that social services should be exclusively provincial, because it is almost impossible to tell what the federal government means by this section of the proposal. I gather it would be left entirely to the courts to decide whether a program was mainly one of income security and therefore under federal jurisdiction, or whether it was mainly one of social services and therefore under provincial jurisdiction.

There is no question that the distribution of jurisdiction relating to social services and social welfare is considered to be very important by some provinces. That being so, it is very important that we are clear on how the powers are divided, if they are to be divided. I think it most unsatisfactory to propose leaving this distinction to the courts. The problem is really one of policy, not one of law, and legal solutions such as the courts provide are of use primarily in solving legal problems. What we need in this regard is a clear distinction and definition in terms of policy.

The federal government in its document also asserts its jurisdiction to handle special cases such as involving Indians and veterans. In general, this responsibility must continue. But we must be careful that we do not get into another constitutional straitjacket. One wonders, for example, about the possibility of making Indians full provincial citizens and integrating them into the provincial political

system. There might be similar problems with respect to the handling of immigrants.

What is most important is constitutional flexibility—a fairly clear delineation in terms of policy as to what powers should belong to whom, and who is responsible for doing what, while at the same time maintaining freedom of manœuvre. The federal proposals do not seem to take into account the evidence that a number of provincial governments are concerned about Indians, are concerned about immigrants, and some are even concerned about veterans, strange as those ideas might appear to the federal government. Do I understand from the federal proposals that the federal government proposes to take no account whatever of these provincial interests?

The federal proposals do envision one substantial change in the present distribution of power. Unfortunately, the proposal is highly controversial and seems designed only to provoke the province of Quebec and hostility from other provinces, to no apparent good end. I refer to the proposal to change the 1951 amendment to the British North America Act, the one which made pensions a matter of joint jurisdiction and gave the provinces priority. The federal government which brought about 1951 amendment now proposes to change the priority from provincial to federal. Why, one is not told; and what would be accomplished thereby is not at all clear.

There is no point in changing this part of the British North America Act unless a change in the program itself is contemplated. There are essentially two programs, and only two: one is the Quebec Pension Plan and the other is the Canada Pension Plan. Both seem to be working very well and the provincial governments in particular are pleased with the funds which are made available to them through the Canada Pension Plan.

There would seem to be only two possible reasons for wishing such a change. The federal government should tell us now which of the two reasons it is. The first is the possibility that the federal government wishes to eliminate the Quebec Pension Plan and to integrate the people in the province of Quebec into the same kind of pension program which exists in the rest of Canada. The second possibility is that the federal government wants to change the Canada Pension Plan to a kind of gigantic money-grab. It may wish to see the funds which the provincial governments now have for their own capital development transferred to the federal treasury, so it can squander at will as it has been so used to doing. There may be a third reason, but it is not at all clear what that might be and it is incumbent on this government to tell the country what it has in mind and why it is making this particular proposal. If I may sum up this point, the working paper is probably best interpreted as a direct rebuff to the proposals of the province of Quebec.

• (9:30 p.m.)

There is nothing wrong with the federal government stating where it stands in relation to other proposals, but it should never do so in the deliberately provocative way that it has. Its use of the word "tentative" to describe what has been the explicit and detailed policy of the government of Quebec during the past six or seven years indicates a general attitude which I think is highly undesirable. This is simply confrontation politics and contributes in no way at all to Canadian unity. The degree of inflexibility indicated in the federal working paper on social services and income security is in no way desirable. It is a symptom, I should say, of the autocracy and rigidity which marks the policy of the present federal administration.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have been able to attend the House during most of this debate. If I may say with respect to the House, and I feel sure hon. members will generally agree, it has been a first-class debate. I have enjoyed it thoroughly. I think it has in some way highlighted for the people of Canada the importance of this exercise in constitutional review and its importance for the future of our country.

I know there have been critics of the way the constitutional review has been conducted. Criticisms have been expressed both in the country at large and, indeed, during the course of this debate. We have heard it said that the entire process of constitutional review is irrelevant to the main issues and questions that are before the country, and that the government in proceeding to a deliberate review of the constitution and the British North America Act is not dealing with what have been called the gut issues facing Canada. I think Premier Thatcher put it in the strongest possible terms when he said that the province of Saskatchewan may have had 100 problems facing the future of the people of Saskatchewan, but the constitution was the 101st. In any event, that has been said.

The critics have maintained that the government should be dealing with the main issues of the day and should be concentrating its attention on efforts of reform in respect of the issues of cities such as traffic, transportation, urban renewal, housing and pollution; that it should be directing its efforts toward overcoming the poisoning of our environment on land, in the waters and in the air; that it should be concentrating on developing a national resources policy and on taking an inventory of those resources and assuring the production and manufacturing of these resources in Canada under Canadian control. These critics have said we should be dealing with issues that are economic, particularly those now affecting the country—inflation, the cost of living, prices, rents and wages.

I think the first answer to all this criticism is that we categorically deny that we have not been dealing with these issues. Indeed, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has said, no program of any advantage to the people of Canada has in any way been delayed or postponed by reason of this constitutional review.

I think the more fundamental answer is perhaps to recognize that there are many people in Canada, and might I say many people in this House of Commons, who fail to appreciate the relevance of the constitution, as a fundamental document under which we conduct our affairs in a federal state, to the problems of our everyday life. They fail to recognize that the British North America Act is a fundamental and primary document affecting the relationship between federal and provincial governments. By the very process of reviewing that document we are dealing with the gut issues facing Canada; we are dealing with the bread and butter issues of this nation. A federal state by its very nature involves limitation on the powers and authority of the federal government, and corresponding limitations on the authority of provincial governments. These limitations of powers are set forth primarily in articles 91 and 92 of the British North America Act. This distribution of powers was agreed to over 100 years ago.

There are those who maintain that the constitution was largely rewritten by decisions of the Privy Council, particularly under the auspices of Lord Watson and Lord Haldane over the years, and that the document as currently interpreted by the courts does not resemble what the Fathers of Confederation intended to say and have written down.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

New economic realities permit many people to question the current application of that distribution of powers as set forth in the BNA Act. Regarding the concentration in urban centres, the Economic Council of Canada suggests that by 1980 over 80 per cent of us will be living in large metropolitan areas in this country. Regional disparity is growing and the gaps are growing wider. This was eloquently put by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)—this has happened since the French-speaking Canadians have a new awareness of their own cultural identity particularly in Quebec.

For what it is worth, my own view is that in the past generation the federal government has failed to exercise fully its available constitutional powers, the powers available to the federal government under the present constitution of Canada. For what it is worth, I feel that the federal government over the past generation has failed to test its constitutional muscle before the courts of this country, when such testing was necessary. I believe the federal government has been constitutionally timid. Perhaps it has been traumatized by past decisions of the Privy Council.

Certainly I would think, and submit to the House and Your Honour, that we as a federal government and as a Parliament of the people of Canada, have been insufficiently resourceful in testing the trade and commerce clause, the residual clause of peace, order and good government, and in confining property and civil rights to its proper ambit. We have placed overreliance on the criminal power, particularly as it has been used to regulate economic affairs. I refer particularly to the Combines Investigation Act which is really economic regulation and control by criminal power. This involves a stiffer burden of proof than the state can discharge in many cases. This has resulted in the merger clauses becoming ineffective. It prevents the ordinary citizen from obtaining civil damages from those who monopolize and conspire to fix prices. It also prevents cease and desist orders and injunctions to prevent action in respect of which a remedy is sought.

Notwithstanding my view that we have been constitutionally timid, I think the critics fail to realize or admit that the ultimate long-term solution to the economic and environmental issues in Canada—those issues which will demand our attention in the 1970s—involve a review of the fundamental constitutional framework under which the country operates.

I suggest that the federal government ought to explore exclusive jurisdiction or at least joint jurisdiction over these areas. The point was well taken by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). The federal government should explore this jurisdiction in respect of matters or urban renewal and other urban issues, the environment, resources, development, inflation, consumer credit, and so on.

It is true that the Prime Minister and this government have recognized this. On the other hand, there may be other powers now found in article 91 that might now be more conveniently exercised and more efficiently exercised by the provinces. I think we should envisage more flexibility in joint jurisdiction and in the transferring and delegation of powers from one jurisdiction to another under proper circumstances.

The Leader of the Opposition accused the Prime Minister of playing confrontation politics with Quebec. I am not going to get involved in an argument at this stage, but I suggest to him that a federal state by its very nature involves confrontation at times between the federal and provincial jurisdictions. There is always a flowing and ebbing of power to and fro in these jurisdictions. This is particularly true between Ottawa and Quebec.

[*Translation*]

The province of Quebec objects to certain centralizing influences which can be acceptable to other provinces. Why? Because the province of Quebec is the home of a people, because the French Canadian people has its own traditions, its own language, its own law.

If I were a French Canadian, living in the province of Quebec, I would insist on two things. First, I would insist on the need for a heavy representation in the House and in the federal cabinet. I would insist also to see the French Canadians adequately represented in Ottawa, and it seems obvious to me that they are not too badly represented in this government, for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is one of them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner: In fact, French Canadians have been appointed Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, Minister of National Defence, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Secretary of State. There are also other ministers of great talent who represent here the French Canadian fact in North America.

Then, if I were a French Canadian living in Quebec, I would insist on the principle that Quebec must be strong, have enough resources to fulfil its responsibilities under the constitution, and enjoy enough constitutional powers to mobilize the forces of its identity, something which invariably leads to a conflict of interests between the federal and the provincial governments.

It is necessary that there be confrontation from time to time in order to clarify the terms for the Canadian public.

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

I should like to say a few words about the current status of the negotiations at the federal-provincial conferences. It seems to me we have not yet had a joinder of issue. The federal positions have been set forth on a number of major items. They have been published and hon. members are aware of the publication. Therefore, it is not necessary for me to recite them. Except for the province of Quebec, the province of New Brunswick and in respect of certain issues the province of Manitoba, the provinces have been reluctant to reveal their own hands. There has been a failure to come to grips or, as lawyers would say, to join issue with the federal government so that true discussion can be possible.

It has also been suggested that negotiation in respect of a constitution under the lights of television may not be too productive because this may not be the best possible atmosphere. For my own part, I believe in an open democracy. So far as television is concerned, I believe it is inevitable that television will be brought into the proceedings of committees and into this chamber so that the ordinary person in Canada will be placed in the position of people in the galleries. If this means the rules will have to be revised to accommodate this place to the instrument of instant communication, then the rules will have to be revised. At any rate, at the federal-provincial conferences we will now have working sessions, an euphemism for closed sessions.

A new or revised constitution is not easily packaged. There is no instant solution. I say to the hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte (Mr. Flemming) that there is no reason the British North America Act cannot be the base from which we operate. There will be some hard negotiation, not only between govern-

ments but between regions and the people living in these regions.

The Prime Minister and this government have opened a total review of the constitution. There will be give and take concerning what we believe the people of Canada as a whole should have in terms of legislative authority, and what the people of individual regions and provinces should have. There will be hard bargaining. I want to suggest to the hon. member for York South, who made his usual able contribution to this debate, that perhaps he is using sophistry when he suggested the conferences so far have been merely exercises in auctioneering whereby the provincial and federal governments auction power at the expense of the Canadian people.

A new constitution or any amendment to a constitution implies some bargaining. We will concede to the hon. member and to the House that the negotiations cannot be solely between governments but must be between the provinces and the people of Canada who form this great country. The people of Canada must be involved. If they are to be involved, then we as a Parliament must be involved. We are the forum of the nation. We are still the theatre of this great country.

[*Translation*]

I do not intend to recapitulate all the arguments that have been advanced during the debate on the resolution before the House. No doubt, such a committee can very efficiently contribute to the examination in depth of the constitution presently in force.

However, the measure of this contribution will be, to a certain extent, determined by the way in which the committee's work will be co-ordinated with that of the federal and provincial governments. We also hope that the constitutional review will be strengthened by the combined voices of senators and members of Parliament.

[*English*]

For this reason, we see this committee as one having a positive and influential role if its work is to be related to the constitutional review process. The federal government and the provinces in their constitutional negotiations have, perforce, had to establish a plan, a methodology, for review. This has involved selecting certain areas for priority study, if only for the purpose of defining the issues. To the extent that there is a limitation proposed in the ambit of the study of the committee, it is the same limitation to which the federal government and the provinces will have to submit themselves in relation to the process of total review of the constitution. The discipline of some defined approach to constitutional review is implicit by the very nature of the enterprise, and that same discipline is all that is sought to he imposed on the committee.

It may well be asked: What is this process? I believe the Prime Minister has already outlined the background of our involvement in constitutional review and how the process went from a review of individual rights and the institutions of the federal government into a review of the division of powers. But the point he made with great force was that the total review of the constitution implies an organized review, a controlled review and a controlled development of our constitution. The federal government, as I have said, has sought to move from the rights of citizens and institutions of our federation into a study of the more contentious subjects involved in the division of powers. For this reason we have been concerned with questions relating to a charter of rights and the judiciary, two matters with which I have had a particular concern as chairman at the ministerial level.

The government hoped to place to the forefront, in a constitutional review, the reassessment of the protection of the rights of individuals in our society. We hope there will be an increased recognition of what we consider to be the necessity of formal recognition of certain basic rights of Canadians. We believe this should be implicit in the constitution of Canada. In fact, it seems to me it would be really inconceivable in respect of the establishment of a new constitutional framework for Canada if the principle of freedom of assembly, freedom of religion and freedom of speech were not enshrined as part of the constitution of this country.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And freedom from discrimination.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): If I can summarize the reasons for the establishment of the committee, I would say first that governments cannot operate in a vacuum. They need a responsive climate of public opinion. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said rulers cannot decide the rules under which we are to be ruled. I agree. However, I think he would concede that governments have to lead and take responsibility. I believe this government has taken its responsibility and has declared itself by way of its proposi-

tions before the country. We have put ourselves on the line. The federal government has now declared its position on a number of items. Parliament should now review, test and probe those positions. As the Prime Minister said in his opening speech in introducing the resolution, Parliament should nurture the necessary consensus for nationhood. Constitutions in the past have been written only under the fire of crisis. A sense of urgency has had to dominate the minds of men before constitutions could be written or rewritten—revolution, anarchy, secession.

Our controlled procedure of rational discussion, discussion of the issues in the widest possible national form, is the first time in history that a nation has tried to anticipate and head-off a crisis, and to dissolve it before it crystallized, by rational discussion among free men.

[*Translation*]

Perhaps I could come back to the theme so eloquently developed during the debate by the member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau), a name which has a particular signification for all Canadians of good will. Indeed, the Right Hon. Ernest Lapointe who sat in the House for a long time and who for many years, headed the department I am honored of now being in charge of personified the open-mindedness that has always characterized French-speaking members and the whole French-speaking population.

This spirit springs from the desire of making our federal system work, of helping to build a strong and united Canada which, at the same time, makes room for linguistic, cultural and geographical variety. This is not to say that differences do not exist, but that we have the experience of different views, of a possible synthesis, of the acceptation of better solutions that are possible but not perfect.

We, the English-speaking Canadians have, in a certain way, lived under federalism, like the French-speaking Canadians for more than a 100 years.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to interrupt the minister, but the time allotted to him has expired. Unless he obtains the unanimous consent of the House, he cannot continue his speech.

Some hon. Members: Agreed!

Mr. Speaker: Agreed!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I sincerely thank my colleagues, Mr. Speaker.

Our experience is made up of pragmatism and generosity from both parts.

I am sure that the representatives of all political parties who took part in this debate are faithful to the same traditions.

But I must add that, for its part, the federal government will never give up its place as a front-line defender of National unity and efficient federalism. For that reason, we have been most diligent in the realization of our linguistic objectives as required by the Official Languages Act which, was drawn up in the light of public opinion.

In the constitutional field, we do not submit to this House any fixed and unchanging positions.

We merely suggest, a means of taking part in this review of the constitution, that is the creation of a parliamentary committee. This will allow for a greater political involvement in this process, as was pointed out by the hon. member for York-Simcoe (Mr. Roberts) whose very wise words should be kept in mind by those who are interested in this question of constitutional review.

We ask the House to vote in favour of the motion. We believe that a parliamentary committee would make a great contribution to the long and detailed study which is at the very basis of any constitutional review.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, writing a new constitution or reworking the present one will demand reservoirs of good will, understanding and tolerance in Canada. This good will cannot be imposed upon the Canadian people by experts, bureaucrats or mandarins. Essentially, this process is a political one, reconciling the legitimate interests and approaches of various parts of Canada. It is a political one, but it need not be a partisan process. The issues are for the people to decide, not for experts to proclaim. This committee, if it meets the hopes of the government, and indeed the hopes of the House, will bring the constitution home to the people of Canada.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have made shorter speeches than the one I shall have to make tonight, but not many. Like the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) I should like to make the comment that this has been an excellent debate during which valuable contributions have been made from all quarters of the House, and indeed I should like to add to those who were commended by the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Justice himself with respect to the very useful contribution he made to this debate just now.

We all agree that the task of reviewing and rewriting our constitution is a difficult one. It seems to take a long time. There are many occasions when we feel frustrated, when there is the temptation to feel that it is hopeless. But because of the importance of a basic constitution to a country like ours, we must press forward, and I think it can be said that the Members of Parliament from all parts of Canada have made it clear during the course of this debate that that is what we shall do. I trust the result will be an excellent piece of work by this committee which will press forward the cause that is now in hand.

In the minute or two that are left there are one or two things I would like to say. In a sense, the Minister of Justice gave me a text to use for what I wanted to say when he asserted that at times the federal government has been too timid in testing its federal authority. Whether he noted it or not, I was applauding that statement and I welcome it. It does seem to me that one of the dangers, because of the time it is taking to review and rewrite our constitution, is for certain things that could now be done to be left undone or to be allowed to wait.

I was not impressed by the assertion of the Minister of Justice that nothing has been delayed because of this discussion. After all, that is an argument by assertion and the minister and I are both good at it. But the fact of the matter is that the minister was right when he said that this government has not tested the authority that it now has, and I name in particular such fields as housing, pollution and income security.

I quite disagree with the interpretation of the working paper on income security and social services that was offered tonight by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt). I would say that whatever may be the outcome, there are areas of federal authority asserted in that document that no one will challenge, and the government should act on them now in terms of such programs as the guaranteed annual income and other ways of supporting the incomes of all the Canadian people.

As I said, in all these fields that I have indicated, such as housing, pollution and income security, and in the other fields that the Minister of Justice himself cited tonight, I do not think that the federal Parliament or the federal government have yet tested their authority to the extent that they might have done. I hope that concurrent with the attempt to rewrite our basic document and come up with a constitution that will stand us for many decades to come, this Parliament will insist on the government proceeding with policies and programs for which it now has authority and which this country and our people sorely need.

Mr. Speaker: It being ten o'clock, pursuant to special order made by the House yesterday it is my duty to put the question to the House. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

At 10 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

MANITOBA CENTENNIAL

DECLARATION BY MAYOR OF OTTAWA OF MANITOBA DAY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Members of Parliament from Manitoba I should like to express sincere thanks to His Worship Mayor Fogarty of Ottawa for having declared that in Ottawa this is Manitoba Day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I should also like to congratulate all those who have been fortunate enough to get tickets for tonight's performance of the Royal Winnipeg Ballet at the National Arts Centre, after which we shall enjoy a centennial birthday party, the hosts for which will be Mr. Schreyer, the premier of the province, and Mr. Maitland Steinkopf, Chairman of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation.

Perhaps in honour of this occasion the Prime Minister, the Leader of the Opposition, my hon. friend from Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands and the hon. member for Shefford might like to wear Manitoba pins today.

Mr. Stanfield: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I already have a Manitoba pin.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, if I may add a brief word to what the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has said, I should like to remind you and all members of the House that throughout this entire year Manitoba will be celebrating its centennial. There is an old saying that all wise men come from the east.

An hon. Member: Nova Scotia.

Mr. Dinsdale: Those of us who come from Manitoba will subscribe to that viewpoint, adding that the wiser they are, the faster they come. We cordially invite all hon. members to visit the Keystone province during 1970.

Mr. Speaker: To follow up the question of privilege which has just been raised, hon. members might allow me to bring to their attention the presence in the Speaker's gallery of Mr. Speaker Hanuschak and his wife.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: I am sure all hon. members will wish Mr. Speaker Hanuschak to convey to his colleagues in the Manitoba legislative assembly the greetings of their parliamentary colleagues in Ottawa.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth reports, in French and in English, of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs—Mr. Clermont.

[*Editor's note: The text of the foregoing reports appear in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TABLING OF STATEMENT ON PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF SESSION

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, in both official languages, a paper setting out details with respect to the business of the House for the balance of the session.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatsoever to the tabling of this document. In fact, the President of the Privy Council has been good enough to let some of us see it in advance. But I should like to enter a caveat against this being done under Standing Order 41(2).

• (2:10 p.m.)

It seems to me this is House business and that it would be more appropriate if the President of the Privy Council were to ask the unanimous consent of the House to table

the document. I do not have my rule book open before me, but the pertinent Standing Order says that the minister may do this with respect to any statement that deals with any matter coming under the administrative responsibilities of the government. This statement has to do with the business of the House and, whatever territory the government may take in, it is not responsible for the administration of the House. I do not ask for a debate on the point of order or a ruling; I am satisfied to enter a caveat, although there may be other occasions when we may wish to argue the point further. But today it would be much better if the Government House Leader were to ask for unanimous consent, which I am sure he would get, for the tabling of this document.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, with reference to the point of order Your Honour may recall that in the previous session we raised similar objections in connection with motions of the Minister of Finance and other ministers. Today I am prepared to say that our party will give its unanimous consent for the tabling of the document. However, I leave with Your Honour the caveat that while the Prime Minister and the President of the Privy Council are moving rapidly in the direction of making the House of Commons the administrative responsibility of the government, they have not quite reached that point. I wish to make that quite plain.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, may I point out, as hon. members have indicated, that the document in question concerns the business to be put before the House by the government and decisions to be recommended to the House with regard to times for the adjournment and resumption of the sittings of the House. Surely this quintessentially comes under the administrative responsibility of the government. It is the administrative responsibility of the government to bring forward legislation, and this document indicating at what times we anticipate bringing forward legislation comes under that heading.

I can understand that in some circumstances with regard to other matters concerning the internal operations of the House the objection raised might be made, but I would say quite clearly in response to the caveat that it is the responsibility of the government to bring legislation forward and this is what the document is about. Perhaps hon. members would agree that, for the convenience of the

[Mr. Knowles (Wininpeg North Centre).]

House, the document might be printed as an appendix to today's *Hansard* so that it could be readily referred to in future.

Mr. Baldwin: We agree, subject to the caveat.

Mr. Speaker: Since it is only a caveat that has been brought before the House today it will not be necessary for me to make a ruling. The President of the Privy Council has sought the unanimous agreement of the House for the purpose of having this document printed as an appendix to today's *Hansard*. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Editor's Note: For text of document referred to above, see appendix "A".]

AGRICULTURE

TRACTOR AND COMBINE PRICES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to ask for unanimous consent under Standing Order 43 for a motion to be put to the House. The matter is urgent and immediate as it involves the extremely important recommendations made by the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery in its special report on prices, dated December, 1969. This report took three and a half years to produce and deals with the excessively high prices of farm machinery, a matter of the most crucial importance to farmers today who, particularly in western Canada, are faced with a lack of funds to obtain essential equipment. In order to have the government consider and act on this report without further delay, I ask for consent to move the following motion:

That the special report on prices of tractors and combines in Canada and other countries and the recommendations set out in such report be forthwith referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain. Under the provisions of Standing Order 43 the motion can be put to the House only if there is unanimous consent. Is there such consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Since there is not unanimous consent I regret that the motion cannot be put at this time.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

LAY-OFFS OF CNR TELECOMMUNICATIONS EMPLOYEES, ATLANTIC REGION

Question No. 392—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. How many employees of the Canadian National Railways in the Telecommunications Branch in the Atlantic Region have been informed that their services are no longer required either at the present time or in the future and what action will be taken by the CNR as far as job protection is concerned?

2. Did the CNR inform the Minister of Transport of its intended action in this regard, and (a) if so, what action is he taking as far as job protection is concerned (b) if not, for what reason?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Management of Canadian National Railways advises as follows: 1. As a result of technological advances, operational and organizational changes and staffing adjustments dictated by declining patronage, since November 1, 1969, 18 employees located throughout the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick have been given notice of lay off. Those affected may avail themselves of every consideration within the context of the existing Labour Agreements such as exercise seniority rights, retraining, early retirement and severance pay.

2. No. (a) Not applicable; (b) Such actions are within the jurisdiction of management and are governed by the applicable labour agreements.

ELDON POWERIDE CAR

Question No. 564—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. Was the Eldon Poweride Car made by Eldon Industries of Canada Limited examined, tested and approved for sale by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and, if so, who were the officials involved in this examination and what criteria was used regarding the hazards associated with the car's sulphuric acid battery?

2. What other children's toys have been examined and approved for sale by the Department?

3. What is the basis or criteria in the selection of children's toys to be tested by officials of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. A Poweride X-2 Rechargeable Electric Car manufactured by Eldon Industries of Canada Ltd. was seen by R. W. James, an official of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs but it was neither tested nor approved for sale.

2. Numerous children's toys have been seen by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for purposes of preparing standards or criteria under the Hazardous Products Act but none has been approved for sale.

3. The Department is endeavouring to establish criteria.

PUBLICATION OF BULLETIN, "LABOUR NEWS HEADLINES"

Question No. 647—**Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys):**

1. What is the reason for the publication by the Department of Labour of the *Labour News Headlines?*

2. On what date was the publication of this information bulletin initiated, how many people are involved in the publication of this bulletin and what is the estimated annual cost of same?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): 1. The main reason for the publication of this bulletin is to assist in keeping the Minister of Labour, the Deputy Minister, other Senior Officers of the Department and Information Staffs abreast of major industrial relations news, editorial opinion, and special features appearing in the daily press and industrial journals. However, as a result of a growing number of requests, the Department recognized there was a valid and widespread interest for such information in areas such as educational institutions and the general business and labour community.

2. The bulletin, more or less in its present form and for internal Departmental use only commenced daily publication on August 8, 1955. The first edition for expanded distribution outside the Department was issued November 21, 1969.

Six people are involved part-time in its publication and the estimated current total annual cost, including prorated labour costs, is $3,452.19.

765 copies of the bulletin are distributed outside the Department (including circulation to the Senate and the House of Commons) at an estimated additional cost of $332.01 per year. This figure is included in the above total.

U.S. MAGAZINES HANDLED BY CANADA POST OFFICE

Question No. 664—**Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand):**

1. What was the poundage of United States magazines, printed and published in the United States, handled by the Canada Post Office during the years 1966, 1967 and 1968?

Questions

2. What was the revenue received by the Canada Post Office in return for handling the volume of U.S. magazines referred to in Part 1?

3. Does the Canada Post Office have any figure on the loss entailed in handling the U.S. magazines referred to in Part 1 and, if so, what is the average annual loss?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. Information not available.

2. Not applicable.

3. Not applicable.

EXTENSION OF SHIPPING SEASON, CHURCHILL

Question No. 694—**Mr. Korchinski:**

1. (a) Has any department of the Canadian Government authorized studies of the feasibility of the extension of the shipping season to the Port of Churchill in the last two years (b) what was the cost of such studies or reports (c) are the reports available to the public?

2. Have any independent reports been made on the extension of the shipping season to Churchill which have been made available to the government?

3. What were the opening dates and closing dates of shipping from Churchill in the past ten years?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. (a) Yes; (b) $58,900; (c) Yes.

2. Yes.

3. During the past ten years the open season has been from July 23 to October 15.

EXPROPRIATION PROCEEDINGS, CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Question No. 708—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. Are expropriation or nationalization proceedings with respect to the Cape Breton Development Corporation completed?

2. Have the shares or assets of private companies been expropriated or nationalized?

3. What compensation was paid?

4. What were the criteria governing compensation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. No.

2. The physical assets of the companies mentioned in section 2(d) of the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act were expropriated by the Cape Breton Development Corporation on March 30, 1968.

3. None to date.

4. The criteria governing compensation are set out in section 12 of the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act.

[Mr. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand).]

[*English*]

CATTLE RUSTLING IN ALBERTA

Question No. 736—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many cases of cattle rustling were reported by the RCMP in Alberta in (a) the first half of 1969, 1968 and 1967 (b) the total year 1968, 1967 and 1966?

2. How many charges were laid in connection with the above?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. 1969, No statistics to date; 1968, 151; 1967, 123; 1966, 97.

2. 1969, No statistics to date; 1968, 59; 1967, 18; 1966, 12.

Note: The nature of this offence is such as to preclude accurate statistics on half yearly basis. Cattle reported stolen are frequently found to be only temporarily missing.

OLD AGE SECURITY TAX AND PAYMENTS

Question No. 750—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What was the total amount collected in the form of Old Age Security Tax in 1968?

2. How much was paid out in 1968 on Old Age Pensions of $75.00 per month?

3. How much was paid out in supplementary payment in 1968?

4. Is there a balance of the Old Age Pension Fund and, if so, how much?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Statistics are maintained on a fiscal basis. 1. Total Old Age Security Taxes collected in the fiscal year 1968-69, $1,626,100,000.

2. Basic Old Age Security payment was $76.50 per month in 1968 and $78 per month in 1969. Total payments in the fiscal year 1968-69 were: $1,296,849,281.

3. Guaranteed Income Supplement payments for the fiscal year 1968-69 totalled: $244,470,268.

4. The balance in the Old Age Security fund as of October 31, 1969 was: $711.7 millions.

POST OFFICE CLOSURES, PALLISER CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 752—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. Since June 25, 1968, in the Constituency of Palliser, how many post offices have been closed to date?

2. Where were these post offices located?

3. What alternative service has been provided, in each case?

4. What is the entire cost, in each case, for providing such alternative service?

5. What was the financial saving to the department, from each post office closed?

6. How many other post offices in the Constituency of Palliser are under consideration for closure?

7. Where is each located?

8. What is the projected cost of providing alternative service in each case?

9. What financial saving is expected if the department decides to close these post offices, in each case?

10. What alternative service will be provided in each case, if these post offices are closed?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. Six.

2. Post Office	3. Alternate Service	4. Cost of Alternate Service	Former Cost of Operation	5. Savings
		$	$	$
Bottrel	Cochrane R.R. No. 1	Nil	1,000	1,000
Redland	Rosebud R.R. No. 1	720	1,098	378
Elkton	Didsbury R.R. No. 1	707	1,000	293
Hesketh	Carbon R.R. No. 1	625	1,350	725
Ardenode	Strathmore Post Office	Nil	1,000	1,000
Cambria	Rosedale Station, Drumheller and East Coulee Post Offices	Nil	1,200	1,200

6. Three.

7. Bragg Creek, Nacmine, Beynon.

8. Not yet known.

9. Not yet known.

10. To be determined.

WATER POLLUTION—CHARGES LAID UNDER HARBOURS BOARD ACT

Question No. 757—**Mr. Harding:**

1. For the years 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 to date, how many charges were laid against individuals or companies by persons in the department responsible for the enforcement of the National Harbours Board Act and Regulations regarding violations of the Act and Regulations dealing with pollution of waters?

2. How many of the above charges resulted in (a) convictions (b) dismissal of the charges (c) withdrawal of the charges?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. In so far as the National Harbours Board is concerned: 1963, 1; 1964, —; 1965, 2; 1966, 1; 1967, —; 1968, —; 1969, 1.

2.	(a) Convictions	(b) Dismissal	(c) Withdrawal
1963	—	1	—
1964	—	—	—
1965	2	—	—
1966	1	—	—
1967	—	—	—
1968	—	—	—
1969	1	—	—

POLLUTION—CHARGES LAID UNDER DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE ACT

Question No. 761—**Mr. Harding:**

1. For the years 1963, 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 to date, how many charges were laid against individuals or companies by persons in the department responsible for the enforcement of the Department of National Health Act and Regulations regarding violations of the Act and Regulations dealing with pollution?

2. How many of the above charges resulted in (a) convictions (b) dismissal of the charges (c) withdrawal of the charges?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1. There are no provisions in the Department of National Health and Welfare Act, or Regulations thereunder, dealing with pollution, which create an offence for their violation.

2. See one above.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION ADVERTISING

Question No. 762—**Mr. Hales:**

1. What was the total cost of the advertisement carried in the newspapers by the Unemployment Insurance Commission beginning "Ottawa pays 20% of your Unemployment Insurance"?

2. In how many papers did it appear and was it nation-wide?

3. Is it the intention of the Unemployment Insurance Commission to publish a series of similar ads?

4. Is the Unemployment Insurance Commission included in the government austerity program?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): 1. The total cost of display in newspaper and

periodicals of the advertisement beginning "Ottawa pays 20 per cent of your Unemployment Insurance..." is $28,510.

2. The advertisement received national coverage through 34 daily newspapers and four periodicals.

3. The advertisement is one of a series of four dealing with various aspects of the operation of the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

4. The Unemployment Insurance Commission is within the scope of the government austerity program, and this measure of public Information and education has been achieved within the limits of the budget so determined.

CANADA EXECUTIVE SERVICE OVERSEAS

Question No. 790—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

Does Canada Executive Services Overseas receive any grants or assistance from the federal government and, if so, what has been the total amount advanced to date?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes. Total amount advanced to the Canadian Executive Service Overseas (CESO) from its inception in 1967 to date, $824,310.62.

PAYMENTS FOR CARRIAGE OF AIRMAIL

Question No. 802—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Since the inception of airmail, what has been the amount paid annually to Air Canada (Trans Canada Airlines) by the Post Office Department?

2. For what volumes of mail was this amount paid?

3. What other airlines carry mail for the Post Office Department and, what has been the annual payment?

4. In each year, what was the revenue obtained from sale of airmail stamps and other air carriage rates?

5. Are tenders invited for carriage of airmail?

6. In the last five years, what airlines have submitted tenders and in what amounts?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications):

1.	Domestic	2.	International	
Year	Cost	Poundage	Cost	Poundage
1937–38	$ 41,387	39,398		
1938–39	878,828	436,842		
1939–40	1,766,337	755,684		
1940–41	3,151,348	990,631		
1941–42	2,995,447	1,605,651		
1942–43	3,342,186	2,739,482		
1943–44	3,594,705	3,861,685	$ 455,074	293,624
1944–45	3,868,822	3,704,553	2,885,315	2,324,534
1945–46	4,301,639	3,070,915	2,971,661	2,120,150
1946–47	3,619,504	2,361,802	2,088,530	303,554
1947–48	3,900,617	2,714,509	1,090,255	225,496
1948–49	5,029,798	5,975,300	1,122,947	232,493
1949–50	5,400,000	7,307,536	$1,178,403	244,489
1950–51	5,450,000	6,164,089	1,207,554	254,688
1951–52	5,802,000	9,102,258	1,587,013	336,202
1952–53	5,844,000	9,500,553	1,856,436	394,289
1953–54	5,877,000	10,685,893	1,936,980	488,634
1954–55	6,200,000	13,760,996	2,187,907	613,984
1955–56	6,330,000	15,000,796	2,100,767	738,668
1956–57	6,590,000	16,920,558	2,386,059	848,584
1957–58	6,721,000	18,215,347	3,020,615	1,099,359
1958–59	6,830,000	19,005,893	3,067,423	1,160,150
1959–60	6,900,000	20,176,389	3,041,925	1,160,222
1960–61	6,980,000	21,160,729	3,254,868	1,277,212
1961–62	7,060,000	22,008,216	3,152,570	1,248,643
1962–63	7,230,000	23,880,213	3,281,136	1,404,805
1963–64	7,420,000	25,874,433	3,653,498	1,515,267
1964–65	7,730,000	29,157,962	4,334,808	1,690,658
1965–66	7,986,374	31,930,780	4,719,344	1,870,011
1966–67	8,229,660	35,705,987	5,129,497	2,030,486
1967–68	8,813,128	39,677,456	5,270,312	2,624,018
1968–69	9,558,431	42,793,447	5,291,233	2,863,915

[Mr. Mackasey.]

3. 1968–69

Canadian Pacific Air Lines	
(Domestic)	$1,592,044
(International)	4,695,243
Athabaska Airways Ltd.	2,744
Austin Airways Ltd.	303,506
B.C. Airlines Ltd.	74,403
Courier Flights Ltd.	2,926
Eastern Provincial Airways	733,873
Georgian Bay Airways Ltd.	8,324
Great Northern Airways Ltd.	42,385
Mel Air Ltd.	13,053
Nordair Ltd.	414,739
North Canada Air Ltd.	51,144
North Coast Air Services	1,540
Northern Air Services	3,745
Pacific Western Airlines	709,212
Quebecair Inc.	105,810
Transair Ltd.	309,626
Trans Provincial Air Carriers	8,733
Air Gaspé Inc.	15,000
Atlas Aviation	36,375
Brochu Industries Ltd.	8,197
Carrot River Airways Ltd.	7,014
Coast Range Airways Ltd.	4,807
Discovery Mines Ltd.	1,277
Fort Vermilion Air Service	1,809
Gordon Airways Ltd.	9,708
Halls Air Services	620
Hooker Air Services	22,503
Island Airlines Ltd.	9,378
Lambair Ltd.	2,136
Lethbridge Air Services	6,460
Midwest Aviation	6,875
Montmagny Air Services	2,958
Northern Wings Ltd.	152,764
Northland Airlines Ltd.	237,333
Northward Aviation Ltd.	44,093
Omineca Air Services	2,418
Orillia Air Services	828
Ptarmigan Airways Ltd.	686
Riverton Airways Ltd.	3,994
Roberts Flying Service	5,577
Starratt Transportation Ltd.	959
St. Felicien Air Services	30,109
Tyee Airways Ltd.	423
Alert Bay Air Services	1,069
Trans Mountain Air Services	3,606
Contact Airways Ltd.	2,355
Northwest Territorial Airways Ltd.	79

4. 1967–68—$26.1 million
1968–69— 26.1 "
This information is not available for fiscal years prior to 1967–68.

5. No.

6. Not applicable.

LITERARY FIGURES ON STAMPS

Question No. 807—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Is it intended to issue a stamp in 1971 commemorating the 175th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Chandler Haliburton?

2. What Canadian literary figures have appeared on Canadian stamps and, in what years?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. No.

2. Emily Pauline Johnson, 1961; Henri Bourassa, 1968; John McCrae, 1968; Stephen Butler Leacock, 1969.

Questions

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENTS

Question No. 826—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

How many personnel of all ranks have voluntarily and/or on request, retired from the Armed Forces, month by month, since January, 1969 with service of (a) less than 6 months (b) 6-12 months?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence):

1969	(a)	(b)
January	23	14
February	46	16
March	46	28
April	51	32
May	67	75
June	60	71
July	46	41
August	54	43
September	36	86
October	23	45
November	40	59
December	38	53

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION SUBSIDIES TO INDUSTRIES

Question No. 852—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. Since Bill C-202 was enacted, how many industries have obtained subsidies from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion?

2. Which industries and how much was granted to each?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1 and 2. This information is contained in the reports tabled each month in Parliament.

[*English*]

EXPENDITURE ON FOREIGN MAGAZINES

Question No. 854—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

For each year 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969, what amount was spent on foreign magazines distributed in Canada by the Canadian postal service?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Information not available.

*HAGUE AGREEMENT RELATING TO REFUGEE SEAMEN

Question No. 871—**Mr. Haidasz:**

1. When did Canada accede to the November 23, 1956, Hague Agreement relating to refugee seamen?

2. Did Canada's agreement include any exceptions or reservations to any of the articles of the Agreement?

3. Since the date of the Agreement, has Canada invoked any of the articles of the Convention?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is May 30, 1969; entered into force for Canada August 18, 1969. The answer to the second part is no, and the answer to the third part is no.

ARDA PROJECTS IN RIVIÈRE BLEUE

Question No. 875—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. Have one or more ARDA projects been carried out in Rivière Bleue, constituency of Témiscouata, P.Q.?

2. What was the nature of each project?

3. Who will benefit by each project?

4. Who applied for each project?

5. What was the total cost?

6. What was the federal government's contribution?

7. On what date did the work begin and when was it completed?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. No.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Not applicable.

[*English*]

REGISTERED NURSES EMPLOYED BY NEWSTART IN P.E.I.

Question No. 881—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. How many registered nurses are employed by New Start within the Province of Prince Edward Island?

2. What degrees do the nurses so employed now hold?

3. What are the years of nursing experience of the nurses now employed?

4. What, specifically, are the duties of the nurses presently employed?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Three.

2. Registered Nurse (R.N.)

3. One, seven years; one, nine years; one, four years.

4. Two engaged in developing, conducting and evaluating an experimental program to assist disadvantaged adults into stable and rewarding employment as institutional attendants.

One engaged in developing, conducting and evaluating an experimental program to train day care attendants, including supervision of two day care Centres.

[Mr. Haidasz.]

*IMMIGRATION ACT

Question No. 888—**Mr. Haidasz:**

Is it the intention of the government to present to Parliament at this Session, a new Immigration Act or amendments to the existing Act based on the White Paper on Immigration and the recommendations of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Immigration?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, while the Immigration Act is under review, there are no plans at present to introduce revisions to the present act during this session. The government has already implemented many of the recommendations of the white paper on immigration through revisions to the immigration regulations and administrative procedures.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION ON STATUS OF REFUGEES

Question No. 889—**Mr. Haidasz:**

1. Has Canada acceded to the 1951 International Convention on the Status of Refugees?

2. Has the Canadian Government made any decision on the establishment of a refugee eligibility referred to in paragraph 55 of the White Paper on Immigration, October, 1966?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. Yes.

2. Following the accession by Canada to the 1951 Convention, the government has instituted a review of refugee policies and is being assisted in this review by the Canada Manpower and Immigration Council, to whom this matter has been referred.

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

FLOUR EXPORTS

Question No. 696—**Mr. Korchinski:**

What amount of flour was exported during the past two years and to what countries?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 179, 314 and 328 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

DRUG REGULATIONS—CORRESPONDENCE WITH MANUFACTURERS

Motion No. 179—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the federal Food and Drug Directorate and Canadian drug manufacturers regarding changes in Canada's drug regulations.

Motion agreed to.

NRC CONSULTANT REPORT, ERWICK, CURRY AND PARTNERS LIMITED

Motion No. 314—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Erwick, Curry and Partners Limited undertaken for the National Research Council as mentioned in answer to Question Number 2,452 of the past Session.

Motion agreed to.

TERMS OF REFERENCE, FARM MACHINERY COMMISSION

Motion No. 328—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence and other documents exchanged between the Privy Council and the Barber Commission on Farm Machinery concerning the terms of reference and the scope of inquiry of the said Commission.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, notices of motions Nos. 264, 291 and 303 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 or conditions expressed by the hon. parliamentary secretary is it the pleasure of the House that notices of motion Nos. 264, 291 and 303 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

REGIONAL AIRPORT, VICTORIAVILLE, QUE.

Motion No. 264—**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 development of a regional airport in Victoriaville, Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

BABB CONSTRUCTION WATER SYSTEM CONTRACT, ENGLEE, NFLD.

Motion No. 291—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the contract awarded to Babb Construction Limited of Harbour Grace, Newfoundland by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion regarding the construction of a water system at Englee, Newfoundland.

Motion agreed to.

PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK, SHIP HARBOUR, N.S.

Motion No. 303—**Mr. Forrestall:**

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, together with copies of any proposed plans dealing with the establishment of a National Park at or near Ship Harbour, Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 1, 171, 199 and 256?

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

[*English*]

COPPER EXPORTS

Motion No. 1—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all export permits granted for copper exports for the period January 1, 1969, to September 30, 1969.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY COST STRUCTURE STUDY

Motion No. 171—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by economist David F. Smith of the Mechanical Transport Branch, Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on "The Effects of Canada-United States Wage Parity Upon the Cost Structure of the Canadian Automotive Industries".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

Motions for Papers

DISCONTINUANCE OF PRODUCTION BY KAISER JEEP CANADA LTD.

Motion No. 199—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and Kaiser Jeep Canada Ltd. regarding the discontinuation of its production activities in Canada.

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 correspondence requested includes confidential information on the internal affairs of the parent corporation and the Canadian company's performance under the automotive agreement. Such information is proprietary and its disclosure could have a serious effect not only with this particular parent corporation and its future Canadian operations but with other companies, as well, which have provided similar information in confidence. In view of this, the minister would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Broadbent: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVE GRANTS

Motion No. 256—**Mr. Burton:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a list of the 278 development incentive grants made by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion from January to mid-November 1969, and in each case (a) the name and address of the firm receiving the grant (b) the amount of grant received (c) the total estimated capital cost of the project (d) the nature of the project for which the grant was provided and its location (e) the number of new jobs created as a result of the project?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the cases referred to are not grants paid out but offers made. The details requested will be made public in all cases when the project is proceeded with, and before any grant is actually paid. But at the offer stage, confidentiality is essential to the program.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Secretary has consulted with me on this matter. The information provided leads me to the conclusion that the department's press release of November 19 announcing the number of new jobs created in 1969 is a hoax and a fraud. Therefore I ask that this motion be put to a vote.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is transferred for debate.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, may I inquire when I may expect notice of motion No. 80 standing in my name, which has been on the Order Paper since October 23, to be called?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I will inquire, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, can the House Leader also say when notice of motion No. 32 under my name as of October 23 will be called?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I shall make that inquiry as well, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my inquiry of the President of the Privy Council relates to a notice of motion for the production of papers which has been passed. I refer to No. 30 passed on December 17, 1969, having to do with the report of Professor Jeremy Williams on the subject of conflict of interest legislation. Can the minister say when this document, already ordered, will be tabled?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Today or tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire about Notices of Motion Nos. 295 and 296 placed on the order paper on December 9. It seems to me it should have been possible to deal with these motions before now.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL DEFENCE

AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION FROM ALLIES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence what the policy of the government is in light of the fact that our allies have reduced substantially Canada's accessibility to military and strategic information, a situation which could be very serious for the future of our defence activities?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition is drawing conclusions that are not warranted by the testimony to which he is obviously referring.

Mr. Stanfield: Am I to take from the minister's statement that there is no concern about this matter? May I ask the minister whether he or anybody else on behalf of the government has made any representations to our allies with regard to the exchange of military and strategic information, which apparently took place formerly quite freely?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, we have many allies and I believe it would be useful if the allies to which he is referring were identified.

An hon. Member: Don't you know them?

An hon. Member: You haven't any left.

An hon. Member: We had.

An hon. Member: We are losing them, though.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, am I to take it from the reply of the minister that he is simply evading his responsibility in this regard—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: —and that the government of Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, will the minister advise the House whether it is a fact that he has received reports from Canadian officers posted to establishments in the United States to the effect that they are finding restrictions placed upon them with regard to access to information and also participation in discussions as a result of the reduction in Canada's participation both in NATO and SACLANT?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): Mr. Speaker, now we are talking about the United States. I am very happy to have this identification.

An hon. Member: You are smart.

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): My hon. friend is obviously referring to the testimony given the day before yesterday before the committee by Dr. Lindsey. I believe Dr. Lindsey said that in the scientific field some of the information is released on a need-to-know basis. I think it would be a big step to conclude from that that there is some restriction on the exchange of military information.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will allow the hon. member's supplementary in a moment, but I think I should caution hon. members that this might not be the place to discuss evidence given before a committee when that committee has not yet reported.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Very much so, Mr. Speaker, but will the minister kindly inform us whether there have been reports by Canadian officers from various military bases in the United States which in fact indicate there has been a restriction placed upon them?

Mr. Cadieux (Labelle): I am glad to have this opportunity to deny such an assertion.

An hon. Member: Why didn't you say that in the first place?

OIL

CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN PANARCTIC OILS LIMITED

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development may I direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister regarding Panarctic Oils Limited in which the Canadian government has a 45 per cent equity. In view of the fact that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources has said, "We do not know whether we will sell or continue to participate," I want to ask the Prime Minister whether the government has made a decision either to continue to participate and to put up its share of the $10 million expansion or has decided to withdraw from the Panarctic Oil consortium?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): This question has been taken up by the government and an announcement will be made in due course.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government considering the advisability of acquiring a controlling interest in the Panarctic Oil consortium in view of the recent developments in oil exploration in the Northwest Territories?

Mr. Trudeau: This question has not been considered in the context in which the hon. member has put it. It was considered at the outset in the setting-up of Panarctic.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ISRAELI-ARAB CONFLICT—REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING SALE OF ARMS TO BELLIGERENTS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Has the government of Canada expressed its concern to some powers that are sending arms to the belligerent countries in the Middle East and does it intend to ask France and the United States, for instance, to stop supporting the war between Israelis and Arabs?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As the House knows, Canada is not supplying arms to either side in this conflict and has urged in the United Nations and elsewhere that this should be the practice of all countries, including France and others who are supplying arms to that area.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Have these countries to whom we have shown our concern given any affirmative answer to the minister?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Obviously not, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

REPRESENTATIONS RESPECTING CULTURAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND BELGIUM

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Has Canada received through its ambassador in Brussels, or through any other means, representations from the Belgian government with a view to amending or terminating the cultural agreement between Belgium and Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I do not think so, Mr. Speaker, but I would have to check. My recollection is, no.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Can he inform the House whether this agreement enables Quebec to sign agreements with Belgium for cultural and technical exchanges? If not, does Canada intend to amend this agreement in order to enable Quebec to have exchanges with Belgium?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: I think the position of the government in this respect is very well known, that is that Canada is responsible for its foreign relations with other countries. It is quite possible, within that ambit of course, for close relations in cultural and educational matters with other countries, but we must insist that no government in Canada other than the government of Canada can act as if it were a sovereign state.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

INVITATION FROM MAURITANIA TO ATTEND CONFERENCE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING MINISTERS OF EDUCATION

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Could the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell us if Canada has been invited by Mauritania to attend the conference of the ministers of education of French-speaking countries? If so, is it the government's intention to accept the invitation and send the same delegation as the one who represented Canada at the Paris conference last December?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is yes, Canada has received an invitation. We have not yet replied to it.

[*Translation*]

POLICY RESPECTING DELEGATIONS TO FRANCE

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Could the Secretary of State for External Affairs inform the House whether the way of selecting the Paris delegation is the official and final one or whether it will be modified?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the general

principles underlying the participation of Quebec or any other province in Canadian delegations are laid out in the documents that were tabled at the time of the constitutional conference. That remains our policy.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ALLEGED MISLEADING ADVERTISING BY IMPERIAL TOBACCO COMPANY

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is he in a position to say whether his department has launched an investigation into allegations of misleading advertising by Imperial Tobacco in connection with the marketing of a new brand of cigarettes in the province of Alberta, and would the minister undertake to advise the House of the results of such inquiry?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not at this time able to go beyond what I said the other day.

Mr. Mazankowski: A supplementary question. Can the minister say whether the interests of those who are claiming significant winnings as a result of the Imperial Tobacco Company's promotion program will be taken into consideration?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

IMMIGRATION

DEPORTATION OF JERRY MYRIC MIHM AND FAMILY—REQUEST FOR INTERVENTION

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Prime Minister on a matter which may not have been brought to his attention and which he may want to take into consideration. It arises out of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada that a Mr. Jerry Myric Mihm, his wife and children should be deported from Canada in accordance with an order of the Immigration Department. Would the Prime Minister consider and discuss with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration the possibility of letting this family remain in Canada despite the decision of the Supreme Court in view of the fact that deportation under present circumstances would cause great hardship to the family?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the matter has not been brought to my attention. I thank the hon. member for doing so. I will ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration to advise me on the subject.

LABOUR RELATIONS

MONTREAL WATERFRONT—PUBLICATION OF REPORT

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour following upon other questions that have been asked in the House. Is the minister now ready to make public the findings of the Smith Commission report relating to the harbour of Montreal?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I anticipate making the report public by next Wednesday. The report was authorized by the then Minister of Labour under a section of the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, and it is not necessary to table it in the House. It will be made public to the parties concerned, and I think in view of the unusual interest in the report I will however table it not later than next Wednesday.

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Labour. In view of the suggestion made yesterday by Mr. Beaudet, the port manager, that the pilferage was so mysterious that it might have something to do with the signs of the zodiac, I would like to ask the minister if he is waiting for a favourable astrological sign to release the Smith report?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

FREEDOM OF JOINT COMMITTEE TO MAKE DECISIONS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister prompted by a report that the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville is to be appointed co-chairman of the Joint Committee on the Constitution, together with an unnamed French-Canadian Senator. Without in any way disparaging the qualifications of the hon. member, I would ask the Prime Minister to assure the House that at least at this early point in the committee's history that the government will keep its hands off the committee and allow it to come to its own decisions.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Quite gladly, Mr. Speaker. I was surprised to see the story in the *Globe and Mail* indicating that the hon. member's appointment would be confirmed shortly by the Prime Minister. Surely a paper that knows so much about Parliament should know the Prime Minister does not confirm such appointments.

Mr. Baldwin: It knows the Prime Minister.

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON CONSERVATION REGULATIONS AND LAND USE POLICIES

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and also for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, but since they are unfortunately not with us today and it concerns both their departments, as well as that of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, I will address my question to the Prime Minister. In view of recent matters that were before the House, and also in view of renewed concern over possible pollution in the Arctic following the discovery of oil by Imperial Oil Limited near the mouth of the Mackenzie River, when can the House expect a meaningful statement on government plans regarding conservation regulations and land use policies in the Northwest Territories, the Yukon Territory and the Arctic Islands?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, is the question related to the land or to the Arctic area in general? I missed the preamble to the question.

Mr. Nesbitt: Your Honour, I realize the Prime Minister has many things on his mind, and perhaps with your permission I might repeat the question.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the question might be made just a bit shorter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to accept your suggestion. I said—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am quite prepared to wait, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time will expire pretty soon.

Mr. Nesbitt: I am sorry that because of the disturbance I cannot hear Your Honour's advice on the matter. Will Your Honour allow me now to rephrase my question to the Prime Minister? When may members of the House expect a meaningful statement on government plans regarding conservation regulations and land use policies in the Northwest Territories, the Yukon Territory, the Arctic Islands and the waters lying between?

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nesbitt: I ask this question, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked it twice. Perhaps he could get a reply now.

Mr. Trudeau: It came out a little clearer that time, Mr. Speaker. Concerning the addendum to the question, that of course will be dealt with by the government when it discusses the legislation which was announced in the Speech from the Throne concerning anti-pollution measures in the Arctic. The other aspects of the question come under the policies of the Canadian government with regard to pollution in waters under the Canada Water Act. There are also measures being contemplated in other areas concerning, for instance, gas and oil pollution.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contents of the Prime Minister's reply as far as it went, but I would ask him this question. In view of the fact that legislation from several departments obviously is coming forward, as announced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs the other evening, and in view of the fact that some of these matters are pretty urgent and of great public concern, could the Prime Minister tell us when his ministers will be able to make a statement dealing with those matters which do not need legislation at the present time?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

POLLUTION

NON-PHOSPHATE DETERGENT RESEARCH

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board. Given the fact that housewives through the daily use of detergents are forced to contribute heavily and unwillingly to water pollution in Canada, is the government considering asking the National Research Council to initiate an emergency research program to develop a non-phosphate, non-pollutive detergent?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would think that this question, important though it is, ought normally to be placed on the Order Paper. If it is a matter of great urgency it might be debated at the time of adjournment.

Mrs. MacInnis: Ten o'clock.

SPORTS

APPEARANCE OF HOCKEY CANADA BEFORE COMMITTEE

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the withdrawal of Canada from the international ice hockey tournament and its implications for the future of our national game, would the minister use his good offices to arrange for Hockey Canada to appear soon before the appropriate standing committee of the House?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to give consideration to that suggestion.

Mr. Rose: As a supplementary and related question, does the minister intend in the near future to make a statement on motions regarding the government's sports policy, elaborating on the statement he made on this subject outside the House on February 27?

Mr. Munro: No, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to make a statement in the House.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS FROM RESERVATION PASTURE DEVELOPMENT

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Under the new pasture development plan for Indian reservations, are these pastures for Indian cattle only and, if not, will the Indians receive all the moneys from the development of these pastures?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that this question should be placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Horner: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I raise this question today because the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development released a press statement today that should have been made in the House. He should be here to explain and answer questions. This is why I ask the question today.

[*Translation*]

TRADE

REASON FOR LOSS OF ORDER BY DAVIE SHIPBUILDING COMPANY

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rural Development.

The president of Davie Shipbuilding has stated that construction of 24 ships for Greece at Lauzon would not be carried out, because of administrative delays on the part of authorities in Ottawa.

Can the minister inform us whether he agrees with the assertion of administrative delays?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will, I am sure, appreciate that the question, in its present form is out of order.

The Minister of Economic Regional Expansion on a point of order.

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to mention that there is no Minister of Rural Development in the federal government.

[*English*]

COMBINES

REVIEW OF RETAIL GROCERY INDUSTRY IN PRAIRIE PROVINCES

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is an old one given renewed urgency by last week's announcement by Dominion Stores Limited of its withdrawal from the Calgary and Edmonton markets in accord, as its press release said, "with our over-all long-term plans for expansion and growth." Since this withdrawal involves the concurrent expansion of the already impressive market penetration of Canada Safeway Limited in those cities, can the minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should ask the question. He is making an argument. He should not make a speech but ask the question.

Mr. Mahoney: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of all that, can the minister assure the House that the Combines Investigation

Branch will give top priority to a review of the retail grocery industry in the prairies and particularly in Alberta?

An hon. Member: "It's all because of the meat."

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Because the hon. member for Calgary South is always on the job—

Mr. Baldwin: Too bad you were not.

Mr. Basford: —I and the director under the Combines Investigation Branch are aware of the situation and he will deal with it under the provisions of the Combines Investigation Act.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

NEWFOUNDLAND—SIGNING OF AGREEMENT ON FIRST PHASE OF DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and has to do with the question I posed to his Parliamentary Secretary last Wednesday, as found on page 2647 of *Hansard*. Is the minister prepared to answer the question now?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Would the hon. member repeat the question, please?

Mr. Marshall: Can the minister indicate and confirm that the agreement on the first phase of a five-year regional development plan for Newfoundland will be signed in April and would he be prepared to table the contents so that the people of Newfoundland can be made aware of the benefits of this plan?

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member is referring to the signing of a document in April, I doubt that the question is in order at this time. It should be placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Marshall: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour allowed the question last Wednesday.

Mr. Speaker: If I made a mistake, it was last Wednesday.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

OFFER OF POSITION AS JUDGE TO MR. CLAUDE WAGNER

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour.

[Mr. Mahoney.]

Would he tell the House whether the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice has authorized him to offer a judgeship to Mr. Claude Wagner?

Mr. Speaker: I cannot allow this question.

[*English*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTE OBJECTION TO TERMINOLOGY RESPECTING LAY-OFFS

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 objections raised by the Professional Institute of the Public Service to the terminology used by the minister in referring to scientific and professional men who were being laid off as deadwood, would the minister take steps to remove this stigma from these men who are now trying to find new jobs?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I think the best way to remove this stigma is to stop using the term, Mr. Speaker.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONTRACTS AWARDED TO RCA VICTOR—INTEREST CONFLICT OF J. B. HOULDING

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, given the fact that the Defence Research Board plays a leading role in establishing research priorities of the government involving millions of dollars, will the minister assure the House that he will investigate the conflict of interest position of Mr. J. B. Houlding who is simultaneously president of RCA Victor and a member of the Defence Research Board?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be useful to indicate to the House that the terms of reference of the Defence Research Board designate representatives from industry, universities and other research interests in Canada as possible members of the board. The case in point is a temporary assignment. I can reassure my hon. friend by telling him that the Defence Research Board has no specific responsibility for directing purchasing for the government.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—EFFECTIVENESS OF RELIEF OPERATIONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask

the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether he has any recent report from the observer team or the Canadian representative on the observer team regarding conditions in Nigeria and what was formerly Biafra, particularly with regard to the flow of relief and whether it is satisfactory and also conditions generally?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian observers have reported to me about conditions. The report is very similar to the one made by the representatives of the Secretary General of the United Nations. I have been urging the release of this report but apparently there is some difficulty that has arisen because it is not unanimous. One country in particular, not Canada, has filed a minority report and some difficulty has arisen as to when it can be released. The observers themselves are continuing their survey.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the minister any information from the Canadian observers or the Canadian Red Cross on whether the Nigerian government has granted clearance for planes carrying relief supplies to land at Uli or any of the former Biafran airports?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been any approval given yet to the use of Uli airport. I gather that other airports in the area are being used and, indeed, I saw a report the other day that there was some doubt as to whether one of them was in proper condition. So attempts are being made to use them, but with regard to Uli my understanding is that so far the Nigerian government is not using it.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of the current difficulties with regard to the observers' report, will the minister give an undertaking to the House that relevant information of particular interest to the committee at present meeting on the question of relief procedures will be made available to that committee, and that every measure will be taken to assure the publication of even the minority report in light of the great interest in this country and in others that full exposure be given to the situation in that part of Nigeria?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made it clear that I have seen a copy of the report made by a majority of the observers. However it is subject to an embargo as the members of the team themselves have to release the report. It is not a question of the Canadian government holding up the publication of the report. I am not sure what the rules of the team are, whether they have to be unanimous, but apparently there is some difficulty. We have urged the publication of the report but we do not order our observers about. They report what they see when they are ready to report.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

COST OF NURSING HOME CARE

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 increasing number of generally older people who are being discharged from hospitals to nursing homes for further care and who find themselves without funds and not covered by hospitalization services for which they have paid for many years, has the minister discussed this problem with his provincial counterparts or has he some plan to cover the cost of such care for these people?

Mr. Speaker: The question might be replied to by the minister by way of a statement on motions. He might indicate to the hon. member who asked the question whether this is his intention.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I would be pleased to consider making a statement on motions concerning this matter, Mr. Speaker.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

DELAY IN PAYMENT OF BENEFITS

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Labour. It arises from a good many complaints I and many other hon. members, I am sure, have received concerning the payment of benefits to unemployed people. There seems to be a very great delay in the payment of these benefits. Has the minister any plan in mind to streamline the present operation?

Mr. Speaker: I think also in this case that this is the kind of general information which should normally be given by a statement on motions unless the minister has a very short answer to the question asked by the hon. member.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The hon. member is such a considerate

member that I should like to answer his question. I was informed this morning that 97.8 per cent of all claims processed by the Unemployment Insurance Commission are processed on time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mackasey: The majority of the complaints are usually due to faulty information supplied by the unemployed people when filling out the forms.

Mr. Hales: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I thank the minister for his statement on this matter. I think the minister might discuss this problem with his colleague, the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This seems to be a debate between the minister and the hon. member.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

REQUEST FOR ORGANIZATION MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In keeping with the undertaking the minister gave the House before the end of the last session that he would take steps to call the Standing Committee on Regional Development together in January, is the minister now prepared to do that and have the committee meet so it can deal with some of the serious problems facing his department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I hope we shall soon be able to appoint the committee.

[*English*]

CRIMINAL CODE

PROCLAMATION OF REMAINDER OF AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BREATHALYZER

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): I have a question for the Minister of Justice. When does the minister anticipate the remainder of the breathalyzer section of the Criminal Code dealing with the approved container will be proclaimed?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): When we have found a container that can be approved.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

COMMISSION ADVERTISEMENTS RESPECTING FRAUD

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Has the minister seen and does he approve of the advertisements which have been appearing recently on behalf of the Unemployment Insurance Commission warning about alleged fraud in the collection of unemployment insurance claims?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): I have seen the advertisements, Mr. Speaker, and I approve of them. I do not think anybody should apologize for the fact that we feel the unemployment insurance fund belongs to the workers of this country and their employers who contribute. We should not have sympathy for anybody who sets out to defraud that fund. It is our obligation to protect the fund. All that we have said is if you intend to intentionally defraud the fund, be prepared for your day in court. We do not intend to apologize for this philosophy.

Mr. Orlikow: Has the minister received representations to the effect that the advertisements are drafted in such a way that many people who have legitimate and proper claims are afraid to make their claims?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, the only—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. In view of the statement he just made that the unemployment insurance fund belongs to the workers of this country, I ask him to consider that Devco, a Crown Corporation, has forcibly retired persons in Cape Breton and compelled them to use their own UIC benefits while they are unemployed.

Mr. Mackasey: The hon. gentleman has raised this point about seven times. It is a very uncharitable, inaccurate and unfair misrepresentation of the facts. I think it should be clarified once and for all, Mr. Speaker. Under the regulations—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the minister that this is a debate between the minister and the hon. member as to the interpretation of the facts of the situation. I do not think there should be a debate on that point.

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the question will appear without an answer and this is very unfair to the Unemployment Insurance Commission. I would like to set the record straight.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister cannot do this on a point of order. I suggest that whether he is right or wrong this is not a point of order. It is a question of debate.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege. The minister has indicated that I have misrepresented the facts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacInnis: The minister also indicated in previous answers that he has hundreds of examples of this type of abuse of the UIC fund. My question of privilege arises from the fact that I asked for one or two of these hundreds of examples, not only verbally but also in the form of a letter to the minister over a month ago to which I have not received a reply.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. Will the hon. minister kindly resume his seat. I have to suggest to the minister who has a point of order, and to the hon. member who has a question of privilege, that my interpretation is that this is a debate over the interpretation of the facts of the situation. That is not tantamount to either a question of privilege or a point of order. I suggest that the minister might get together with the hon. member later in the day and they might resolve the difficulty by private discussion.

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, in order to help—

Mr. Speaker: Is the minister rising on a point of order?

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Because he is one of my favourite members I am only trying to help him. If the hon. member will put a question on the Order Paper asking if other similar programs are in existence, I will—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister has to respect the observation made by the Chair that this is not a point of order but a question of debate.

Inquiries of the Ministry

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUPPLEMENTARY PENSIONS BENEFITS BILL

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is for either of the presidents across the way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: There is only one.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is too bad there is not a television camera to record the rising of His Excellency the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): However, I am referring to the President of the Treasury Board or the President of the Privy Council.

An hon. Member: They are just honorary presidents.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of the fact that the list of business tabled today includes the very welcome supplementary pensions benefits bill which is listed for first reading before the Easter recess, and in view of the fact the President of the Treasury Board announced on December 19 that this legislation would be effective in April, may I ask whether efforts will be made to put this bill through all stages before Easter?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

POLLUTION

CONVERSION OF GOVERNMENT CARS TO NATURAL GAS FUEL

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): I direct my question to the Minister of Supply and Services. In view of the report by the general services administrator of the United States, does the Canadian government plan a conversion of government cars to natural gas fuel which trials have shown to be successful in eliminating pollution?

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES ACT

EXTENSION OF BOUNDARIES

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): My question is for the Minister of Regional Economic

Expansion. In view of the serious economic situation in the province of Saskatchewan, is the government considering or has it decided to extend the boundaries under the Regional Development Incentives Act?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): No, Mr. Speaker.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LAY-OFF OF GRAIN HANDLERS AT THUNDER BAY

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. In view of the unemployment situation affecting the grain handlers at Thunder Bay—the figure has risen to as high as 300 in recent weeks—would the hon. gentleman urge his colleague, the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the movement of grain, to accelerate delivery to the terminals and thereby provide badly needed economic relief to grain handlers and prairie wheat growers?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister without Portfolio is an adept and talented minister. As a matter of fact, in anticipation of this problem he and the Minister of Labour met representatives of labour at the Lakehead three weeks ago and reached a satisfactory solution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dinsdale: In light of the meeting I had with the same representative last evening, I wonder whether the minister would review the situation.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Assiniboia.

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. member that in light of my answer he should hold another meeting with that particular gentleman.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is this: In view of reports that grain sales have been lost because of threatened management-labour difficulties on the west coast, can the minister advise the House what steps are being taken to deal with the situation and prevent further disruption and loss of sales?

Mr. Mackasey: In view of the fact that there is a possibility of a strike on the west coast at Vancouver, perhaps the question should be addressed to the Minister of Industry, because the employers are just as responsible as the labour movement and no settlement has yet been reached.

[Translation]

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

DISCUSSION BETWEEN OTTAWA AND QUEBEC RESPECTING RE-ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

In view of the fact that the number of murders has increased in Canada in 1969, compared to 1967, and in view of the fact that the Minister of Justice of Quebec has asked for the re-establishment of the death penalty, can the minister tell us whether he has had talks on this subject with the Quebec Minister of Justice?

Mr. Speaker: I think this question was put to the minister a few days ago.

[English]

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON LICENSING OF WEST COAST SALMON FISHERMEN

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry with regard to the government's policy on the licensing of salmon fishermen on the Pacific coast. Since most of the information we have received on this subject has emanated from press releases made outside the House and has been somewhat fragmentary in character, would the minister consider making a full statement in the House on motions setting forth the government's policy and the regulations pertaining thereto?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, because a number of briefs have been submitted on this subject and a number of meetings are being held, I think it might be better to refer the matter to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Will the minister assure the House that this matter will be submitted to the committee within the next few days, because for a long time hon. members have been asking that it be referred to the committee?

Mr. Davis: If there is not an early opportunity to discuss this question on the estimates, I shall be glad to refer it to the committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to bring to the notice of hon. members that the question period expired a few minutes ago. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition might be allowed one further question.

PENSIONS

INQUIRY AS TO LEGISLATION RESPECTING OLD AGE SECURITY BENEFITS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have noted there is nothing in the list of legislation set down for the remainder of the session which will provide any relief for those in receipt of old age security benefits. I therefore ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare, particularly bearing in mind the rising cost of living, whether this is an oversight or whether we are to assume that no measure designed to bring such relief will be introduced during this session of Parliament?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition may know, we intend to present a white paper setting out policy in this area. In the meantime, the provinces have been informed in a series of meetings on welfare that the federal government will be amenable to sharing, under the Canada Assistance Plan, the cost of any supplementation they consider necessary. This would apply to any supplementary payments they care to make under the federal programs.

Mr. Stanfield: Is it the feeling of the government of Canada that an offer of this sort is likely to lead to justice for the older people of Canada, particularly in view of the difficulty some provinces are experiencing in carrying out even their present programs, let alone taking on increased commitments?

Mr. Munro: It was the view of the provinces at the time of the introduction of the Canada Assistance Plan that this would assist present programs. At the time the hon. gentleman was Premier of Nova Scotia this legislation was regarded as being very just, very much needed, and as serving the purpose.

[*Translation*]

MANITOBA CENTENNIAL

PRESENTATIONS OF COMMEMORATIVE SILVER DOLLARS

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think the hon. member for Saint-Boniface (Mr. Guay) is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (Saint-Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the opportunity of Manitoba Centennial Day being commemorated in Ottawa today, to present you, as well as the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Official Opposition, with a case containing a one-dollar coin fresh from the mint as a remembrance of Manitoba's Centennial.

I have the pleasure of offering it to you, Mr. Speaker. Somebody will hand it to you in a moment.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I think the procedure will be shorter if I thank the hon. member on behalf of myself, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

COMPANY OF YOUNG CANADIANS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING STRUCTURE OF ORGANIZATION

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State) moved that Bill C-176, to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

He said:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I do not have to remind the House of the incidents which led before the Christmas recess to the inquiry held by the Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts into the Company of Young Canadians.

Neither do I need to remind the House of the contents of that committee report which led to the appointment of a financial controller for the Company of Young Canadians.

After first reading of the bill, the government committed itself to a motion for second reading of the bill by the end of January. We are now dealing with such a motion.

The House is no doubt aware that, at its request, we have determined the exact duration of the financial controller's mandate. In so doing, we were tacitly committing ourselves to completing the legislative process of amending the act by March 31, so that the controller could be replaced by the new structures provided by the amendments that the House will be considering today.

Before commenting upon and explaining briefly those amendments and those new structures, and this I am sure will be done in a much more detailed manner in the committee, I would like to reflect for a moment with the hon. members on the philosophy which inspired government action in this field. I would, as I say, like to reflect on what, in spite of certain pressures, led us to maintain the Company of Young Canadians and on what, on the other hand, justifies our making significant changes to its legal framework.

• (3:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

The first point I want to make is that no one can understand the nature of the CYC unless one fully understands the nature of our society.

Mr. Stanfield: Nobody can understand it.

Mr. Pelletier: We live in a society of conflict. I do not necessarily mean conflict in the normal, physical sense of the word. I mean confrontation, upheaval, poverty and change; I mean the conflicts of a society with an unequal distribution of wealth, an unequal distribution of power and an unequal distribution of participation. A society in which individuals cannot participate inevitably breeds conflicts. It is a society that robs man of his dignity; it is a society that breeds disillusionment and indignity, generates frustration and, in effect, tends to dehumanize people.

In its initial stages, political action must be remedial. The purpose of many government initiatives is to remedy existing flaws. We must, however, strive to achieve the development of a society that is not only remedial but constructive. We must attempt to achieve a society of equality, a society in which all people may participate, not in token fashion but rather in active ways in attacking both the problems of today and of tomorrow. Either we achieve this goal or we will develop an oligarchic society in which a group of technocrats dictate the means of achieving their goals and assume their goals to be the goals of society at large.

We live in an age that is full of contradictions. This is an age in which expertise has become the passport to success. People, it is often said, know more and more about less and less. In many ways this is a necessity. In a period of time when knowledge is doubling every 10 years, how can one expect to keep abreast of all factors? I am amazed sometimes to hear how the social sciences have subdivided themselves and then re-subdivided themselves into smaller and smaller groups dealing with smaller but more complex problems.

We cannot deny the necessity for expertise and the necessity for sophisticated knowledge. However, at the same time, more and more of our problems are being seen as multi-disciplines and sub-disciplines. This is a moment in time when not the expert, but rather the generalist, the multi-disciplinarian must come to the fore. We must recognize that very often the sum of the trees does not equal the forest. Without expertise, we cannot exist. However, we cannot make the mistake of allowing expertise to dictate solutions. Expertise must remain the handmaiden of policy-makers and not the controller of policy-makers. Expertise can never be allowed to become an excuse for the blind acceptance of solutions.

We are fortunate to live at a time when the technology exists to free man from the day-to-day drudgery of mundane chores. Machines can release man to develop his potential in an atmosphere free of want. Unfortunately, the machine can also be allowed to suppress man, to dictate man's existence and in other ways totally dehumanize him. We must learn to harness our creations to free, rather than to enslave.

I plead today for a re-evaluation of our decision structure, based upon my basic belief in the integrity and intelligence of man. We must allow all members of our society to participate equally in the decision-making structure of our country. We must not fall into the trap of believing that our privileged information gives us a privileged right to make decisions. We must, rather, educate and inform the members of our society in order to assure their participation in the evolution of our society.

It is unacceptable for people in a democratic society to abrogate their responsibilities because of a supposed lack of information. It is our responsibility to assure that the necessary information is available. Too many atrocities have been perpetrated on mankind

because supposed expert opinion was unavailable to the people. Too many heartless solutions have been imposed in the name of technocracy.

What I have said thus far is neither new nor original. I can suggest that it has not been said often enough. I can suggest that it is one of the most important results of the critical analysis to which society has been subjected during the sixties. The generations gathered in this chamber have sometimes been overly impressed by efficiency. Throughout our life we have watched with envy, with pride and respect, the development of efficient machines designed to accomplish tasks, duties and produce results.

This world has developed efficient machines of destruction and, fortunately, efficient machines of production. It is not surprising that we have been overwhelmed by means of production and infatuated with efficiency. We are the product of the last stages of the industrial revolution. But now, as we approach the post-industrial society, the time has come for us to rigorously re-evaluate the utilization of technology.

The time has come for us to heed the call of youth who have been screaming the basic questions of why efficiency; why growth; why this allocation of resources? While we must organize our wealth in order to assure the maximum benefit for all mankind, we must recognize that the benefits to mankind cannot be measured in material terms alone. We must recognize man's need to strive for fulfilment in many different ways.

Our youth are active participants in our society, and although we wish to encourage their participation they are in many ways independent enough, aloof enough, to undertake a critical analysis that is impossible for our generation. I do not wish to set up youth as a sort of independent alter ego screaming in the darkness. Rather, I wish to argue for a legitimate voice for youth in our structures just as I would argue, and have argued, for a legitimate voice for all people in our society. Youth in particular have a point of view; youth in particular have an analysis. The fact is that what we do today determines the society in which they must live tomorrow. The mistakes we make today, they must undo tomorrow. Surely, this is reason enough to grant them full and equal participation in our society. The worst possible thing that could happen, in my opinion, would be a return to the dull fifties, the period of navel contemplations by youth.

To the lawmakers of the time, there were no problems with youth; youth knew its place and youth was no bother. Perhaps one of the reasons we are confronted with some of the problems of today is precisely because youth shunned its responsibility in the fifties of analyzing and challenging society.

• (3:20 p.m.)

These remarks are not designed to suggest that all that youth recommends or all that youth undertakes is destined to be good as long as we do not interfere. We know that this generation of youth is subject to many of the same problems as our generation. We know of the danger of manipulation by small groups. We know we must maintain safeguards within the structures used by youth in order to protect the great bulk of youth from manipulative minorities. But these small contemptuous minorities, who by their machinations have destroyed many of the positive projects of youth, cannot be allowed to destroy all the mechanisms designed for the participation of this group.

[*Translation*]

The Company of Young Canadians, established in 1966, was founded on youth idealism. Its purpose was to channel that idealism toward constructive programs. The creation of the Company of Young Canadians perhaps showed a certain artlessness. It was thought that youth would be spared the scheming from which so many groups have suffered in the past. The experience has shown that we were wrong to believe this. But experience has also clearly shown that the Company of Young Canadians, through its programs, can greatly contribute to the development of our society, can encourage and prompt youth to play an active part in the rehabilitation of that society. We can analyze and dissect every aspect of such experiences as that of the Company of Young Canadians in order to discover exactly why it somewhat fizzled out.

The Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, did everything it could and it is to be commended for its analysis of the problem.

I wish to point out that the committee strongly re-affirms the need and the importance of organizations such as the Company of Young Canadians which is an experience in itself, as are, in one way or another, most youth activities.

As it was mentioned in the House in 1966, during the debate on the legislation establishing the Company of Young Canadians, the

experience was almost inevitably bound to result in many failures, but it was hoped that with the anticipated successes, they would be lessons.

I should like to think that is exactly what happened. We have learned that the CYC projects, its role as a thorn in the flesh of the powers that be, were necessary. It was also necessary that the Company should help the people and provide them with the bare minimum to enable them to participate in the life of our society. Past mistakes must not make us forget those facts. We also know, now, that it is necessary to spell out to the CYC the responsibilities to be assumed and the authority to be wielded. We also know that idealism and the duty to be accountable are not actually incompatible.

Mr. Speaker, the amendments provided in this bill are the minimum changes necessary to enable the Company of Young Canadians to remain in operation. Contrary to what has been suggested, these amendments are aimed at establishing an organization which will still enjoy wide autonomy. Once the proposed amendments are passed, the Company of Young Canadians will be comparable to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, the Canada Council, and the Corporation of the National Museums of Canada. In each of these cases, although the government appoints the members of the board of directors and the executive director, one must admit that these bodies are largely independent from public authorities. They have been structured this way in order that they may continue to perform their difficult task, aloof from the vicissitudes of politics, and that they may initiate, when needed, projects that may be of a controversial nature. The Company of Young Canadians will always be controversial.

The Company of Young Canadians will keep on working in the midst of marginal groups on the fringe of our society, and it will keep on threatening and troubling the powers that be. This is not what we are seeking, but we must recognize beforehand that it is almost unavoidable. This bill aims at giving the Company of Young Canadians the independence required to undertake some tricky projects when it deems.

It seems to me logical, Mr. Speaker, to remind the hon. members that as representatives of the people, it is our duty to see to it that the use of the taxpayers' money can be controlled. By introducing this bill, the government is assuming its responsibilities, while granting the company its legal autonomy.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

I would like to point out that the government intends to appoint a board which will be representative of youth and not a group whose duty would be to supervise the Company and to keep youth in its place, as some people say. The average age of the persons appointed by the government within the last Council was quite a bit under thirty and there is no reason to think that it will go up substantially.

Before concluding, I would like to mention another aspect of the problem which is raised periodically. Some people wonder why the government should grant its financial support to those who are contesting some of its decisions and who are challenging it. The government has to inform the public and to listen the views which are submitted to it, and even to facilitate in a financial way the submitting of views which could be different from its own. Everybody knows that big companies, in order to make themselves known and to protect their interests, hire people or agencies specialized in public relations whose services are highly developed technically and are equally very costly. Some, of them, as we know, will not hesitate to convey their views to members of the House. One can stand aloof from pressure groups that seek thus to make the influence they may have felt openly. One can wonder whether the costs incurred by firms to get themselves a good public relations branch are really legitimate expenses. Personally, I think they are in so far as these operations are conducted openly and the objectives of the companies concerned are all clearly identifiable.

In fact, the government helps those companies financially by allowing them to deduct such costs from their fiscal charges and that at the rate of several million dollars a year.

Is it not logical that we should help population groups which lack the means to have recourse to sophisticated representation techniques? Is it not logical that we should help groups whoses expenses are not deductible for income tax purposes? We do it in several cases and at a relatively low cost, one case being the Consumer Advisory Council and another the Company of Young Canadians.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The Company is a sort of investment by the government and Canada's youth in the process of participation. It is an investment of the greatest of our resources: our human capital.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would repeat what I said earlier. I pointed out that we live in a society at grips with many conflicts, suffering from alienation, discrimination and

other forms of enslavement. The Company of Young Canadians represents a major factor in the government's policy on participation. On the one hand, it will provide youth with a means—not the only one, of course—of taking part in the evolution of our society. On the other, the CYC is meant to help badly informed and ill-prepared groups to join in the life of our society and, for that purpose, to master the techniques of participation. Unfortunately, participation often implies a degree of specialization which some of our people do not have. The CYC can help those who are not technicians acquire the necessary knowledge for putting their views across.

After all, we are living under a democratic system in which all citizens over a certain age are allowed to vote. Unfortunately, some votes count more than others. Most young people are not entitled to vote and thus cannot make their voices heard. The great majority of those who live in slums, on reserves and in other substandard environments of our society are also unable to make their influence felt, or to wield any significant influence.

The establishment of the Company of Young Canadians is a step toward the development of a more just society. I have one last recommendation to express, Mr. Speaker: that we proceed as soon as possible with discussion of the bill, that of course it be referred, to the Committee according to the work of the House, but with minimum delay, in order that we may meet the deadline of the end of the term of office of the Financial Controller and that we may return to a normal system of administration for the Company of Young Canadians as soon as possible.

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, would the Secretary of State allow a question?

Mr. Pelletier: Certainly.

Mr. Valade: In his statement, the Secretary of State said that the government itself would appoint the officers representing the students within the new organization and that the directors appointed by the government would be in majority on the council. How does the minister intend to proceed with those appointments so that that Company will not be influenced by the government in a partisan way or otherwise? Could the minister give me some information in this connection?

Mr. Pelletier: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out an inaccuracy. I think the hon. member for Sainte-Marie made a lapsus by referring to students, since it is not stipulated anywhere, and it is not the government's intention, that the Council of the Company will be restricted to the student class which is a minority, and a privileged one at that, among our youth.

As to the process of appointing these representatives, I would say to the hon. member for Sainte-Marie that the government will follow the same pattern that it applies for instance in the case of the directors of the C.B.C., or the members of the Board of the Canadian Radio-Television Commission, whose integrity or objectivity has never to my knowledge been questioned by anybody—not even by the hon. member for Sainte-Marie.

[*English*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the minister with a great deal of interest as we began the second reading debate on Bill C-176. I share with him the desire that this bill proceed with dispatch so that the committee may study it in detail before it comes back to the House for third reading and the comptroller who has been appointed by act of this House may be relieved of his duties.

As I listened to the opening remarks of the minister I wondered whether he was talking about a bill to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act or a bill to amend his philosophy of life. He has given rise to enough provocation, perhaps in a philosophical way, for me to debate with him several statements about his philosophy of life.

The original intention on this side of the House was to have only one speaker take part in this debate. I am not sure whether this intention can now be maintained in view of the many statements the minister has made about his philosophy of life. I do not know how that matter has any relevance in this debate, but it certainly stimulated a little thought in my mind.

I agree that many of his philosophical statements are not necessarily new or original. In addition, I do not think they are pertinent to a bill to amend the charter of the Company of Young Canadians. I repeat that while it was our original intention to have one speaker give our point of view so that we could move quickly through the debate today, I am not sure that we will now be able to follow this procedure. I have seldom seen or heard—I say this with all respect to the minister and intend no personal slight—a more intellectual

gymnastic exercise than when the minister talked about participation of youth and involvement of youth. The clauses of the bill to amend the charter of the Company of Young Canadians, in effect—except for the whim and/or discretion of the cabinet, which we do not know about—eliminate the participation of youth unless the cabinet decides to appoint youth to the council, or as chairman, vice-chairman of the council or executive director.

The effect of the amendments in the bill is that no longer will the volunteers, youth on the streets, directly participate in the deliberations of the Company of Young Canadians. I do not understand how the minister could stand up this afternoon and for the first 10 or 15 minutes give his personal philosophy of life and relate that to the Company of Young Canadians and, the participation of youth. The core of the debate is related to clauses which would remove their direct participation. As I have said, this is an exercise in intellectual gymnastics such as we have seldom seen in this House.

So far as life and conflict is concerned, I am sure the minister would agree—if not, we could debate the issue for many minutes but I do not intend to do so unless the minister so desires—that when we talk about life and conflicts in society we realize that of course there are conflicts in society. Is not life a conflict? I say to the minister, in a philosophical way, that the only time one does not have conflict is when one is dead—it is as simple as that.

The minister should not have wasted time, and we should not be wasting time on this philosophical preamble to a bill to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act. The relevant portion of that philosophical preamble concerning participation and involvement is not borne out by the bill we are debating today.

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member answer a question?

Mr. Nowlan: Gladly.

Mr. Pelletier: I understand the hon. member's initial remarks to mean that I have stirred up some thought in his mind. He seems to resent it. I am ready to withdraw anything that has stirred up some thought in his mind if he finds it uncomfortable.

Mr. Nowlan: I think the minister is not asking a question but is making a statement. I am most comfortable with stimulating thoughts of either the minister or myself; I am comfortable with thoughts from all sources. But we are debating a bill to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act. There are in this bill about eight germane clauses which completely contradict the minister's philosophy of life and involvement and participation of youth. I do not see any point continuing the debate along this line, although I agree with his philosophy that there are conflicts in life and society. I make the equally obvious statement that all life is a conflict, and the only time you do not have conflict is when you are dead. So why waste time discussing it?

I should like to briefly review a little of the history that has brought us to this debate. The minister spoke of the dull fifties. I do not accept that statement, either. That was the time of the first real mass confrontation. That was when desegregation began. It was also a time when some members of his party were even then active in politics. I think the concept of the Company of Young Canadians and its creation is well known. It was created by the then leader of the government, the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson. I do not imagine any piece of legislation passed through this House with higher hopes and greater expectations than the Company of Young Canadians Act.

• (3:40 p.m.)

In his philosophical preamble in June, 1966, Mr. Pearson talked about the participation of youth. But Mr. Pearson allowed youth to participate. He introduced what was called the volunteer member. We can say in retrospect, having seen the Company operate for three years, that obviously it should not have had all that freedom. But, conversely, under the legislation sponsored by the minister in Bill C-176 there should not be the complete domination of the Company which the government seeks to impose.

Our high hopes and great expectations were evidenced by the unanimous vote of the House, which in itself is a rare thing. I will not dwell too long on this aspect of the matter, but the minister did not even refer to those high hopes and expectations. He said we were well aware that we would debate this subject today, but for the purposes of the record we should state frankly that although at first there were high hopes and expectations with regard to the Company, they were matched by the sad results, pathetic performance and misguided messages which came from many individuals who were working in the CYC.

I say this with the caveat and the qualification that it was uniformly assessed—I think the minister would probably agree with the evidence given to the committee although I am not sure about that—but it has been pretty well admitted that however laudable were the Company's concept, ideas and objectives, they were not enough to produce practical results and to resolve some of the problems which, as the minister said, were evident in our society. These problems are evident today and will be evident tomorrow whether or not there is a Company of Young Canadians, and whether the present government or another government is in office, because life is a conflict.

You try to resolve the problems and blunt some of the sharp edges, you try to help those who cannot help themselves and you give voice to the voiceless; but these are just euphemisms which we utter so easily, sad as it may seem. I say in a realistic way that we in our short existence will not achieve a Utopia wherein everything is planned, everyone is happy and we are all in lotus land. We can only reach lotus land when we are somewhere else, either up above or down below.

Be that as it may, I suggest that although the results were poor, the performance unfortunate and the messages misguided, the fault does not lie with those who were so intimately and sincerely involved, as the minister well knows through being better acquainted with some of the CYC members than I am. It is not the fault of the individuals and volunteers who were with the Company through the stormy times from interim to permanent council. Those individuals may have contributed to it in part, but it was not the fault of the youth who were participating or involved in this grand design and this exciting adventure, as Mr. Pearson called it in the debate on the CYC which took place in the House on June 10, 1966, as recorded at page 6257 of *Hansard*.

I suggest that in large part, if not overwhelmingly, the fault lay in the lack of direction, the lack of interest and the absence of leadership at the top. These are the factors that got the Company into the difficulties in which it finds itself today. I believe those who were charged with directing this exciting experiment should accept the responsibility for the failure of the Company of Young Canadians, which was so obviously ignored in the minister's presentation today. The sad truth is that it did not take place overnight.

I point out, with all due respect to the minister, that this was not one incident. Mr. Saulnier of Montreal might have been the catalyst responsible for the ultimate investigation of the Company. The minister said before the committee and in one of his press releases that even before Mr. Saulnier made his statements about the CYC, the minister had evidence that gave him reason for concern about the direction of the Company. But let me point out that long before the minister had any responsibility for the Company—although the minister was elected in 1965, he was not responsible for the company when it was first established—those in charge were aware that things were not going right, that neither direction nor course were set for the Company, and that the Company would founder unless something was done about it.

I will not review the evidence which was presented to the committee. However, it was clear from the press statement given by the vice-chairman of the provisional council while the committee was reviewing this matter, and from the statements made to a columnist of a Toronto newspaper, that the vice-chairman was aware of certain problems which the company was facing, of certain personalities who were dominating, and of certain movements that were starting to take over. Yet nothing was done about it.

The fact is that after the Company was set up, a provisional council directed it for over three years from July 11, 1966, when the act was unanimously passed in this House, until October 4, 1969. This was a temporary body which directed the Company.

In retrospect, many people have tried to say that it did not matter that there was an interim board of directors which was officially called the provisional council. I do not know of another body created by parliament that has operated for three years with temporary directors.

We in the last few years have experienced problems in the CBC and in the National Film Board. With regard to these two bodies, I suggest that part of the reason for their problems was the existence of a vacuum up at the top before a president of the CBC was appointed and perhaps before a new commissioner of the National Film Board was appointed. When there is a vacuum, and no leadership or direction at the top, the legislative creatures whom we create in the House of Commons often go astray. I am afraid that is what happened here. Now we hear protestations and rationalizations in retrospect; we hear excuses for the emptiness which did not seem to matter when nobody was directing the affairs of the Company.

Some of the evidence indicates that this lack of direction at the top was a factor in the troubles which beset the Company. Some of this evidence does not come from Members of Parliament on the government side or on the opposition side; it comes from those who were on the provisional council of the Company and from one of the executive directors who for a year was responsible for its affairs.

It does not do anything constructive to again go into that evidence in detail. However, the facts must be stated for the record, especially when the minister makes statements of a philosophical nature and does not say what is the real purpose of debating this matter today. The reason is to be found in the omissions, errors and perhaps misjudgments of the past.

It is clear from the evidence given to the committee evidence that the Company operated under a provisional council for over three years and spent $7.2 million on 38 on-going projects. The minister spoke about the involvement of youth, and we on this side are all for it. But we also have to be realistic. Because the Company's activities have been publicized in the newspapers over the past two or three years, many people forget how many volunteers took part in its activities. The figure is in some dispute, but I suggest about 350 volunteers in the three-year period were involved in a continuing way in the affairs of the Company.

• (3:50 p.m.)

To my mind this is a reflection on the construction of the Company and the course it took. Only 350 to 400 volunteers were involved. I agree with the minister that many projects throughout Canada need youth involvement at the community level. This Company which has occupied so much of the time of Parliament and to which so much time and space have been devoted by newspapers and television networks, attracted only 350 to 400 volunteers since its inception and has cost $7.2 million. I know the figure of $9.2 million has been suggested, but regardless of the amount involved I suggest that those at the top must accept responsibility for the failure to chart a course for the Company.

Without going into detail, I shall just read some of the shortcomings of the Company as outlined by the parliamentary committee which investigated the Company's affairs about three weeks before Christmas. That committee's report was tabled on December 5, 1969, and now forms part of the records of the House. It illustrates more graphically than any words of mine how this exciting adventure got off on the wrong track and ran onto the shoals where it unfortunately remains today. I quote the paragraph headed "Shortcomings of CYC" in the committee's report:

Notwithstanding the fact that the Company of Young Canadians has some obvious accomplishments and successes to its credit, your committee is gravely disturbed by many aspects of the legislation, organization and operations of the Company.

More specifically, the areas of concern include the following:

i. There is a lack of administrative procedures resulting in almost chaotic conditions.

ii. Financial procedures, to say the least, are questionable and unconventional.

iii. Evidence has been adduced of an infiltration into the Company, particularly in one region of the country, by individuals who have used the Company as a base for acts of subversion, violence and illegality, which the administrators of the Company were apparently powerless to control. It would also appear that public funds may have been surreptitiously diverted to support these purposes.

iv. It is apparent that from time to time and from place to place various volunteers, in the course of their duties, participated in overt acts of a partisan political nature, contrary to the objectives and the best interests of the Company.

v. Your committee has evidence that the executive director of the Company is seriously hampered in the performance of his duties. This situation results from the following factors, among others:

(a) The Company has no policies on the qualifications required of volunteers nor any definition of their exact role and functions;

(b) There is no policy on the recruitment of volunteers;

(c) There are no policies on the training of volunteers;

(d) There are no evaluation procedures with respect to the performance of volunteers or staff;

(e) There is no adequate procedure to deal with the grievances of volunteers or staff;

(f) There are no adequate policies for the suspension and dismissal of staff and the suspension or cancellation of volunteer contracts.

vi. The Company has no policies for the research, selection, evaluation, modification and/or termination of programs or projects.

Rarely, if ever, has a parliamentary committee filed a report on a creature of Parliament detailing such errors and omissions as I have just read; and this not after two months of operations of the Company, six months, a year or two years—this indictment comes after three years of operation of the Company. What hope or solace can we in the opposition take when this type of indictment is made against the Company? The government has had authority over the Company for three years. The Governor in Council had some powers, although admittedly not many, and there was a minister to report to Parliament on behalf of the Company.

Publicity has been given to the affairs of the Company in Toronto and Montreal. Recently, all those engaged in the Company's Cape Breton project resigned en masse, even though they knew the general guidelines which this bill would set. For these and many other reasons, members of the Conservative Party who served on the Broadcasting Committee, having listened to all the evidence of the witnesses—and some of it was conflicting—in effect filed a minority report.

Under the rules of the House they could not file a minority report as such, but they issued a press release on December 5, the day on which the committee's report was filed, stating that they did not support the committee's report and that they felt the reality of the situation dictated that the CYC should no longer be considered a credible agency to try to undertake social work with youth at the community level. I wish to read into the record a portion of that press release, beginning with the third paragraph as follows:

The fundamental reason for the present difficulties of the Company was the continued failure of the Pearson and Trudeau governments to follow the direction of Parliament, as expressed in the legislation. It is basic to these difficulties that the Company of Young Canadians was run by a provisional council from its inception on July 11, 1966, to October 4, 1969, when the permanent council was appointed. This more than three year period of stewardship was the incubator for many of the Company's present problems. The Liberal government cannot escape its responsibility for a failure to provide sufficient interest and support to the Company throughout its life. A quick perusal of the shortcomings, as set out in the report, reveals as sad an indictment of mismanagement and lack of control in a federal agency, rarely seen, if ever admitted.

Accordingly, for a variety of reasons, the Company of Young Canadians—in many cases through no fault of its own—is no longer credible for social action at the community level.

Since it has become clear that legislative changes are necessary, we feel that the Company of Young Canadians should be phased out, and the federal government should appoint an independent body to review the experience of the past three years, consult with those involved, and other agencies, so that the original concept of social action with youth and government to give a voice to the voiceless, can be carried out by a new organization, without the liability of the old. Further, we understand that the Secretary of State presently has a 12-man task force within his department studying the entire question of youth and its involvement with government. Obviously, such a study should be integrated with, or at least co-ordinated with, a study of the Company of Young Canadians.

It is naïve, or idealistic, or perhaps a combination of both, to think that a parliamentary committee which only sat, intensively, for three weeks, can right the wrongs, and recommend policy changes, which others more intimately involved have ignored, or failed to do for over 3 years.

It is obvious that the Company has developed a bad reputation despite the good intentions of most of its sincere and dedicated volunteers. Such a reputation will not be corrected by legislative changes, and the fear would be that a trusteeship, labouring with the present problems of the Company, might very well pollute and irrevocably pervert the original concept and objectives behind the act.

We say it is time to be realistic, not just idealistic, and call a spade a spade. In view of the past history and present reputation we doubt if the most objective trustee can successfully impose a different structure, even radically revised, on the original frame of the Company. That frame has already been bruised and battered and any such grafting attempt, we fear, would create such a mutation that it could very well adversely affect the future role of youth in any social action at the community level.

• (4:00 p.m.)

We believe that if the government carries out the suggestions of the committee, then the Company of Young Canadians is dead de facto, if not de jure, and so it is thus reasonable to start afresh from square one.

In admitting this reality, there is no breach of faith with youth.

I am coming back to the point the Company is dead, anyway. If there is any doubt that the Company is dead, evidence can be found in the debate.

On the contrary, we believe a fresh start, building on the experience of the past, can develop a viable and constructive outlet for youth in social action at the community level, which will far exceed the present legacy of $7.2 millions spent on 38 ongoing projects which involved not more than 400 volunteers in its troubled and turbulent three year history.

Our primary belief is that volunteer service for youth is still as valid an aim as it was when we supported the concept behind the Company of Young Canadians. Surely, however, we have all learned that good intentions are not sufficient to prevent the abuses that arose in the company's operations. We endorse a new start after proper study.

This statement was endorsed unanimously, Mr. Speaker, by all members of the committee including those of my party. If there is any doubt about the statement, after reflection and having considered it in light of Bill C-176 which we are now debating, the doubt is removed. At least we are admitting the reality of the CYC as envisaged by Mr. Pearson and as spoken of by many members opposite. However, the concept of the voluntary member, which was so important to the whole purpose of the Company, is completely removed by this bill which I say makes the Company dead in reality, if not in law.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: With all due respect to the minister, when we get rid of his philosophical perambulations and get down to the bill—which the minister did not do—we realize he is carrying on a charade and creating camouflage when he talks about the involvement of youth and participatory democracy. It is a camouflage, Mr. Speaker, and to appreciate this you have only to look at the main sections of the bill, starting with clause 1 which reduces the council from 15 to a group of not less than seven and not more than nine, all appointed by the cabinet. This provision is quite different from 15 members of council, ten of whom were volunteer members, appointed and governed by the CYC.

Clause 3 provides, not that the council shall appoint one of its members to be chairman but that cabinet shall appoint the chairman. The next provision is that cabinet shall appoint the vice-chairman, and in clause 4, instead of the council recommending the executive director to the cabinet it is laid down that cabinet shall appoint the executive director. Consideration of the bill shows that the members of the council replacing the volunteer-member council are appointed by the cabinet; the chairman, vice-chairman, and executive director are appointed by cabinet.

I suggest that the problems of the Company in the last three or four years will not be cured by substituting for the Company of Young Canadians a company of cabinet Canadians. The minister may have the best intentions, but when drawing up legislation good intentions are not sufficient.

It is as wrong to have cabinet domination of the council as it was for it to have total freedom or to have a majority of volunteer members in control. Because of the problems the company encountered, I suggest that the cabinet has over-reacted and has gone from total freedom to total dependence. I do not believe that the formula proposed by the government for the Company of Young Canadians is correct. There should not be total independence by which the volunteer members may dominate the council, but it is equally wrong that it should be completely dominated by cabinet, making the council subservient to the cabinet.

It should not be just another arm of government or another regional desk; it should be, rather, a youth desk. Because the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) is the minister reponsible, it is only fair that it should be his youth desk. The minister made a speech about cultural concepts and said he is reviewing the whole work of youth. If this bill makes the minister responsible, and through him the cabinet, for complete control of the CYC, it should be his appendage. He knows the state of general unrest amongst the youth of the nation, and he has written editorials to justify youth having a voice in the universities of the land. There are two sides to that question; some say that no board of governors of a university should talk to the people who are protesting.

Extremism in any form is bad. It is as bad to have cabinet domination of the council as it was to have the volunteers in control. Because this is such a fundamental change in the character of the CYC, I say that the Company is dead in fact, if not in law. There is no role for the volunteer in the deliberations of the council, unless the minister puts a volunteer there; there is nothing in the act about this.

The youth who were supposed to be participating are voiceless in the new council. But they were not before this provision was written in the bill. They will not even be represented on the council unless the minister appoints one or two of them. They are powerless, because there is no structure for them. In view of all the talk of participatory democracy, and the realities and philosophy of today, this is a paradox. The minister would have this House believe that the bill is moving against that pressure, trying to hold back the hand of time because there is no place at the top for youth. This seems to be as a result of the misdeeds and misfortunes of a few of the volunteers, which have condemned all youth and prevented them from participating at the top.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I suppose in a philosophical way the minister intends the youth to participate in the streets but not at the council table, to hopefully contribute to the community but not in the committee room—to be seen but not heard. This will be as bad as the situation which existed because of total freedom. It is even worse, in my humble opinion. This minister and the government preach the just society but their actions make a mockery of the phrase. This is an area in which participatory democracy would have been easy to legislate, even in an advisory way, so that youth could have contributed toward some of the deliberations and perhaps even had a vote on decisions reached by the provisional council.

I have said before, and I repeat, that we should not rush this legislation. It is being somewhat rushed. The committee report was dated December 5 and today is January 28. In this time we are supposed to have found solutions to all the problems the committee had when it investigated the Company of Young Canadians. We should have had a respite from the CYC. We should have reviewed the experience of the CYC with experts so that we could build a constructive and credible agency in which youth could participate socially at the community level.

I am coming to the end of the thoughts that we on this side have expressed about this whole story. Obviously it will be a continuing story. I predict that before this 28th Parliament ends we will again be debating the CYC. The CYC will be back on the parliamentary platter because we have not taken the time to really study it and to do what has been suggested. There should be an independent study. We should use our experience and take steps which are more credible.

These are not only the views of the Conservative party. I wish to quote one eminent Canadian who is also disturbed at some of the things contained in the committee report and the way this matter seems to be heading. There is an article about Duncan Edmunds in the Ottawa *Citizen* of December 6, 1969. For the record, Mr. Edmunds was a very active and enthusiastic supporter of the CYC in its early stages, a former executive assistant to Senator Martin. Since we are today celebrating Manitoba's centennial, I should mention that he was a candidate for the leadership of the Liberal party in Manitoba.

Mr. Dinsdale: There is no Liberal party in Manitoba now.

Mr. Nowlan: There was at that time. I quote from this press clipping:

—"the proper thing to do is what the Tories suggest: Stop it (the CYC), use the lessons learned and find other ways and means" of harnessing youthful energies for social action.

The article further states:

Although Mr. Edmunds said his objection to the CYC had "never been its radicalism but its total and utter incompetence," in his correspondence with Prime Minister Pearson—

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Nowlan: I will be only another minute or two, Mr. Speaker. I thank the House for its indulgence. I have spoken longer than I intended, but I suppose this is not unusual.

This article continues:

—on its "root problems" in 1967, he wrote that it was because CYC "has become the captive of a small ideological group of young people, strongly committed to radical social change through the use of volunteers and very sophisticated modern community development techniques."

He thought there should be a new image, a new creature, a more broadly-based Crown agency encompassing a wider area of interest. I read that article into the record to show that the CYC has cut across party lines. It cut across party lines in its inception, because we all voted for it.

I do not wish to trespass any further on the good grace of the House. I hope I have not taken too long, Mr. Speaker. Our party intended to have one speaker. Because of the interesting philosophical comments of the minister, there may be others who want to enter the debate and perhaps challenge some of his philosophical dogma.

As far as my party is concerned, we want to see this bill move into committee. We may very well move amendments in committee even though we do not think the Company should be kept alive. We think it has lost its credibility. In an attempt to keep faith with youth and to provide some influence, assuming the bill passes this House, we may try to correct some of the faults of the bill. But we do not want the Company to have complete independence again. We believe that youth still has a part to play in social action at the community level. We are completely against the thought that youth is to be merely an echo chamber of the cabinet and council.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the previous speaker, I enjoyed the minister's philosophical comments. I find that frequently I can agree with the words of the minister and the government. What does distress me is not what they say, but what they do.

In speaking for our party I say that for a government that over the years, and even today, has boasted constantly about being concerned with social injustice, and one which presumably prides itself on encourage-

ing the rights of people to dissent, I believe this bill marks an explicit betrayal of our youth, the poor, the voiceless, and of the original ideas that led to the establishment of the Company of Young Canadians under former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson.

I think it would be difficult to find a more stark example of legislative overkill. Clearly, the government is saying not only to the CYC but to all Canadians that the menace of a few irresponsible militants is greater and far more dangerous than the menace of continued social injustice directed at the deprived people in our slums, public housing projects and Indian reservations.

I agree with the previous speaker that the CYC has been bungled by the government, but this is no reason to believe the whole idea was wrong. The government's reaction to the heat directed at it by powerful groups and individuals has been to throw the baby out with the bath water and to turn the Company overnight from a relatively independent agency attracting purposeful young people dedicated to social change, to a typical Crown corporation under the direct thumb of the minister.

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

Mr. Rose: I would appreciate answering any questions at the conclusion of my remarks. I believe the Company now runs the real risk of developing into a benign, youthful service organization that goes about doing "good works" such as handing out cups of coffee at drop-in centres.

• (4:20 p.m.)

In my opinion, this bill cuts the guts right out of the CYC. We in this party doubt that young men and women willing to fight hard and unselfishly, to challenge the existing power structure, will be prepared to serve any longer. These are the young men and women who are needed to accomplish the purposes of this legislation as originally enacted. I use the words "fight" and "power" intentionally. To me it is axiomatic that some of the dispossessed and alienated find themselves in their present unhappy circumstances because they are powerless to change those circumstances. It follows that if one group—tenants, for example—are to achieve more power, another group—landlords, for instance—will possess less power. Tenants will have to fight for this additional power because the laws of our country are stacked in favour of landlords.

I was interested to read recently that although most of us decry the need for militancy on the campuses, the fact is that militancy works—that change in university structure and organization has been brought about far more successfully by militant rather than by moderate methods. This is a fact. I am not commenting on these activities one way or another. The point is, these methods work. The lesson has not gone unnoticed.

In tenants groups and other circumstances the CYC has played a useful role in advising people of their rights, helping them to define their problems and assisting them to organize and work toward solutions. But the accomplishment of something meaningful in bringing about social change is precisely what lands the CYC into hot water and ultimately into the newspapers. This is what gets the organization into trouble.

It is my belief that an administration directed from the top, the type of set-up called for in this legislation, is likely to be oversensitive, even gun-shy, with regard to publicity of the kind likely to be directed toward the CYC, its staff and its volunteers if one of their projects threatens the status quo. I believe an administration such as is contemplated by this bill will often be tempted to cancel projects before they can accomplish the socially desirable changes which they are intended to bring about, and do so merely because some powerful person or group has seen fit to criticize those activities vocally and fiercely. It is for this reason that I and my hon. friends intend to vote against Bill C-176. We believe the freedom to act of the CYC will be removed or circumscribed by some proposed amendments, and that the organization will survive in name only as a useless relic or as a reminder of vanquished hopes.

It might be useful to review what this bill seeks to accomplish and to sum up what we find objectionable in it. In calling for the Company to become an agency like any number of Crown corporations, the government is destroying one of the unique conditions under which the Company was created. By seeking to make the CYC a Crown agency, the government is virtually destroying its independence of government policy, its freedom to question the establishment that sits opposite us, the municipal establishment, the establishment in the labour unions or even in the universities.

The government has gone far beyond the recommendations of the Committee on Broadcasting. It has retreated completely from the

idea that there should be any kind of volunteer representation on the executive council. The committee report did not advise that there should be no volunteer representation on the council; on the contrary, it implied that there should be. But today, as we know, the government intends to appoint all the board members, plus the chairman and the vice-chairman. Apparently democracy cannot even be entrusted to the board to the extent of allowing government appointees to elect their own chairman and vice-chairman. So much for democracy within the council itself!

I am aware that the meetings of the permanently elected council, a body which was in existence for three or four months, were anything but tranquil. But I am also aware that the Company was managed—perhaps mismanaged would be the better word—in the first three years of its existence by a similarly appointed board, and that it was in constant hot water during that time. So if there is any thought that merely by providing for an appointed board, without volunteer representation, we can solve the problems of the CYC, all I can say is that we tried it once and we did not like it.

The previous speaker made much of the fact that some highly-placed men in the government were occupying places on the board in this early period. Therefore, nobody can allow the government to escape its responsibility for the chaotic conditions which resulted from the policies of that board, or its shortcomings whether of commission or omission. It may be, of course, that the new board will be composed of sensitive, creative and even courageous men and women—people with sufficient sense of security to enable them to back to the hilt useful projects to their completion even in the face of local hostility. It may be our fears will prove to have been unjustified. That is certainly to be hoped, because there are enough social evils around to occupy not 200 but 2,000 volunteers for years.

We cannot but support attempts to strengthen the administrative framework of the organization. We are not questioning proposals to amend the act where such action will lead to an increased sense of responsibility on the part of the staff and volunteers. Nor do we object to proposals to tighten financial accountability. For example, we do not think it is a bad thing to provide that the Auditor General should audit the books. We recognize, too, that there have been some extremely wasteful projects in the past, along with some very poorly thought-out decisions by the volunteers and the council. It is regrettable that some of the volunteers were not content with being independent of the government but also wanted to be independent of their own council. This attitude cannot be accepted. It has caused numerous misunderstandings; it has led to wasteful extravagance and consequent bad publicity against which the Company will have to labour mightily to live down.

• (4:30 p.m.)

But we also know that despite all the uproar, there have been some very good projects throughout the years—and we want these to continue and expand. Where you have volunteers who are accepted by the community and enjoy the confidence of the community in which they work, we do not want them yanked out at the whim of some bureaucrat just because a power group has been made uncomfortable as a result of the volunteer work. Such was the case, according to a recent report in the Toronto *Star*, with respect to the Cape Breton project.

I assure hon. members that when the committee meets to consider this bill I shall make it my business to find out what decisions about projects and people have been made since the trusteeship was imposed in December under the comptroller and the executive director. We shall also be interested to know the whys and wherefores behind these decisions, because such decisions and the rationale behind them may provide an indication, a sneak-preview if you like, of the tone and thrust we may expect in future under the legislation we are contemplating today.

In addition, I intend to fight for the appearance of volunteers before our committee, because by overlooking this matter earlier we were guilty of a glaring oversight in our deliberations. I will also ask our committee to visit some of the projects, which we did not do although the government's terms of reference permitted it. We did not do so, largely because of the time limit imposed on us. I believe that as a result of neglecting to hear volunteers and visit projects, the committee shaped a report far more extreme than desirable. The resulting legislation has been equally far more extreme than would have been the case had we heard from the volunteers and visited the projects. We as parliamentarians and decision-makers, ought to have been more familiar with the project, and personnel, both good and bad, then in existence before making our pronouncement last December.

I visited the CYC project in Vancouver recently and am proud to say I was impressed

by the eager young people who staffed it. They were obviously interested in their work and believed in its value. They believe in what they are doing and are worried in case their work has no future. Some of the things they are doing may interest hon. members. One volunteer is working as a sort of welfare ombudsman; another is developing a day care centre; another is helping union members with their research into conditions causing labour unrest and is assisting them to make effective decisions in their union affairs. Other volunteers are helping ratepayer groups in a particular school area to provide a park for neighborhood children; others are working on anti-pollution projects, on summer student employment programs, and in the slums of Vancouver they are attempting to arouse the interest of the community in fighting, among other things, a freeway that might intrude into the community.

Apart from the things I have already mentioned, there is one other area of concern that I should mention. In the original legislation I believe that members of the Company of Young Canadians were to be asked to serve abroad. This provision has been struck from the new bill. It seems to me that in light of the recent report of former Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, entitled "Partners in Development", members of the Company of Young Canadians could well perform work in developing countries, especially those who use either of our two official languages. Canada could do much to develop the well-being of people in nations less fortunate than ours. Not only is there a field in the developing countries in which our young people could make a contribution; I also think that our own country would benefit from the experience gained by our young people in serving overseas.

An hon. Member: Some Company members went to Cuba.

Mr. Rose: I shall ignore that interjection because it betrays the kind of bias that has led to the extreme nature of various clauses of the bill. No one in this or any other party countenances within the CYC any seditious or subversive activity. But when CYC workers begin to move out of the realm of service work and into the kind of work that might be controversial, I do not think they can avoid coming into conflict with political prejudices and political establishments.

An hon. Member: Especially the Liberal dinosaurs.

[Mr. Rose.]

Mr. Rose: In his opening remarks today the minister said that he believes in the integrity of human beings. Nevertheless, it seems that the various clauses of the bill do not reflect the minister's confidence. I believe we are trying to create a non-political, quiet little organization which will be involved in local social service and which will not involve itself greatly in vital community development and social activity. Perhaps we are just trying to acquire social workers on the cheap.

If we are to abrogate our volunteers freedom of movement, take away their initiative and dampen their creativity, there will be little reason for their remaining volunteers. I suggest that instead of working for $200 a month, they might prefer to quit, or alternatively organize their own union and demand salaries that are paid to professional social workers.

A good deal has been said about extravagance and mismanagement, and we have heard repeatedly that CYC projects have been ill-thought out and costly. Probably we shall never be able to measure the good and the hope that has been generated by successful CYC projects. Putting the matter in its proper perspective, this organization has cost our country approximately 10 cents per capita per year.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I agree with the previous speaker who commented that the regressive move by the government as outlined in this legislation is flying in the face of the concept of shared decision-making that is currently developing, not only in the labour movement but in universities. I think it would be unfortunate if the CYC organization were structured, not to reflect the enlightened words of the minister in his preamble but degenerate instead into a kind of lame duck replica of what was probably envisioned as the most altruistic and progressive piece of legislation that ever came out of this Parliament.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, following the statements which we have just heard in this house, we can say that some good intentions have been expressed.

But from that to believe, however, that the statements of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) will soothe everyone and answer all the charges made against the Company of Young Canadians, which could again disappear with the adoption and the reference to committee of Bill C-176, I would say that

there is quite a difference. The charges made against the CYC proved justified. On this subject, I will quote a statement by Mr. Lucien Saulnier who asked for a royal inquiry which should have been granted in order to determine exactly all that was done within the Company. When he made that request, Mr. Saulnier stated, and I quote:

We now know that in Canada, individuals and groups are working actively to implement a plan which will carry the destruction of freedom, of our form of democratic Government and, in this plan, the people's will, as expressed in the ballot box, is excluded. These individuals and groups are inspired and financed, in many cases, by foreign political powers related to an "International" that does not share our notion of man's fundamental liberties.

Besides, he added further on:

Moreover, the Company of Young Canadians has, in its ranks, in Montreal, more than one member previously convicted, in Montreal, for terrorist activities.

We also find on the premises officially occupied by the Company of Young Canadians and paid for by the Canadian taxpayers, newspapers and pamphlets showing how to fabricate molotov cocktails, paint bombs, flasks and vials devised to disrupt police work in the maintenance of public order.

If as serious a man as Mr. Saulnier can say such things, they must be true. He said that there should have been a royal inquiry instead of merely entrusting the investigation to a committee of the House of Commons, with a Liberal majority. And so, those who could have come as witnesses were unable to do so because the suggestion made by some of the members of the committee are always turned down when put to the vote. Those who could have spoken the truth were therefore unable to appear as witnesses, and Canadians did not find out how those millions had been spent.

Besides, I have here the statement of Patrice Walsh of the Canadian Intelligence Service who offered to appear as a witness, according to a letter dated November 15, 1969 addressed to the member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), and vice-chairman of the Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts. I shall quote only the most important parts of that letter:

We pointed out in our November and December 1967 issue that we feel Mr. Allen Clark's observation is quite right, page 4, adding however: "Mr. Clarke speaks the truth. The whole present concept of the Company of Young Canadians is founded on the power, *without responsibility*, to spend millions of dollars taken out of federal taxes, without being answerable either to parliament or the taxpayer." Our organization is now 20 years old. As taxpayers, we have the right to demand the *immediate dissolution* of the Company of Young Canadians. We are also ready to give testimony before your committee in Ottawa, with a view to giving more details on the subversive activities of the members of terrorist movements in Quebec, who in fact control the Company of Young Canadians in Quebec. Trusting that I shall have an early reply to this offer, I remain, yours sincerely,

Patrice Walsh.

Everyone knows that Pat Walsh never appeared before the committee because he was denied the right to inform the Canadian people about the confusion the Company of Young Canadians had created in some areas of the country.

Mr. Speaker, while many want to question ideas of the past which, however, have produced men of value who today govern our country, young people read the works of Karl Marx, Communist writings which can be found almost everywhere, and they are the ones we want to shield from that harmful influence.

The Canadian Intelligence Service has issued a study called: "The evolving of the ideologic purpose". I would like to quote, in this respect, a statement made by Mr. Ron Gostick, pointing at the danger of confusing words, of enrolling young people who, through sheer ignorance, might want to involve themselves in disastrous mistakes.

I shall also explain how eager the young people can be to revolutionize everything. We shall then realize the danger of misinterpreting the words and the deeds of a body such as that of the Company of Young Canadians who do not have to answer to anybody, except to a committee with a liberal majority where everything has been ruled beforehand.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Here is Mr. Ron Gostick's statement, and I quote:

It has been established, for instance, that Sam Carr and Fred Rose, M.P., both trained in the principles of Moscow, not only pointed out Canadians to be recruited for the espionage network, but were also active with others in promoting courses or workshops where the motives of espionage were gradually developed, thus expanding the structures in view of a more intensive recruiting and, in some cases, recruited themselves some members for the espionage network proper.

The inquiry divulged the names of a number of Canadians, employed in various government agencies or departments who, while they were completely unaware of the existence of a spy network, and were not involved in any way in such illicit actions, were submitted to the same methods of "training" in order to be of use at some later date.

Mr. Speaker, if it is possible to mislead adults, governments officials, as this leaflet

indicates I say this is even more true of young inexperienced, people who become the prey of communism.

This is why we, the guardians of Canadian democracy, must warn the young people against the danger threatening them.

And I shall go on with the quotation:

For these reasons, we study closely the matter of the motive and the methods carefully chosen to instill the proper moral and mental conception into the minds of future Canadian adherents before telling them what they are going to do.

In almost every instance, as has already been said, the agents come from "cells" or study groups made up with secret members or supporters of the Communist party (the progressive labor party).

Those statements have been backed up with evidence, which then sent a few people to jail. It is thereforee quite a hazard to put millions of dollars at the disposal of young enthusiastic Canadians without giving them sound guidelines.

A young member of the Company of Young Canadians, whose name is Pierre Cléroux, made a significant statement in his youthful enthusiasm and his desire to do something, to build a country. That is where the danger lies. In fact, Canadian ideology does not let anyone see this freedom and this security. So, there is danger that the young will be tempted by a socialistic ideology, leading to communism. That is why there is some similarity between the statement made by this youth in his enthusiasm and the words that I quoted a little while ago. The article reads as follows:

In the organization, Pierre considers himself as an animator as well as a helper and a secretary. "It all depends on the situation and the guys I have to face, he said. I fully co-operate in the preparatory work, but I never accept a leading position. Above all, I consider myself as a subordinate. In figures, I may be doing 60 per cent administration and 40 per cent animation.

No matter how praiseworthy are his intentions, if this youth is told lies, he may believe them. In Canada, we have groups of boy-scouts, snow schools and youth camps. With all those elements, it could certainly be possible to create better oriented movements.

I know that the minister will continue to think and say that everything must continue as before, because with a majority in parliament he can organize whatever he pleases.

I have here a letter dated January 5 and addressed to the regional coordinator of the United Steelworkers of America in which the Secretary of State gave the following reply:

—a bill to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act was tabled in the House and will be discussed very soon. It is certain that the CYC will be maintained and the failings uncovered at the inquiry will be rectified.

We see from this statement that the maintaining of the Company of Young Canadians was automatically assured, and today's discussions will bring no change as the majority government does as it pleases in parliament.

I should also like to point out that in Canada, a country that has produced men of real ability, it would be, in my opinion, most logical to revert instead to our former institutions. That is why we, of the Ralliement créditiste, ask that the Company of Young Canadians be dissolved. We demand the dissolution of this Company which has already spent too much of the taxpayers' money, when there are already, in Canada organizations, such as the Canadian Boy Scouts Association, which has rendered great services and which all Canadians are proud of. In fact, this Association has tought to young Canadians a truly extraordinary discipline.

It seems to me that the Boy Scouts of Canada could advantageously replace the Company of Young Canadians, and the money that was allocated to this group should be granted to the Boy Scouts, so that they may continue to serve Canada well.

I could also mention other groups such as Girl Guides, youth camps organized by some parishes, and folk-lore groups, which should rally the youth, help them to enjoy themselves. Young people, who probably are bored in Canada, need guidance. With certain grants, those groups would do a hundred times more than the Company of Young Canadians. Had we helped them, Mr. Lucien Saulnier would never have had to demand an inquiry on the Company of Young Canadians.

There is also in Canada a number of majorette groups composed of young girls who would like to get some training but who cannot for lack of funds.

By the way, in my riding, the young cadets of Thetford Mines have asked for subsidies so as to represent Canada in Osaka, Japan. The answer was negative and this group of 50 young Canadians, who could have gone there to make Canada better known, will have to stay in Thetford Mines. The president of this group has had to go and beg for $10,000 from Quebec to get a grant to pay for the transportation and the training of these young people who will do us proud at Osaka.

Since Canada did not assume its responsibilities, since it prefers to waste millions of dollars in grants to the Company of Young

Canadians, this means that the federal government has surrendered. The parents will have to pay the bill. We have learned in committee that automobiles had even been purchased by the CYC. Nobody knows what happened to them. While money is being wasted, the young who want to contribute to the building of this country, according to sound ideas, are unable to do so for lack of money.

Mr. Speaker, again I say that we, of the Ralliement créditiste, ask for the dissolution of the Company of Young Canadians.

The groups I have mentioned urge the young people to perform one good deed each day and I believe that those should be subsidized rather than the Company in question, who is responsible neither to Parliament nor to anybody.

The Secretary of State said that the Company will remain in existence despite all the charges made against it; however, we shall vote against the bill because we demand the dissolution of that organization. Moreover, we are convinced that the scouts, girl guides, cadets and other young people in this country would make better use of public funds while serving the community.

[*English*]

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?

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: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Pelletier) which was agreed to on the following division:

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Anderson
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Blouin
Borrie
Buchanan
Cafik
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Deachman
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Duquet
Émard
Forest
Forget
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Groos
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harries
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Jerome
Kierans
Lachance
Laflamme
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Murphy
Noël
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Pepin
Portelance
Pringle
Reid
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Robinson
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Wahn
Walker
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—96.

NAYS

Messrs:

Alexander
Baldwin
Barnett
Beaudoin
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Carter
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Danforth
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Downey
Dumont
Fairweather
Flemming
Gauthier
Gleave
Godin
Hales

Division

Harding	Moore
Horner	Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Howard (Skeena)	Nesbitt
Howe	Noble
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Nowlan
Korchinski	Nystrom
Lambert (Bellechasse)	Peters
Lambert (Edmonton West)	Ricard
Laprise	Ritchie
La Salle	Rodrigue
Lewis	Rondeau
Lundrigan	Rose
MacEwan	Rynard
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)	Scott
MacInnis (Mrs.)	Simpson
MacLean	Skoberg
MacRae	Skoreyko
McCleave	Southam
McGrath	Stanfield
McIntosh	Stewart (Marquette)
McKinley	Tétrault
McQuaid	Thomas (Moncton)
Marshall	Thompson (Red Deer)
Matte	Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Mazankowski	Valade
Monteith	Winch
	Yewchuk—81.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts.

RAILWAY ACT

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF CANADIAN TRANSPORT COMMISSION RESPECTING TELEGRAPH AND TELEPHONE TOLLS

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications) moved that Bill C-11, to amend the Railway Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Kierans moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): May we call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the House to call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At 5.40 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

APPENDIX "A"

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SECOND SESSION 28TH PARLIAMENT

It is proposed to conclude the current part of the session, which commenced on Monday, January 12, 1970, on Wednesday, March 25, the Wednesday before Good Friday. Counting Wednesday, January 28, there remain 41 sitting days in this period, of which six are to be devoted to opposition allotted days. While the exact date for the budget speech has not been finally determined, it is anticipated that the six-day budget debate will also occur during this period. There remain, therefore, 29 days for dealing with government bills between now and Easter.

It is proposed that the House should reconvene after Easter on Monday, April 6 and adjourn for the summer on Friday, June 26. There are 57 sitting days during that period, of which 13 are devoted to opposition allotted days, leaving 44 days in that final semester for government business.

It is anticipated that the Main Estimates for 1970-71 will be available for tabling in the House during the second week in February and they will be referred to the Standing Committees immediately thereafter. The Final Supplementary Estimates for 1969-70 will be tabled on March 5 and referred to committee immediately. It is proposed that the last opposition day in this part of the session, and the final day for supply purposes, be Tuesday, March 24.

At the moment, there are 15 government bills on the Order Paper awaiting second reading and 4 at the Report Stage. They are as follows:

At Report Stage: Small Businesses Loans Act Amendments; Canada Student Loans Act Amendments; Railway Act Amendment; Expropriation Bill.

At Second Reading: Motor Vehicle Safety Bill; Quebec Savings Bank Act; Dominion Coal Board Dissolution; Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act Amendments; Cape Breton Development Corporation Act Amendments; National Parks Act Amendments; Company of Young Canadians Act Amendments; Nuclear Liability Bill; Quarantine Bill; Canada-Sweden Income Tax Agreement Act Amendments; Standards Council of Canada Bill; Criminal Records Bill; Investment Companies Bill; Canada Shipping Act (Part V) Amendments; Yukon Placer Mining Act Amendments;

In addition the following Government Bills are under consideration in committee: Trust Companies Act Amendments; Loan Companies Act Amendments; Foreign Insurance Companies Act Amendments; Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act Amendments; Canada Water Bill; Deep Sea Fisheries Act Repeal; Coastal Fisheries Protection Act Amendments; Salt Fish Bill; Criminal Code Amendments (Hate Literature); International Development Research Centre of Canada Bill; Canada Corporation Act Amendments.

The following government bill is presently before the Senate: Radiation Emitting Devices Bill.

It is anticipated that the following government bills will be given first reading before the Easter recess: Supplemental Pensions Benefits Bill; National Energy Board Act Amendments; Supreme Court Act Amendments; Northern Inland Waters Bill; Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act 1964 Amendments; Shipping Conferences Bill; Industrial Research and Development Incentives Act Amendments; Parole Act Amendments; Canada Grain Act Revision; Bills of Exchange Act Amendments; Consumer Textile Articles Bill; Farm Products Marketing Boards Bill; Law Reform Commission Bill; Canada Cooperative Associations Bill; Basic S. I. Units Bill; Weights and Measures Act Revision; Agricultural Products Cooperative Marketing Act Amendments; Tax Review Board Bill; Federal Superior Courts Bill; Arctic Seas Pollution Prevention Bill.

In addition, the following government motion will require consideration before the Easter recess: Joint Parliamentary Committee on Price Stability.

It is also anticipated that the following government bills will be given first reading between Easter and the summer adjournment: Uniform Packaging and Labelling Bill; Statistics Act Amendments; Excise Act Amendments; Yukon Act and Northwest Territories Act Amendments; Canada Labour (Standards) Code Amendments; Canada Elections Act Amendments; Representation Com-

missioner Act Amendment; Canada Shipping Act Amendments; Immigration Appeal Board Act Amendments; Security Review Board Bill; Combines Investigation Act Revision; Criminal Code Amendments; Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act Revision; Public Servants Retirement Bill; Agricultural Adjustment Bill; Pilotage Bill; Canada-Finland Income Tax Agreement Bill; Canada-Jamaica Income Tax Agreement Bill; Cigarette Advertising Bill; Financial Administration Act Amendments; Air Canada Act Amendments; Yukon Minerals Bill; Canada Development Corporation Bill.

To this list would have to be added any bills resulting from the budget.

In view of the fact that the Standing Committees will be embarking upon detailed examination of the Main Estimates in the week commencing the 16th of February, it would be desirable if the committee discussion of bills now before the committees could be substantially concluded by that week, and that committee discussion be well advanced on those now awaiting second reading. Such a timetable would then leave the committees free to concentrate on estimates and on the additional bills that will be introduced in the latter part of the session.

The estimate of time available for government business is, of course, subject to any interruption by unforeseen circumstances, by adjournment motions under S.O. 26, and by other decisions of the House. In turn, the legislative program will also be subject to changes imposed by circumstances not at the moment foreseen.

In summary, then, from January 28th until the summer adjournment, there are now, or there will be, 74 items of government business before the House while there will only be 73 days remaining for government business in that period. Clearly, the House will want to devote more time to some of these bills at the expense of others and it is apparent that careful planning of the time of the House will be necessary, so that all parts of the program may be dealt with.

The reference to 73 days is, of course, a reference to the time in the chamber itself and does not include the additional time available for consideration of bills at the committee stage. The committee stage offers an opportunity for more extensive detailed discussion of bills over a number of days, and in some cases, weeks.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, January 29, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MANPOWER

STATEMENT ON SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR STUDENTS

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I promised some months ago that I would make a statement on the experience with summer employment for students. Recently another question about this matter was asked in the House, and with this in mind I should like to report briefly on results last summer and to indicate some of the initiatives currently being followed by my department to assist students in finding jobs next summer.

Based on a survey carried out by my department last fall, some 323,000 students were able to find paying jobs last summer. I may say that the survey covered 39 post-secondary institutions—universities, colleges and technological institutes—across the country.

Of the roughly 400,000 students from post-secondary institutions, some 348,000 were in the summer employment market and of these 93 per cent found summer work. An estimated 323,000 of the 348,000 students who sought paid summer employment found jobs. Of these, 14 per cent worked for more than four months, 60 per cent for two to four months, 18 per cent for one to two months, and 8 per cent for less than a month.

This is generally a good result and encourages us to maintain and expand the program launched to assist student employment in the past summer. Of those who were not looking for jobs, nearly half continued their studies; another 25 per cent travelled, took time off or did unpaid volunteer work.

Half of those who found employment expressed satisfaction with the duration of their jobs. One-third would have liked two months more work and 11 per cent stated they would have worked more than two months.

Of the students working, 72 per cent were employed in industry and 14 per cent with provincial governments across Canada, while 7 per cent were granted employment with the federal government and a further 7 per cent with municipalities.

• (2:10 p.m.)

The federal government hired some 11,365 students, an increase of 26.8 per cent over the previous year. Students working for the federal governments earned $11,129,417 in salaries and wages. Seventy-five per cent of those hired were returning to post-secondary institutions. Students of post-secondary institutions in federal employment earned an average of $1,083, while high school students earned an average of $654.

Finally, plans are under way in my department, in co-operation with private and public organizations and provincial government departments, to complete plans and programs for the coming summer months. A national committee for student summer employment is functioning and includes representatives of the Association of Canadian Universities and Colleges, the University Career Planning Association, the Economic Council of Canada and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce. Working through manpower centres both across the country and at the universities, as well as with federal and provincial departments of government, it is hoped that employment can be provided for the majority of students in order to obtain funds to finance their continued education.

In closing I would pay tribute to the energetic campaign being carried on by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce through its members, who have been working closely with my department to make the "Hire a Student" campaign a success next summer.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I received a copy of the minister's statement just as I took my seat. I should like to make a few comments on what the minister has said and about this problem.

There can be no question that a number of students had difficulty obtaining employment last summer, and presumably difficulty will be encountered again this summer. I suggest

this will result from the general employment conditions in the country and the policies of the government regarding employment, austerity programs and so on. These policies have increased unemployment substantially and have had an effect on students as well as others seeking work. On the basis of the present outlook we can expect quite a difficult summer in terms of students obtaining employment.

While the minister has said he has an advisory board and a program that is getting under way, I do not think anyone can stress too strongly the necessity for the minister and those with whom he is associated to understand fully the gravity of the situation and the implications for students who are not able to obtain work. Unfortunately we face a situation in which not only is employment becoming more difficult to obtain but also the number of students who need the extra money is increasing. Not only does the minister have to launch a considerably more vigorous program than we have seen to date but the government of Canada in association with the provinces must take a very careful look to determine the over-all position of these students and the extent to which students are being forced to drop out or defer their education for financial reasons.

I am disappointed that rather than working with the provinces with a view to meeting this problem the government has indicated in the white paper on tax reform that it is going to subject bursaries to income tax. This can only serve to increase the difficulties. We all recognize that if a student cannot continue his studies at a particular time in life he or she may well suffer irreparable injury with the result, of course, that the nation also suffers.

While I welcome the minister's statement and his assurance that he is working on this very serious problem, quite frankly I see no indication that the government is prepared to grapple with student assistance by placing it in context with the over-all unemployment problem. I urge the minister and the Prime Minister to really take this matter seriously, particularly in view of the fact that their policies are designed to create unemployment and incidentally create additional difficulty for our students.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I too received the minister's statement a few minutes ago just as I entered the House. We in this party welcome the minister's statement of his intentions which I am sure are good. However, I believe we are in complete agreement that the statement does not go far enough. It barely scratches the surface.

The minister pointed out that 93 per cent of students seeking work found employment last summer, but he went on to say that about half of them were not satisfied with the employment they obtained. We must remember that many students who obtained employment last summer were remunerated at a rate which did not enable them to return to university. Several students from my province of Saskatchewan have written or spoken to me or to some of my colleagues pointing out that they just could not find employment last summer in the province of Saskatchewan which is suffering from some economic hardship. Something must be done immediately because this situation has handicapped many students and made it difficult for them to attend university. This is particularly so in the case of women who find that their salaries are lower and who do not wish to borrow huge sums of money in order to attend university.

We must remember that educated people are our main resource. Therefore I believe top priority should be given to this whole problem. The answer is not simply the finding of jobs. University education should be made available to everyone. If there is universal accessibility to education we will also have to provide more jobs for our working people.

I welcome the minister's statement but it by no means goes far enough toward solving the problem.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased with the results of the survey revealing that the great majority of students found employment last summer. We should certainly like to see every student succeed in getting a job next summer.

However, Mr. Speaker, perhaps it would be proper to point out that even if 82,700 students from Quebec, out of a total of 95,300, found employment, it remains that 12,600 did not. This is rather impressive. Would this mean that almost 13,000 Quebec students were unable to return to the university or to a technical school, because they had not the necessary financial means? If so, it is extremely unfortunate.

It would not only be necessary to find summer employment for the students, but we should also guarantee them a pre-salary, in order that their intellectual development should not be dependent on summer employment.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

PENSIONS

RESPONSIBILITY FOR PAYMENT OF ASSISTANCE TO THE AGED

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare a question arising out of the answer he gave me yesterday indicating that the government of Canada would be prepared to share in the cost of supplemental old age assistance provided the province concerned put up 50 per cent of the cost. Are we to assume from this statement that it is now the position of the government of Canada that it will not accept the full responsibility for payment of assistance to the aged in spite of the fact that it has accepted full responsibility for quite a number of years?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): The situation has always been that if any province felt that the federal payments for old age security or for the guaranteed income supplement were inadequate, for various reasons within the province such as the cost of living and so on, the formula under the Canada Assistance Plan would provide that type of flexibility based on the criteria that additional funds would be given to the people who are receiving old age security, the guaranteed income supplement or other assistance payments from the province itself. That situation has existed now for at least four or five years ever since the inception of the Canada Assistance Plan.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I assume the minister would agree that the present payments are inadequate. Is the government prepared to pay more old age assistance to old people in one part of the country as opposed to those in another part of the country provided only that the provincial governments are sufficiently well to do to be able to find the 50 per cent of the cost which the minister specifies?

Mr. Munro: The situation in Canada has always been that in certain areas of the country benefit levels have been higher due to the cost of living. Where that situation exists and the province pays out more money we still provide our 50 per cent share in which case we are spending more money in that province or in that region.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. We are getting a new look at the just society. Is it the position of the government that payments for old age assistance are inflationary if the government of Canada bears 100 per cent of the cost but are not inflationary if the province pays 50 per cent of the cost?

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether the statements he made yesterday and today are a preview of the government's white paper on social security, or is the door still open for increasing the rate of the universal portion of the old age security payment?

Mr. Munro: I would advise the hon. member that the door is still open and that what I have said yesterday and today is nothing new at all. This has been the situation for the last four or five years, as I said, and I am only surprised that the Leader of the Opposition is so totally unaware of the program in which he himself and his province participated.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If the door is still open, is the government giving serious consideration to the universal principle rather than going back to an income test or a split federal and provincial responsibility?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, the universal principle, income testing and the guaranteed annual income concept all have to be considered in any over-all review of social welfare policies, and they are being considered.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is whether the agreements between the government of Canada and the provinces under the Canada Assistance Plan provide that the provinces may avail themselves of the privilege of low-

ering their payments under the Canada Assistance Plan whenever there is an increment in old age security as provided for by the act because, as a matter of fact, this does apply in the province of Alberta?

Mr. Munro: Under the Canada Assistance Plan the province determines when a person is in need. If the federal government should give an increment under some of its policies to people who were receiving payments from the province, the province could, in those circumstances, reduce the payments they had been making up to that time. We usually discourage it, but there is nothing to prevent the province from doing so.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister might then advise the House what is the benefit of the cost of living increase provided under the old age security program if a payment is provided on the one hand under the Old Age Security Act and then withdrawn by the province under the Canada Assistance Plan?

Mr. Munro: I would hope the provinces would not do that.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): But they do.

NATIONAL FILM BOARD

ABSORPTION BY INFORMATION CANADA—FUTURE ROLE

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. In view of the continuing concern about the future of the National Film Board, can the minister assure the House that the National Film Board will not be absorbed in Information Canada? Also, will he undertake to make a statement as soon as possible to clarify the future role of the National Film Board?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, it has never been considered, and it is not now, to merge the National Film Board into the agency to be established under the name of Information Canada. I am surprised that a member of the House who heard my recent statement should ask such a question, as not one sentence of that statement can be so interpreted.

[*English*]

Mr. Burton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the incomplete nature of the study that was made of the Film Board and in view of the uncovered areas in the minister's statement last week, has the minister given further consideration to the views of the National Film Board employees since that time? Is the minister giving consideration to maintaining the personnel strength of the production section at a greater level than he indicated in the House last week?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, cuts in personnel because of the government's austerity policy were inevitable. I said so in my statement. Once more, I will express my surprise at such a question being asked by a member who heard the statement in which I specifically mentioned that a comprehensive policy applying to films was in course of preparation.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

REFERENCE OF SAUMIER REPORT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I hope the minister will not be surprised at this question. Will he use his good offices to have the Saumier report referred to the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts so the question of the Film Board and some of the conflicting and contrasting views of the Saumier Report and the government film commissioner, Mr. McPherson, can be reviewed in terms of a cultural policy for Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the policy concerning the National Film Board and all relevant budgetary considerations will be reviewed by the committee when it deals with the estimates of the National Film Board.

[*English*]

RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER LEVYING CHARGES FOR USE OF FILMS

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): A supplementary question to the Secretary of State. Is the minister reconsidering the policy imposed on the National Film Board through the austerity program which necessitated the implementation of user charges for films supplied to various public, educational and church institutions throughout Canada?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, this question was examined by Mr. Saumier who stated in his report that he thought this policy was sound and necessary at this time.

[*English*]

Mr. Rose: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister if he will give consideration to making a statement on motions in the near future on a comprehensive cultural policy for Canada?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, this matter is under review and the hon. member will agree, I think, that a cultural policy cannot be drafted in a few weeks or even a few months; in any case, I think that the work undertaken long ago by the department of the Secretary of State should produce results within a few months.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

DAVIE SHIPBUILDING COMPANY—PROVISION FOR EMPLOYEES IN EVENT OF CLOSURE

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): From the defunct Department of Forestry and Rural Development, and from the living Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, I would like to know if an alternative exists for the 4,000 workers at the Lauzon shipyards who may be laid off following the eventual closing of Davie Shipbuilding?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, the Lauzon area is a designated area. We are preparing a program, in co-operation with the province of Quebec, and we are actively considering the case of the 4,000 workers at the Lauzon shipyards.

[*English*]

MINIMUM WAGE—INQUIRY AS TO INCREASE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Is the minister planning in the near future to raise the minimum wage in industries under federal jurisdiction? It is nearly five years now since the minimum wage was raised and the cost of living has gone up 20 per cent in the intervening period.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned on several occasions that we are studying this matter. The only consolation I have is that less than 5,000 people in the federal field are working at the minimum wage level. So apart from the psychological effect it has no real effect, or at least very little on very few people.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister as the Minister of Labour gave me almost exactly the same answer a year and a half ago. Is the policy of forcing people to live farther and farther below the poverty level the fundamental basis of his just society?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Hees: The Prime Minister nods his head, which means yes.

An hon. Member: He is shy today.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

BENEFITS PAID RETIRED COAL MINERS

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the right hon. Prime Minister and concerns the method used by the Cape Breton Development Corporation to compensate retired coal miners. Further to the question posed to the Prime Minister on Tuesday of this week asking for an investigation into the whole matter in view of the continuing protests from the unions concerned and in view of the fact that the Prime Minister took my question as notice, may I ask the right hon. gentleman if he is in a position to shed any further light on this subject?

An hon. Member: Not today.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The answer so far as the Unemployment Insurance Commission is concerned is that the income received by the retired miners as a result of arrangements made between Devco and the unions representing them has been classed by regulation in the same category as income from dividends and therefore these unemployed miners are not penalized in respect of being eligible for unemployment insurance. If that is a violation of the Unemployment Insurance Commission regulations, and unless someone can prove it is, I am at a loss to understand what good it would do the miners to find this source of income suddenly removed.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. In view of the continuing telegrams of protest and other communications we are receiving it would appear that this message is not getting through to those concerned, and we are worried about this sort of thing. Perhaps I should direct the question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion; I see he is here today. Would the minister cause an investigation to be made into this whole subject so that we can reach a decision as to who is right? The message apparently is not getting through to the men receiving the moneys and I think they have a right to an investigation. I may not be a "second-hand Rose" but I think I should have the courtesy of an answer in this House.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I must say that I got in touch with Devco. No complaint was made either to Devco or to my department. The union to which the hon. member is referring is in fact a small group of superannuated employees which is called a Union and which has no connection with the United Mines Workers of America who have made no request in the name of those pensioners.

[*English*]

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that statement is completely erroneous. We have a statement here in a letter of protest from the President of the C.B. of R.T. which represents the men who are at present working in the Devco coal mines. I wish the minister would get on the job so he would know what is happening.

Mr. Hees: That is asking too much.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I have order, please.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to look at his files and see if they do not contain these wires and correspondence that he and the Prime Minister deny receiving. We have checked it out and the telegrams were delivered, but they have denied receiving these protests against the action of the Cape Breton Development Corporation. In view of the fact that the corporation is breaking the law every day, will he see—

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Mr. Speaker: Order. As the hon. member has already asked his question it should not be repeated.

Mr. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the question was put to the government whether they had received protests not from retired miners but from active locals within Cape Breton protesting the action of Devco. This was denied by the government but it has since been checked out and Canadian National Telegraph will confirm that these wires were received.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. With respect, I have to suggest to the hon. member that he may have a point for debate but I would not think that this constitutes a question of privilege. I think we should go on to another subject.

Mr. MacInnis: On the same question of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: It would have to be a different question of privilege. The hon. member may have another point and I will listen to him.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I am like the Minister of Labour; I have got hundreds of examples. Does the government now deny receiving these protests from active local unions?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at times I am asked if I have received a message. When I know I say I have or have not, and when I do not know I say I will check. It is conceivable that members of the public send their telegrams to members of the opposition so that they know about matters before I do but, except in this case, I always check if I have received them.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): January 18.

Mr. MacInnis: Now that the Prime Minister has seen fit to answer my question, can I consider this a promise broken?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): The Prime Minister is a funny boy, not a "Funny Girl".

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—EFFECTIVENESS OF RELIEF OPERATIONS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Has he received reports from the Fathers Doheny, Irish priests, who recently returned from the eastern region of Nigeria where they served for 15 years, to the effect that there is an urgent and very real need for international action to persuade the government of Nigeria to accept an immediate and massive airlift of food? What action, if any, is the government taking on these reports?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of spending a good half hour with these gentlemen and I must say I admire greatly their devotion to the cause of their parishioners. I had from them a report on conditions as they were a couple of weeks ago when they left Nigeria and they urged the desirability of getting relief to these people. I could not agree more.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Secretary of State for External Affairs would make a report on the progress being made with regard to the publication of the most recent report of the observer team?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, there have been no further messages since my report yesterday.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister clarify his statement yesterday and tell us just where responsibility lies with regard to these reports and whether there is not some responsibility on the part of our own observers to make these reports and then to make them public?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, as I have already said, these are independent observers who do not take instructions from the Canadian government. They act on their own and report what they see which is, I am sure, what we want them to do. They have their own rules and I think we have been well served by these observers. From the reports I have seen recently I think we will continue to be well served, and I hope my hon. friend will support me in that.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs if he is acting upon the suggestion that Nigeria be urged to use the two other airports besides Uli, that is, Obill-a-goo and Ogua?

Mr. Sharp: I must repeat what I have said before, that I do not accept the proposition that the government of Nigeria is less interested in the people over whom it has control than we in this Parliament. If we go on taking this patronizing, superior attitude toward them, we cannot expect the kind of co-operation that I think we should have.

DRUGS

MARIJUANA—ALLEGED STATEMENT AS TO LEGALIZATION

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Did the minister state yesterday that the government will legalize marijuana if a reasonable minority of Canadians is found to use the substance? If so, what does the minister mean by a reasonable minority?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that the question cannot be asked in this way.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question I asked a moment ago and direct it to the Prime Minister. Was the Minister of National Health and Welfare stating government policy when he said that the government will legalize marijuana if a reasonable minority of Canadians is found to use the substance? If so, may I ask what is meant by a reasonable minority?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the minister that he stated nothing of the kind.

LABOUR CONDITIONS

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN FOR EQUAL WORK

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of the legislation presently before the Parliament of the United Kingdom which will at long last give women in that country the right to equal pay for equal work, is the minister considering bringing before the Parliament of Canada during the present session similar legislation for the benefit of the women of Canada?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, frankly, although we are reviewing our legislation we are waiting for the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women. We want to have before us the recommendations of that report because they will perhaps have some bearing on the proposed legislation.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister not consider that the time has arrived for a little more action and a little less consideration of matters coming under his jurisdiction? We seem to be getting only consideration of matters and no action on them.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

ACTION RESPECTING MALFUNCTIONING TELEVISION SETS

Mr. William Skoreyko (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has the minister seen reports indicating that malfunctioning colour television sets sold in Canada have started fires in homes? If so, what action is his department contemplating taking in order to prevent the sale of such sets in the future?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Actually, Mr. Speaker, preliminary information became available last fall at which time we asked the Canadian Standards Association to review their standards applicable to television sets made in Canada. Two days ago the work of the United States commission on product safety became available and two of my officials are in Washington analysing that information with the commission in order to determine its applicability to Canada. When all the information has been analysed I shall be meeting with the Canadian Standards Association as well as the Canadian manufacturers and importers to see whether Canadian standards ought to be changed to correct any faults in manufacturing.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given consideration to having colour television sets defined under the Hazardous Products Act?

Mr. Basford: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are, although not for the reasons outlined in the previous question and answer. My colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, will be making recommendations on whether colour television sets should be regulated under the Hazardous Products Act because of their radiation emission.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—EXTENT OF LAY-OFFS OF EMPLOYEES

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I feel neglected. May I ask myself a question?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pepin: May I answer questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition on Tuesday with respect to lay-offs in the automobile industry? The two probing questions asked were, first, whether notice has been given in such instances and, second, whether the situation is worse in Canada than in the United States.

I have looked into this situation. To answer a distinction must be made between two types of lay-offs. One type is for restructuring. We have had two instances of that type, both in Chrysler Corporation. In each of these two instances notice was given to employees several weeks in advance.

In the other category, which involves lay-offs due to inventory surpluses, I found that the company discussed the matter with their employees or their representatives in each case. Since these are generally emergency situations it is difficult for the company to give two or three months notice.

With respect to whether the position is worse in Canada than in the United States, I have been assured by the companies, and our analysis would so far indicate, that although cutbacks have been handled somewhat differently and on a different time basis by each company in each country, there is no indication that the Canadian industry has been hit harder than that of the United States. My officials are keeping a close watch on these developments.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In order to make certain that the minister does not feel ignored or lonely, may I ask him whether he has information indicating the total extent of the lay-offs? Does he know what proportions those lay-offs may reach during this winter? Has the automobile industry indicated the extent of any such possible lay-offs?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the future is difficult to anticipate, as I indicated, because these are emergency situations created by market conditions. If my hon. friend knows in ad-

vance what will happen in the market, I wish he would let me know because that would be useful information for the industry.

IMMIGRATION

DEPORTATION OF JAMES AUTRY

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, not long ago I directed a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration about James Autry. I wanted to know whether his officials had requested the United States government to arrange for his deportation under the Visiting Forces Act. Is the minister in a position now to answer my original question?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have my hon. friend's question in front of me and I intended to rise later to answer it and advise him that because the officials of the Immigration Department were of the opinion that this person should be dealt with under the Visiting Forces Act they were in touch with the United States consul in Halifax and I believe with U.S. officials in Ottawa about this particular person.

Replying to the question asked by the hon. member for Calgary North, there was no request by Mr. Autry to have his case heard before the Immigration Appeal Board and therefore there was no refusal of any such request.

Mr. Baldwin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether in the discussions that took place officials of the department informed United States officials that under the Visiting Forces Act there could be no right of appeal and consequently, unlike the Immigration Act, there could be no proceedings that would prove a political embarrassment to the Canadian government?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question because in the report to me no allusion was made to any conversation along those lines. When our policy with respect to desertion was announced in the House I made it clear that the only exception to the policy would be persons in Canada as members of forces of another country and that these persons would be subject to the Visiting Forces Act. It was for that reason that the normal policy was not followed by the officials of the department who were of the opinion that this person ought to be dealt with under that act.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice about the Autry case. Has he investigated to ascertain whether as a result of decisions by our courts, notably in British Columbia, the handing over of a man like Autry by Canadian military personnel to U.S. personnel was outside the authority of the Visiting Forces Act and therefore totally illegal?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we are conducting a very extensive investigation into the case, and because of the importance of the case I shall consider making a statement on it after we have concluded the investigation.

NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

REFUSAL OF MEMBERSHIP TO WOMEN—SUGGESTED VIOLATION OF BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. On Monday I asked the hon. gentleman whether he would check the tenancy of the National Press Club in a building owned by the government of Canada. May I ask him whether he has been able to reconcile any regulation authorizing that tenancy with the provisions of the Canadian Bill of Rights?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): The Canadian Bill of Rights applies only to statutes and section 2 is, I think, very clear. It does not apply to the internal management or rules of a club or private organization. The National Press Club has a lease from the Department of Public Works until April 30, 1972, with an option to renew for five years—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the minister. It seems to me this is information which should be sought by way of a question on the Order Paper and given in writing by the minister.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Canadian Bill of Rights does apply to regulations as well as the statutes, will the minister check into this angle of the matter and give an answer in whatever way he may choose to do so?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TRANSFER OF NERVE GAS FROM OKINAWA TO UNITED STATES

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): I have a question for the Secretary of State for

Inquiries of the Ministry

External Affairs. Has the Canadian ambassador in Washington reported on the subject of the United States army's intention to ship five barges of nerve gas from Okinawa to Hermiston army base in the state of Washington via the Strait of Juan de Fuca? Furthermore, can the hon. gentleman inform the House what message the Canadian ambassador in Washington delivered to the United States authorities on this subject?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have received a report from our ambassador in Washington on this subject. I am informed by him that no shipments have yet taken place. We are pursuing discussions with the United States. The shipments cannot take place until the Secretary for Health, Education and Welfare has reviewed the proposal, including measures to protect public health and safety, and this he has not yet done.

Mr. Anderson: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would allow the hon. member's supplementary but we are running short of time and I think we ought to move on as quickly as we can.

Mr. Anderson: Can the Secretary of State for External Affairs let the House know the message which was delivered by the Canadian ambassador to the United States authorities?

Mr. Sharp: The ambassador made inquiries, as I have indicated, as to whether in fact these shipments had been made or were being made. I have given the information I have received, namely, that they have not yet been made.

AGRICULTURE

PROGRAM TO MOVE FARMERS OFF LAND

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of statements made by the minister in a recent public address, when does the government plan to bring forward its program to speed up the transition of marginal farmers to the city or to retirement with dignity?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): As I have said many times during the course of this session, Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be before the end of the session.

[Mr. Anderson.]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY—ASSURANCE OF RIGHT TO ENGLISH OR FRENCH EDUCATION

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I have a question for the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. Having regard to the frustration experienced by Eskimos in Northern Quebec who wish to have their children educated in the English language, and in view of the government's declared policy of promoting the equality of both the English and the French languages across Canada, will the Secretary of State inform the House what steps he has taken to ensure that any transfer of responsibility for Canada's Indian people from the federal government to the provinces will not be undertaken in the absence of guarantees to the Indians that they may have their children educated in either the English or the French language?

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member and to the minister that this is information which ought to be given to the House by way of a statement.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INVITATION FROM MAURITANIA TO ATTEND CONFERENCE OF FRENCH-SPEAKING MINISTERS OF EDUCATION

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could he tell us whether an agreement has been reached between the federal government and that of Quebec with regard to representation at the conference in Mauritania?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. We have been taking part in some discussions with the province of Quebec on representation at a number of these conferences both in Niger and in Mauritania. These have not yet been concluded but I judge from the statement attributed to the Premier of Quebec that a decision will be made along the general lines of the agreement reached in the past.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

EASTERN NOVA SCOTIA—REPORTED DRASTIC CUTS IN MAINTENANCE OF WAY EMPLOYEES

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): I have a question for the Minister of Transport,

Mr. Speaker. In view of a report that drastic cuts are to be made in the near future in the number of workers employed by the CNR on maintenance of way in eastern Nova Scotia, would the minister check to ascertain whether this information is correct, bearing in mind the possible effect upon employment?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation to the minister and he must assume it will be looked into.

POLLUTION

ARCTIC WATERS—TRAINING OF COASTGUARD MEMBERS TO ENFORCE STANDARDS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I have a question for the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the hon. gentleman to the House on a day when he is not supposed to be here, though we are not sure what reason brings him here. Are members of the Canadian Coastguard Service currently receiving training in policing anti-pollution standards in northern waters?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Since the hon. member is always telling us we do not even know the time of day, he will not be surprised if I say I will be glad to investigate, and provide an answer to his question in due course.

INTRODUCTION OF NATIONAL CLEAN AIR LEGISLATION

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It arises, in part out of the statement of business which was placed before the House by the Government House Leader. Can the hon. gentleman tell us what has happened to the proposal for a national clean air act which his predecessor indicated in the last parliament to be in an advanced state of preparation for presentation to the House?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Work is being done on a clean air bill but in view of all that remains to be done it is not planned to introduce the measure during this part of the session.

GRAIN

INVESTIGATION OF RATIONALIZATION OF COUNTRY ELEVATOR SYSTEM

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): I should like to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the many statements which have been made in connection with the entire grain handling system, can the minister tell us whether or not a committee of officials is investigating the rationalization of the country elevator system in the prairie provinces and whether such committee has made either firm or preliminary recommendations with respect to the long-term rationalization of the country elevator system in Saskatchewan so as to reduce the number of shipping points from 1,100 to fewer than 100?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): The matter is under consideration but it certainly has not reached the stage suggested by the hon. member in the last part of his question.

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

INCREASE IN CRIME—REPRESENTATIONS BY QUEBEC MINISTER OF JUSTICE

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the recent statements by the Quebec Minister of Justice regarding the fresh outbreak of crime in Canada and the telegram received by the federal Minister of Justice last Friday, could the Prime Minister tell us if the government has answered the telegram and, if so, what the reply was?

[*English*]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I believe this question has already been asked. We are as concerned as the Attorney General of Quebec about crimes of violence; we are not sure he has suggested the right remedy.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

REPRESENTATIONS BY DIABETIC ASSOCIATION RESPECTING CYCLAMATE BAN—AVAILABILITY OF SUBSTITUTE

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): My question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the recent ban on cyclamates and subsequent representations made to the minister by the Canadian Diabetic Association indicating that as a result severe hardship has been imposed upon those afflicted with diabetes, is any consideration being given to making available a substitute in order that diabetics may acquire some relief?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mazankowski: In the meantime is the minister giving any consideration to permitting the use of controlled amounts of cyclamates by those afflicted with diabetes?

Mr. Munro: Depending on what is meant by controlled, yes, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

PAYMENT OF DEFICIENCY INDEMNITIES TO SALT COD FISHERMEN

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries. In connection with the unnecessary delay in making payments of deficiency indemnities to salt cod fishermen, will the hon. gentleman investigate this situation with a view to speeding up these urgently needed payments?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We have done that, Mr. Speaker.

GRAIN

ADVICE TO WHEAT GROWERS ON PRODUCTION

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): This question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. When does the minister intend to offer meaningful production advice to farmers so that they may reduce their wheat production without producing a surplus in other crops, a possibility suggested in a statement made to the Canadian Federation of Agriculture?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): It was also stated yesterday that we were very conscious of the fact that time is pressing in this regard, and therefore we shall be making any advice we have to give on this subject available as soon as possible.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio. In view of the fact the minister is recommending that farmers with surplus wheat further reduce wheat acreage or grow no wheat this summer, is the government considering paying for this reduction in wheat acreage in order to compensate those farmers who follow his suggestion?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the kind of advice we should give to farmers and of the fashion in which we should try to make that advice as meaningful as possible to individual farmers in order to achieve the right result is all part of the matter that is under consideration. In addition, may I say that the word "recommending" used in the hon. member's question is probably slightly mis-stating the situation, since what I was really doing was asking some logical questions in light of the current situation.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of the minister's advice to western farmers not to plant wheat in the current crop year, are we to assume that the Prime Minister's remark in Winnipeg, "why should I sell wheat" has now become government policy?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

SHIPPING

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RECOMMENDATION RESPECTING SHIP SPEED LIMIT

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): I would like to ask the Minister of Transport a question.

Does the Minister intend to carry out a recommendation of the Canada-U.S. committee to the effect that the speed of ships moving through the St. Lawrence Seaway should be limited to 15 miles per hour?

Mr. Speaker: This question could be placed on the Order Paper.

[*English*]

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

MEETING WITH NORTHWEST TERRITORIES COUNCIL RESPECTING CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister received a request from the council of the Northwest Territories, which at the moment is concluding its session in Yellowknife, to meet with the council to discuss constitutional development in the North? May I also ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question. Could the right hon. gentleman give the House some indication as to when he will be able to meet the council?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I must have received such an invitation, Mr.

Speaker, since the Parliamentary Secretary has asked the question, but I must confess that I have not seen it yet. I will look into the matter immediately.

AGRICULTURE

INCLUSION OF NEW PROTEIN GRADING IN CANADA GRAIN ACT

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the new Canada Grain Act, to be introduced this session, include new protein grading for wheat?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Orders of the day.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a very short question.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings, but I would point out that we have already gone beyond the time allotted to the question period by a few minutes. Perhaps the hon. member would ask his question tomorrow.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, tomorrow would be too late. My question will take a very short space of time.

Mr. Speaker: Certainly I have no objection whatever, and I am sure that all hon. members would like to hear the hon. member's question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

OFFER OF POSITION AS JUDGE TO MR. CLAUDE WAGNER

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Prime Minister, if he can take his eyes and his mind off the visitors' gallery long enough to answer it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: My question is: Did the Prime Minister yesterday promise Mr. Wagner a federal judgeship, and does he consider that this will be sufficient to keep him from jumping out of Liberal ranks?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This question was asked yesterday.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, may I raise the traditional point of order for a Thursday and ask the President of the Privy Council about the little tidbits of business that he has for the House this week and next week?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The business for today will be as indicated earlier. The first item will be No. 41 on the Order Paper, the Quebec Savings Banks Act, second reading. There will be a slight change in the order as announced in that the second item of business will be order No. 12, the Small Businesses Loans Act amendment. This will be followed by order No. 19 with respect to the Canada Student Loans Act. If those measures are completed at today's sitting, we will then commence the consideration of item No. 24 with respect to the motor vehicle safety legislation.

For tomorrow the bills to be called will be order No. 13, with respect to the Canada Shipping Act, and order No. 55, the quarantine measure. There will be further consultations in case additional business might be appropriate for the latter part of tomorrow.

On Monday we will again call the motor vehicle safety bill, if it has not been completed. Tuesday will be an opposition allotted day. On Wednesday we will call No. 29 on the order paper, the national parks bill, followed by order No. 48, the amendment to the Yukon Placer Mining Act. On Thursday next the House will take order No. 25, the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act, followed by order No. 7, the criminal records bill.

• (3:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

QUEBEC SAVINGS BANKS ACT

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO OPEN BRANCHES

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio) moved that Bill S-2, to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, for many years only two banks have operated under the legislation in question, the Banque d'Économie de Quebec and the Montreal City and District Savings Bank. The first of these was author-

ized to operate in the district of Quebec, and the second in the district of Montreal. These districts were defined in the act.

However, as the House will recall, last year Parliament passed a private bill changing the status of the Banque d'Économie de Quebec to that of a bank operating under the Bank Act. This change of status was effective as of Monday, November 10, 1969.

The purpose of the present bill, therefore, is to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act to permit the Montreal City and District Savings Bank to extend its operations, if it chooses to do so, into that part of Quebec province which lies outside the district of Montreal. In particular, it will authorize this bank to operate in the area in which the Banque d'Économie will no longer operate as a savings bank.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to allow the bank to open branches anywhere within the province of Quebec.

[*English*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no purpose in having any extended discussion on this matter. In light of the spirit of extending competition among chartered banks, and banks coming under federal jurisdiction, the desire of this bank to operate outside the confines of the city of Montreal as it has heretofore can only be commended. Therefore, we support the bill.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we would have supported a move to not even send the bill to committee. I would be quite prepared, on behalf of this party, to agree that we amend the direction so that the committee stage be taken in this House, and that the bill be dealt with in this way.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, if I may respond to that point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am not sure whether the hon. member is raising a point of order or whether he is speaking to the motion before the House. If he is speaking to the motion, then if the minister replies he will, of course, close the debate.

Mr. Gray: Then may I raise a point of order myself, Mr. Speaker. If I may I would like to indicate that we would be willing to accept an amendment to the order that Your Honour has presented to us along the lines the hon. member has just suggested.

[Mr. Gray.]

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Then I would move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale):

That the motion be amended by deleting that portion that refers this bill to the Standing Committee; and that the bill be referred to the committee of the whole.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I should just like to say that since the Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs committee has so much business before it at the present time, I think there is merit in the proposal that has been placed before the House.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps there might be unanimous consent to accept the amendment as it has been suggested by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert).

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the house to adopt the said motion as amended?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): By leave, now.

Mr. Gray moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

SMALL BUSINESSES LOANS ACT

EXTENSION OF CATEGORIES OF LENDERS

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-9, to amend the Small Businesses Loans Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River) moved:

That Bill C-9, an Act to amend the Small Businesses Loans Act, be amended by striking out the word "or" at line 15, page 1 thereof, by adding the word "or", next after the word "Act;", at line 28, page 1 thereof, and by inserting therein, next after line 28, page 1 thereof, the following:

"(iv) A Treasury Branch of the Province of Alberta that is designated by the Minister on the application of the government of the Province of Alberta as a bank for the purposes of this Act;"

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I should like to raise a

point of order, if it is proper to do so at this time. I ask Your Honour to consider whether the amendment can be considered by the House. I submit that the addition of the words "A Treasury Branch of the Province of Alberta" exceeds the terms and recommendations from His Excellency which read as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure to amend the Small Businesses Loans Act to increase the present limit of liability of the Minister of Finance in respect of loans made by individual lenders, and to provide for a further one and a half year loan period ending June 30, 1971; Also to provide that the aggregate principal amount of guaranteed loans during that period shall not exceed one hundred million dollars on loans by chartered banks, and fifty million dollars on loans by credit unions, Caisses Populaires, co-operative credit societies, insurance companies, trust companies or loan companies designated by The Minister.

On October 10, 1968, Mr. Speaker, I raised what I submit is exactly the same point of order in respect of a proposed amendment to the Farm Improvement Loans Act. This matter is dealt with in the House of Commons debates for 1968-69 at page 1047. I have the text of the ruling that you made at that time. I do not know whether you would like me to quote from it, but perhaps I should do so at this time.

Mr. Speaker put the question as follows:

The question before the House is an appeal to Mr. Speaker from a decision given by the chairman of the Committee of the Whole pursuant to section 4 of standing order 59.

In the committee of the whole on Bill No. C-111 the hon. member for Crowfoot proposed an amendment to Clause 1 of the bill as follows:

"To add after the word 'society', line 12, and before the word 'that' in line 13 the words 'and other financial institutions' ".

The question is to determine whether the proposed words of the amendment go beyond the terms of the resolution. My view is that if the words proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot by way of amendment do not enlarge the words "financial institutions" using in clause 1 of this bill, then the amendment is redundant and superfluous. If they seek to enlarge the terms of these words, then we have to determine whether the amendment is consistent with the detailed provisions of the resolution preceding the bill. In my view, when a resolution preceding a money bill sets out in detail the terms of the bill, as this one does, we have to be very cautious about amendments which might enlarge upon these terms.

Then, Your Honour referred hon. members to citation 246 in the fourth edition of Beauchesne at page 207 sub-paragraph (3) which I will not take the time to read at this moment. You concluded by saying:

I suggest to hon. members, with respect, that the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Crowfoot does affect the conditions and qualifications set out in detail in the resolution approved by the House and preceding the bill.

For this reason I feel I have to sustain the decision of the learned and wise chairman of the committee of the whole.

Therefore, I submit that this amendment is not in order.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I disagree with about nine-tenths of what the hon. minister has said, because I think the terms of the amending resolution do not contravene the regulations of this House. However, I do not feel for one moment there would be an increase in the liability of the Crown since equivalent amounts are fixed by the terms of the recommendation, whether or not one more institution shares in it.

Since the terminology of the recommendation does not include treasury branches, I agree that an exact interpretation would exclude the amendment. I am in agreement that it does. In saying so, I must commend the initiative of my colleague for moving this amendment because I think it indicates a lamentable gap in the thinking of the officials of the Department of Finance. Apparently, because there are no treasury branches in or around Ottawa, there cannot be any in the country.

There are treasury branches in the province of Alberta which look after the public's finances. Perhaps there are none in Ontario or the Province of Quebec. We admit that in these provinces there are trust companies, credit unions and caisses populaires. In Alberta, there is an extensive commercial banking business conducted by treasury branches. This measure needlessly excludes them and their customers from the provisions of the Small Businesses Loans Act. I think the action of the department in this connection is lamentable. Surely, the minister understands what I mean when I say this, as I have spoken to him about it before. I had hoped he might find a method whereby this situation could be corrected.

On the point of order, I agree that the amendment is out of order, but in saying so I want to make it clear that I do not detract for one moment from the motivations of my colleague, the hon. member for Battle River. I suggest this is another expression of discontent by those people who feel they should get consideration, but people in comfortable pews sometimes snore.

Small Businesses Loans Act

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: What we have before the House at the moment is a point of order. I trust any discussion we have at this time would not be on the substance of the interesting amendment proposed by the hon. member for Battle River, but rather would be on the procedural aspect of the matter. Having said that, I shall recognize the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I must admit the argument against the procedural admissibility of this amendment is pretty weighty and very difficult to answer. However, as the hon. member for Edmonton West has pointed out, no increase in the total amount of money is involved so far as the amendment is concerned. But it does seem we are stuck with the citations and previous rulings which say we must remain within the terms of the resolution. I suppose therefore, heeding your admonition of a moment ago, and since I find it difficult to argue the other way, there is little I can say. However, like the hon. member for Edmonton West, I think it is too bad there is this discrimination against the treasury branches in the province of Alberta.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Speaker, I believe I find myself unable to compete with hon. gentlemen such as the hon. member for Edmonton West and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre in respect of a point of order and knowledge of the rules of the House. I do recall, however, when the farm improvement loans bill was being discussed in the House last year, many precedents were cited in respect of guarantees. Arguments were put forward at that time that there was no necessity for the federal government to provide a guarantee when the province was providing the guarantee. That is, Her Majesty the Queen in right of Canada would not or could not have the privilege of overriding the guarantee of Her Majesty in right of a province. In this regard, I should like to refer to the Statutes of Canada 1962-63 in respect of the setting up of the Expo Corporation. I shall quote from the Act to establish the Canadian World Exhibition, Section 12(3). It reads as follows:

> The Governor in Council may authorize the Minister of Finance, on behalf on Her Majesty, to enter into a joint guarantee by Her Majesty and Her Majesty in right of the Province of Quebec guaranteeing payment of the principal amount of any note, bond or debenture issued by the Corporation under the authority of subsection (1) and of the interest thereon, which guarantee shall be in such form and subject to such terms and conditions as may be approved by the Governor in Council and the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

It is clear that there are precedents for this type of guarantee. Although it is not clearly spelled out in the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor General of Bill C-9 that this type of arrangement may be entered into when we look at the amount of defaults there have been in the past under small business loan and Farm Improvement loan legislation, I believe it is obvious to all of us that, for all practical purposes, there will be no additional financial commitment or guarantee forced upon the federal treasury. I would ask for the consideration of the minister in this regard. At a time when the people in the west feel they are being discriminated against I think this is very important. In light of the precedent in respect of the Expo Corporation, I would ask for the minister's consideration.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I trust the hon. member for Regina East wishes to speak to the point of order. I might say I am in a position to reach a decision on the point of order raised by the minister, which has already been commented upon by three learned and hon. members of the House. I would hope the hon. member for Regina East would limit his contribution to the procedural aspect of the point now before the Chair.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, may I say that I cannot add to what has been said by the hon. member for Edmonton West and the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. However, I might ask, in view of the disposition expressed in some parts of the House, whether the minister might consider taking the necessary steps to bring in a resolution that would enable this matter to be considered by the House in the event Your Honour should decide the amendment is not admissible.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a suggestion which the minister may wish to consider after the ruling has been made. As hon. members might surmise, it would be very difficult for the Chair to rule otherwise than that the amendment unfortunately cannot be put to the House. As has been correctly mentioned by the minister, and as pointed out by hon. members who have taken part in this debate, the proposed amendment would appear to go beyond the terms of the Governor General's recommendation.

I might take the liberty to bring to the attention of the House citation 246 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition which, in part, reads as follows:

> The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications.

Because of this, it is a long established practice that the type of amendment proposed by the hon. member cannot be put to the House. I regret very much that I must reach this conclusion, particularly due to the fact that there appears to be so much sympathy on both sides of the House for the intent of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey). However, because of the precedents and particularly the ruling I made myself after considerable thought just two years ago when this very point was brought up and considered by the Chair, with regret I rule that the hon. member's proposed amendment may not be considered by the House at this moment.

I must add that in respect of the second amendment proposed by the hon. member for Battle River, being consequential and related directly to the one just ruled out of order, the same conclusion would have to be reached. Therefore, of course, the second amendment could not be put to the House at this time.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio) moved that Bill C-9, to amend the Small Businesses Loans Act, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Gray 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?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): May I ask the minister whether he is prepared to give consideration to the proposal placed before him with respect to the subject matter of an amendment that was proposed by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) and which was ruled out of order. Is the minister prepared to consider taking the necessary steps to enable this change to be made in the bill so that the treasury branches of the province of Alberta could be included within the scope of this legislation?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to rise and put myself in the position of closing the debate if there are other members who wish to take part in the debate on third reading.

Mr. Speaker: Of course, if the minister speaks now, even if he does not close the debate, he can speak only once on a motion. He can choose whether he wants to speak now or wait until other contributions have been made.

Mr. Downey: It is a disappointment to me that the amendment I proposed was ruled out of order, but I hope the minister will take the necessary steps to ensure that a correction is made so that the provincial treasury branches can enjoy equal status with the other financial institutions which operate in the province and in the rest of the country.

I will be brief in my remarks at this stage since I spoke on this bill earlier. May I say, with regard to the treasury branch situation—and here I also wish to include farm improvement loans—that I think we have to consider financial agencies in the light of their usefulness and of their total participation in the field of finance. Certainly, the profits that accrue from institutions such as provincial treasury branches go back into the provincial revenue, and in this way part of the load is taken off the public purse, which I think is most important in view of the country's present economic situation.

Much of the profit of our other banking institutions eventually finds its way outside the country. I am not debating the merits or otherwise of this situation, but I do say that it would be a gross discrimination and contrary to the public interest for the federal government not to extend the same privileges to provincial treasury branches as they do to private financial institutions especially when, as I said earlier, we have clear precedents for this type of guarantee.

There is one other important addition which could have been made to this bill and that is the inclusion of inventory and accounts receivable so that loans could be made on this basis as well as for business expansion. In a depressed business cycle such as we are experiencing now in this country, it is of little value in the majority of cases to indicate that the government will advance

loans for business expansion when often this is not necessary. What these businesses need is financing to sustain them and keep them viable. Loans could and should be made on the basis of accounts receivable and for stock in trade.

There is just one other point which I should like to make which relates to the performance of the treasury branches. In looking at borrowings under the Farm Improvement Loans Act, I notice that between 1967 and 1968 there has been a considerable drop in the number of loans made by chartered banks under this act. Certainly, there has been a need for funds in this area but I think there has probably been a reluctance on the part of these agencies to lend at the lower interest rates. I have figures for three of our main banks and I note that in 1967 loans for farm improvement from the three banks amounted to $52.4 million, $42.3 million and $70.1 million, while in 1968, a year later, the amount lent under the Farm Improvement Loans Act was $7.5 million, $4 million and $11 million, which is a dramatic reduction. I do not have as complete a breakdown for the treasury branches, but it seems that their loans in this area have been at least consistent and have even increased somewhat. Loans for agricultural and personal purposes in the same period of time increased by some $12 million, so I believe that this is quite an argument in support of the concern of treasury branches for the financial needs of the people.

I will not pursue this any further today, but will conclude by again encouraging the minister to consider these treasury branches.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): The great socialist from Windsor West has introduced this bill which, in effect, will provide government assistance to private lending institutions. I should like to go on record as saying that I favour this proposal. The great socialist from Battle River wants the federal government to underwrite the provincial government's lending institution, and I must say I think it is a good idea. I cannot see anything wrong with this proposal, either.

This type of loan has been used more widely in western Canada than in some other areas. I think this indicates perhaps that there is a greater financial need there than in some other areas of the country. However, I am quite concerned at the moment that loan companies which will come under the bill might not have money to lend at the present interest rates, particularly in view of the awkward financial situation in which agriculture in western Canada finds itself. In addition, the government's policy of restraint on agriculture makes farmers wonder if it is wise to borrow money under such a bill. If you are a banker or responsible individual in a lending institution and if you have the money available, you would be wise to lend it to such a borrower.

• (3:40 p.m.)

There are matters related to this bill. Now law stands by itself. It stands in relation to the rest of the community or institutions. If we are not going to have an effective Small Businesses Loans Act, we might as well not have one.

I invite the minister to consider some other aspects of the lending community, the business community and the position of these people generally. We know that some banks have a much more aggressive lending policy, at least they lend a great deal more money than some others. It is not always the policy of the government or the provisions of an act that govern the situation, but it is the policy of the banks. Possibly the minister should do a little more advertising or apply a little pressure to ensure that these lending institutions consider this act seriously. I assume the minister expects small businesses to borrow money.

There are two other points I want to make in relation to this bill. With the white paper, on taxation before the country, the tax situation is such that small businesses are uncertain whether or not they should borrow money. What are the tax changes going to do to them? If I were a banker or credit manager of a financial institution and were approached by a small business for a loan, I would certainly consider what effect the new tax rate would have on this businessman before I would make the loan. The white paper has caused a pall of uncertainty over some sections of the business community.

I suggest the minister should get on with the job and decide what is to be done, so that the small business people will know where they are. I do not think it is right that the government should be responsible for putting a person in a position of wondering whether he should or should not borrow money. The role of the government should be to help individuals to assess their business situation.

Another point I wish to comment on is the inflation which we have in this country, and the plans of the government for curing inflation. I will not go into the plans here, but I

suggest they have some relationship to the bill because individuals and lending institutions must consider what inflation might do to some businesses and also be concerned with what government action to cure inflation might do to particular businesses. Again, there is a pall of uncertainty. Perhaps in his reply the minister might deal with these items and give us some assurance that these matters will be considered.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): I do not know if my voice will last long enough to put on the record the observations I wish to make. I would have liked my vocal condition to have been better so that I would have been able to speak longer and express some feelings about this particular amendment and about the act generally.

I notice there are three points in Bill No. C-9. One is to extend the term of the legislation; two, to set loan limits and, three, to increase the guarantee to lending institutions which will mean that small institutions will be able to get involved in lending to small businesses without the same risk they previously had to face. In this respect, this amendment to Bill C-9 is encouraging and, of course, has my support.

I agree with one point raised by the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson), and I wish to offer evidence in support of that particular argument. I ask Your Honour's permission to digress from consideration of this bill for a moment. Several pieces of legislation similar to Bill C-9 have been passed. One of these is the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. I will use this example in order to make a point respecting people who wish to obtain loans under these acts.

Since the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act was passed last year, I think there have been only two loans made in my Province under this act. I am sure every member from Atlantic Canada, and possibly members from the west coast, have received correspondence from people who have gone to the banks, made their representations, put up the necessary to guarantee, which under that legislation is 25 per cent of the total loan, and made out an application—if they could get one. I am informed that frequently bank managers say they do not have any application forms. On occasion when these people fill out an application, that is the last they hear of it. I received a letter from a person who had made an application for a loan in November. To date, he has not received any response. He is interested in investing $20,000 in a piece of fishing equipment, a long-liner. The fishing season is approaching and because this person has not received any response, he does not know what his position is. The seller of the boat is waiting to complete the sale, but this man must just sit and wait. There has been correspondence with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) and numerous other people in the government departments responsible. We cannot get any fire under the bottoms of the people who are supposed to make these loans, yet the government sits back feeling quite happy that this legislation is on the books.

Legislation, not used, is useless. For example, legislation was passed by a provincial government making it illegal to change a fuse in your house. This was when houses had the old fuse boxes. It is illegal to change a fuse unless you are a qualified electrician. This is a stupid law because it is impossible to enforce. Who would know whether you changed a fuse? This bill is similar. It is not effective.

I mentioned the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act to show that the banks are not co-operating with the government. I suspect this is because the demand for capital is so high they can be very selective when lending money. On the basis of low risk lending, they should lend to fishermen because they have the best record in Canada for repaying loans. This is a fact, not an assumption. However, these loans are made not on the ability of the person to repay the loan, but on the basis of the interest the institution can get by making this loan.

Under the Farm Improvement Loans Act, the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act, the Small Businesses Loans Act and other similar pieces of legislation, the interest rate is relatively low. Certainly it is not low, but relatively low. It is roughly 8 per cent. The banks are not interested in lending money at this rate. The minister might be able to contradict me and say, look at all the money we have been lending.

I have already referred to the fisheries legislation. I participated in the debate on that bill for many weeks in this House and in committee. It was finally passed. I thought it might have been effective. If the record is checked, I am sure it will show that I voted in favour of this legislation. Having now had over a year's experience with that piece of legislation, which has similar components to

the legislation now under discussion, I have grave doubts about its effectiveness. It has been a real headache to those I have been in contact with, including the Minister of Fisheries and members of Parliament. The banks are using many excuses why they are not making this money available to these people under this legislation.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Let me be more specific about the Small Businesses Loans Act. For the record, a report by the Minister of Finance dated December 9, 1969, indicates the number of loans made during the last half of 1969. I want the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gray) to listen carefully to what I am saying. When I have finished, I am sure he is going to say "I have listened to the hon. member; I will investigate that and make a report". I am going to ask the minister to do just this, unlike other occasions when the same promise was made but no action taken. This is a crucial point.

If I may be parochial for a moment, I should like to refer to how crucial this kind of legislation can be to a province like Newfoundland. For example, during the last half of last year there was a grand total of 1,146 loans made totalling $12,732,698 and in the last quarter there were 377 loans totalling over $4 million. But in Newfoundland, in the last quarter there was only one loan made for $15,000 and only three loans made in the whole year. This statement of the minister covering loans made under the Small Businesses Loans Act for the period July to September shows 225 loans in British Columbia totalling $2,323,621; Alberta, 138 loans for $1,345,372; Saskatchewan, 74 loans, Manitoba 57, Ontario 349, and Quebec 243. New Brunswick had 18 loans and Newfoundland 2 loans. In other words, we can just forget about it.

The act is not working. What is the problem? That is the question I want to pose to the Minister without Portfolio. We have small businessmen eager to expand and no doubt if he checks he will find that there have been quite a number of applications. Under the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act about 15 or 20 people have written to me inquiring how to get a loan. They have reported that when they have followed the indicated procedure they still could not get loans. There are 4,000 fishermen in my riding, but I doubt if one loan has been made under the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act. It is something of a farce, Mr. Speaker, for us to put emphasis on legislation of this kind if people are not taking advantage of it.

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

On Small Business, again, I realize we do not have the same number of small businesses as other provinces, certainly not like Ontario with 349 loans last year. But when you consider that Newfoundland only had two loans last year and three for the same period the previous year, there is something wrong. I should like the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to indicate what the problem is and any solutions he has for it.

The Fisheries Improvement Loans Act has been amended and brought up to date, but the banks are not lending the money. Is there not something to be done here? Can the government not take action to ensure that people meeting the requirements of the Fisheries and Small Businesses acts can take advantage of the legislation to raise the necessary capital? As far as I am concerned this is discrimination and the Minister of Finance has a responsibility here. Some months ago, I asked whether he would take remedial action against this sort of discrimination and whether his attitude toward easing of credit in slow growth areas was the same as that of the Governor of the Bank of Canada. I suspect it isn't, and the banks have been given directives not to lend money to these people because the security is not good or else the bank managers are not aware of this legislation.

There is a form of discrimination, Mr. Speaker, and this has to be rectified because there is a greater need for the liberal application of this legislation in the slow growth areas than in boom areas. In places like Newfoundland, the average small businessman or fisherman has no place but the bank to negotiate a loan. In Ottawa, Montreal or Toronto there are other sources, though applicants may have to pay through the nose. Perhaps this amendment specifically relating to the guarantee might ease the situation a little bit.

I would like to ask the Minister without Portfolio—I hope he is listening to me—if he will initiate an investigation to determine why Newfoundlanders cannot get loans under the legislation, specifically the Farm Improvement loans—they got one last year—the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act—one or two loans have been made in the province—and the Small Business Loans Act, under which a total of three loans were made last year and two the year before.

If the legislation is not applied equally or if the banks are discriminating, then the government has the responsibility to take remedial action. If the Minister of Finance is correct in saying that the Governor of the Bank of Canada shares his view that there is to be a liberalization of restraints in slow growth areas, certainly we are entitled to better treatment than we have been getting.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, the bill to amend the Small Business Loans Act is a very important piece of legislation requiring the full attention of members of this House. I think that small business across Canada is facing very serious problems and, indeed, in many cases is faced with the problem of whether it will be able to survive over the next period of years. This has come about, Mr. Speaker, in large part because of the increasing concentration of economic power within Canada. Thus, many small businesses find it difficult to compete with large corporations, large monopolies or even conglomerates, not only because of problems of competing in price but also because of problems in commanding adequate amounts of the resources necessary to enable small businesses to take advantage of the technological advances which would enable them to give their customers the type of service and product which is required.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, small business faces very many serious problems. Some of these problems have been discussed in this debate, and I concur with the suggestion that some of the aspects of this legislation and its administration, aspects which have been drawn to the attention of the government, require full consideration if, in fact, small business is to survive.

Reference has already been made, as a result of an amendment which was ruled out of order by Your Honour, to the position of the treasury branches in the province of Alberta. Of course, at this stage I cannot discuss the amendment that was originally moved and subsequently ruled out of order, but I wish to discuss this subject matter within the framework of clause 1 of the bill as it has been reported back by the committee without amendment. The amendment that has been moved with respect to paragraph (a) of section 2 pertains to the definition of "bank" and would include banks within the meaning of the Bank Act. It would also permit credit unions, caisses populaire, cooperative credit societies, insurance companies, trust companies and loan companies, if designated by the minister, to become lenders under the Small Businesses Loans Act. It seems to me that the principle involved in this amendment is perfectly sound, namely, that those institutions which people may wish to use to take advantage of this legislation to carry on their business affairs should be empowered to make loans under this act. It seems to me that that principle is perfectly sound. It is the principle that is intended in this amendment.

However, it is perfectly obvious that one particular group of businesses, namely the treasury branches of the province of Alberta, have been overlooked or not included in the amendment placed before the House in this clause. I am quite willing to give the government the benefit of the doubt and say that this was an unintentional oversight; but it seems to me that consideration should be given to including this group of institutions within this act. After all, Mr. Speaker, there are many people within the province of Alberta who conduct their financial affairs at the treasury branches of that province. They are the places of business for the carrying on of peoples' financial business in many Alberta communities, and many of the people of Alberta use them. Thus it seems to me that if the principle involved in this section is to be applied generally, the minister should seriously consider taking the necessary steps to ensure that the branches are included within this legislation. Thus, I would urge him to take the necessary steps to ensure that the treasury branches of the province of Alberta which perform a very useful function for the people of the province are included in this legislation.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, may I speak briefly on Bill C-9? I support the comments of my colleague, the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), and urge the government and the minister to include within the legislation the treasury branches of the province of Alberta because they perform very useful work and to exclude them from the provisions of this bill would be, in my opinion, discriminatory. Surely, there can be no objection to including the treasury branches, because they have served a wonderful purpose in the province. I am sure the treasury branches of that province wish to be included in any privileges that are granted to other lending institutions.

An hon. member who spoke some time ago said that lending institutions discriminate between central Canada and the rest of the country. I am absolutely certain that the amount of money put back into any area, say, in Saskatchewan, by lending institutions in the forms of loans is not nearly as great as it ought to be. Many people who are desirous of obtaining loans from lending institutions in certain parts of the country find it difficult to do so. We ought to require lending institutions to return or make available to any part of the country, amounts of money that have been taken out of that part of the country. They should make available to those people seeking loans the funds they require. It seems that people living west of Winnipeg, right through to British Columbia, have much more difficulty obtaining loans than do people in central Canada, who apparently have no difficulty at all.

Apparently there is no limit to how much money a person in central Canada can obtain for housing purposes, the building of apartment blocks and ancillary projects. This is because our lending institutions seem to follow a policy of making money available for people in central Canada. We ought to make certain that the money of lending institutions is made available to the people living in the extreme eastern and western parts of the country as well as those in central Canada. I also think that lending institutions ought to be obligated to disclose from what part of the country their income is derived. At the same time regulations ought to be drawn up to make sure that our lending institutions provide prescribed amounts of money to municipalities and other like bodies that need capital.

We should make certain that people living in parts other than central Canada obtain the necessary services of our lending institutions. If the treasury branches of the province of Alberta were included within the provisions of the legislation, they would fill a great need. Unless the treasury branches are included in the legislation, the people of Alberta may not obtain the relief they desire.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I should like to respond to some of the comments which have been made by hon. members. The hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson) expressed some concern that institutions that now are being authorized to make small business loans under the provisions of this act may not have money available to make such loans. May I remind him and all hon. members of the House that we sent to the finance committee last week bills to amend the Trust Companies Act, Loan Companies Act and the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act. One of the purposes of those amendments is to enable the institutions covered by these pieces of legislation to attract more deposits and, hopefully, to be in a better position to make loans of the types which are authorized under the amendments in this bill and under other statutes regulating their operations. I hope hon. members will keep the comments of the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley in mind when they decide on the pace of the consideration to be given to the bills which have been referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs for study.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Further, I should like to indicate that one purpose of these amendments is to provide a climate which will encourage the financial institutions covered by the act to make loans under it.

The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) made a number of useful comments, as did other hon. members. I want to state for the record, if for nothing else, that, as he surmised I was indeed, making some notes while he was speaking so as to be in a better position to comment later on what he was saying—I always like to follow carefully what the hon. member has in mind. I should like to assure him I always do whatever I can to respond to his requests. I was concerned when he suggested he had asked me to look into something and that I had not responded. The only incident I can recall is his request that I look into the regional impact of the tax recently enacted in connection with airline tickets. As I pointed out in the course of the debate on that subject, this is a complicated matter and in these circumstances I thought he would not expect an immediate response. However, had he kept in touch with me I would have told him something to confirm that I had begun working on this request.

I believe it is useful when replying to the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate and others who have spoken in this debate to call to mind that loans under this legislation are made by the banks and other financial institutions involved, not the government. The money for the loans comes from the banks, not from the government. This act authorizes the government to say to the financial institutions which are covered: If you are willing to

make loans on certain terms and conditions for certain purposes we will guarantee you against loss. It is, therefore, ultimately a matter for decision by the lending institutions themselves whether they make loans under the terms of the act, or the two companion acts to which the hon. member referred. These acts do not give the government authority to order the lending institutions to make the loans contemplated by them.

As I pointed out earlier in the debate, one of the major purposes of the amendments before us is to extend the lending period under the legislation so that small business loans can continue to be made. The proposal is that the lending period be extended for a further 18 months to June 30, 1971 rather than for a three year period as has been the case in the past. This would bring the lending periods contemplated in all three acts into line as far as terminal dates are concerned.

This will enable the government to carry out a review of these three programs concurrently. Such a review would permit the government to examine the entire scope of the operation, the results of the program, and the question as to whether any changes ought to be made. This review will be carried out in a way which will enable us to look at one program in the light of the experience with the others in so far as this would seem relevant. I believe that many of the suggestions made by hon. members during this stage of the debate and previously are suggestions which ought to be considered in the course of this review. For example, the point raised by the hon. member for Battle River (Mr. Downey) and others with respect to including the Alberta treasury branches under the terms of the Small Businesses Loans Act is one which might be considered at that time. We should remember that the original objective of this legislation, together with its companion measures, was to facilitate by means of government guarantees a flow of credit for certain purposes by financial institutions to small business and certain other categories of enterprise. To include agencies such as the Alberta treasury branches as eligible to receive the federal government guarantee under this law and the two companion laws would raise a very broad question as to the eligibility of lending agencies of provincial governments, and, perhaps, in some cases, even of municipal governments. This, as I say, is a broad question which would extend beyond the matter of Alberta treasury branches, which, as hon. members have said, are playing a significant part in the financial life of the province of Alberta, and I think hon. members will agree we should want to give such a suggestion serious consideration. A good opportunity for carrying out such an examination would certainly be during the course of the review to which I have referred.

I also wish to say that while the terms of this legislation and the companion legislation do not authorize the government to order the financial institutions in question to make the type of loans contemplated, the guarantee loans administration of the Department of Finance is willing to investigate complaints of the type raised by the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate. If he, and other members of the House would like to bring to my personal attention complaints which have been brought to their notice by those who have sought loans under these acts I would be happy to have those complaints looked into and have reports made on them as soon as possible.

Let me in conclusion point out, as I did on another occasion when this subject was before the House, that though lending under the small businesses loans program never approached the volume reached under the Farm Improvement Loans Act it has, nevertheless, been a useful source of term financing for Canadian business. Since its inception some 20,000 small businesses have obtained financing amounting to almost $190 million under this program and the proposals in Bill C-9 will help ensure that credit facilities of this kind continue to be available to assist small businessmen in Canada through arrangements encouraged by the federal government.

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

CANADA STUDENT LOANS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEFINITION OF "BANKS", QUALIFYING STUDENTS, ETC.

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-135, to amend the Canada Student Loans Act as reported (with out amendment) from the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Gray moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): I have a few comments to make at this stage, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the legislation

before us. It is an interesting piece of legislation. I do not know how widely this interest extends, since there do not appear to be many other speakers. Nevertheless, it is interesting to me.

This bill will broaden the sources of lending by the inclusion of trust and loan companies. Scholastic standards originally defined in the legislation now appear in another section and are left more or less to the provinces in terms of eligibility for loans. I notice, too, that a little hypocrisy has been removed from the bill. Landed immigrants no longer have to pledge that they plan to stay in Canada permanently before being accepted for a student loan. I think it would have been a simple matter for anyone to have got around this provision if they did not wish to be completely frank when making a declaration of this kind.

I notice there is now a provision in the bill fixing a semester maximum of $500 in connection with a student loan. This is perhaps in recognition of the fact that various post-secondary institutions in Canada are now embarking on newer kinds of school sessions. This may be all to the good. I am pleased that this legislation has recognized this fact. I am sorry that the student loans are continuing to be limited to full-time students. I submit it might be well worth while broadening this kind of assistance to include those who, for one reason or another, cannot attend an institution full-time but are nevertheless interested in upgrading their education during such time as they do have available. In this respect, I think Canada has been particularly remiss. We have failed to provide enough opportunities for people to gain extra education at times other than the normal dayschool time.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I think the trend today is changing. How often do we hear it said of a famous man, perhaps not so much in this country as in others, that he was originally a ditch digger who got his law degree at night school? I suggest that it would be useful indeed to broaden this legislation in this regard, and this is why I am a little critical of the provision of the bill that restricts the legislation to full-time students only. The basic loan provided under the legislation is increased to $115 million. It is to be applied on a sliding scale formula, and I should like to comment on this feature later.

The student loans legislation has been very popular if its popularity can be judged by the

number of people who have taken advantage of it. I have before me a press release by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) dated September 12, 1969 and I should like to quote the first paragraph. The press release is entitled "Canada Student Loans Plan" and reads:

> The Honourable E. J. Benson, Minister of Finance, announced today that loans totalling $65,767,496 to 107,145 students were authorized under the Canada Student Loans Plan during the period of July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1969. In the previous year—

That is the year 1967-68.

> —loans totalling $57,053,410 to 90,371 students were authorized.

This indicates two things to me. One is that I think people are showing a great and increasing interest in education. Secondly, I think it also indicates something that perhaps most members, are not quite so ready to talk about in this Parliament—I am, but there are some members who are reluctant—namely that if more students are required to borrow money to finance their education, it is because there are fewer opportunities for them to earn money by summer employment. I suggest it also indicates an economic down-turn which limits the opportunities for those students who have financed themselves in the past but cannot equally well do so today.

I suggest this is a matter into which we should look, because not only does it indicate an increasing interest on the part of young people to educate themselves, but it also indicates, or to be fair perhaps I should say it may indicate, a down-turn in the economy. As a result, in order to get their education they have to go into hock by taking a loan to be repaid over a period of nine and a half years at varying rates of interest. I do not know how the rest of the members of the House feel about this but I think this practice may well impose an extreme burden upon them. Certainly, the nine and a half years following my graduation from university were the most economically deprived of my life.

Mr. Jamieson: What about the present?

Mr. Rose: I appreciate the minister's interjection, but I have no desire at this particular point to get into the question of a pay increase for M.P.'s.

Further on in the minister's press release there is this paragraph:

> Since the inception of the Plan in 1964 to June 30, 1969 the nine participating provinces and two territories have issued approximately 378,000 certificates of eligibility amounting to $226.7 million.

That is a substantial amount of money and shows that a substantial number of students have been assisted by this loan provision. But this is far in excess of the 10,000 student scholarships—I underline the word "scholarships"—that were part of a campaign pledge made by former Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson.

But, Mr. Speaker, student loans are really but a half-way house, when you really get down to examining their rationale. Although they are necessary under our present system, they are definitely a crutch. Up to 80 per cent of the cost of secondary education today is paid by the government, either federal or provincial.

The Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen) made a statement to the House today on the efforts being made to increase employment opportunities for summer students. I think that since industry, the public and our institutions all benefit from education, not forgetting the benefit received by the students themselves, it would seem to me that it would only be logical to raise the other 20 per cent of the cost of education. We might then arrive at the point where those students who require summer employment in order to finance their education would not at the same time be competing against heads of families who are often marginally employed, in some cases putting them out of work, and this in spite of the fact that there is usually a seasonal upswing in summer employment opportunities. I think we should examine tuition costs from this point of view. I am not sure that this House, however, is the right place to look at the matter in view of the limits of federal jurisdiction in educational matters. Nevertheless, I feel the subject is worthy of mention.

Before I resume my seat, I should like to comment on the sliding scale that is being proposed in the legislation. This scale is based not on the number of young people in Canada between the ages of 18 and 24 but, instead, on the number of students presently enrolled in post-secondrary education who are between the ages of 18 and 24. The formula is based on what the condition is rather than on what the condition should be. The formula ignores the fact that in this age group of 18 to 24, 50 per cent of our students may have never completed high school. These people should be encouraged to complete their education assured that they will find a place in higher education. These dropouts are indicative of a waste of talent and an inefficient use of human resources. Their talents should be developed to contribute to the development of this country.

I would also suggest to the House that one of the difficulties encountered in the provision of secondary education is that education is often not accessible to students with merit or scholastic ability but instead is provided only to those by affluent parents and to those students who live reasonably close to a university. I believe we should look more and more to the time when students attend university on the basis of ability, not on the basis of how much money their parents have. If necessary, the students should receive travel assistance. Today our university students represent a relatively small and affluent section of the population. We must do much more to see that university education is spread uniformly and fairly through the total population. Intelligence is not confined to any single economic class.

• (4:30 p.m.)

That is the main emphasis I put on the remarks I made this afternoon. I feel the legislation is perhaps of assistance to many students. There will be an increasing number of students who wish to take advantage of this measure. They will not only wish to do so but will be forced to because there are no other alternative provisions to adequately fulfil the demands and needs of young Canadians for post secondary education.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I bow to John.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I had a little difficulty determining who was on his feet first. Does the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate wish to speak?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I have much pleasure in yielding to my hon. friend.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I hardly know how to interpret that remark, but I will take my chances and accept it graciously. I intend only to take a few minutes.

I am interested in seeing how the government continues to be involved in education, even though it is in its efforts coming in through the back door. Let me preface my remarks by saying I speak now on the basis of my opinion. Perhaps one of the reasons I was elected at the federal level was that I felt the government of Canada should assume

much more responsibility for the development of human resources than it has done in the last 100 years.

It is a fact, documented by economists and others who are not professional educators, that there is a great statistical correlation between government investment in the field of education and higher economic benefits. In other words, a country that is capable of investing in the field of education as a matter of fact enjoys greater resources in the economic field. Some people who are not in favour of investing more in the field of higher education argue that it is the economic situation which creates this investment rather than that education itself creates the investment. I hope I am not confusing the minister or the Minister without Portfolio in this regard.

An hon. Member: You are doing very well.

Mr. Lundrigan: Let me commend the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) for his remarks. I know of his educational background and I suggest that hon. members should listen carefully to some of his recommendations.

It has been suggested that there are few opportunities today for Canadian students. Again, a main reason for the increase in the number of student loans is the fact that a great many more people are desirous of obtaining a university education. This is a favourable situation. My main aim, however, is to lend my support to the suggestion made by the capable chairman of our caucus committee, and other members, regarding the restriction being placed on students eligible for loans, in that they must be full-time students.

The Government of Canada has recognized that the provinces have to be given more flexibility in the determination of who should receive a loan. Under clause 10, the provinces are given the authority to determine the scholastic standing, the academic achievement, the need and the amount of money up to $1,000 in respect of students. I suggest that this government should also permit the provinces to determine what constitutes a student rather than limiting this definition by the words "a full-time student", who must be in attendance during not less than one semester. This limitation is to be found in clause 1, subclause (3), paragraph (i). I am not a lawyer but I think that is the part. I cannot understand the need for this restriction or inflexibility.

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

First of all, the use of the word "semester" in a chancy thing because there are about 25 different definitions in various universities across the country. But on the main point, why should the student be a "full-time student"? In many areas, where salaries are low, teachers are without full qualifications and receive small wages, these people must obtain their education by attending evening classes or summer schools. They are not able to enrol as full-time students at universities.

Many thousands of teachers across Canada are not able to attend universities full time because they are married and have families which they must support. Perhaps they got their education some 20 years ago. They cannot now afford to attend university full-time in order to obtain a degreee and that expertise of many hon. members of this House, or others who consider themselves experts. They are not experts. They are just ordinary "Joes" who have only a few years of university education. They are qualified to teach under provincial statutes. Many of them have given up the teaching profession because they are not qualified to demand the higher salaries. And now they are not entitled to these student loans, although in my opinion they are professionals. These people should be permitted to obtain the maximum loan at the reduced rate of interest. They are, in many instances, more eligible than some of the greenhorns and rookies who are going to universities but cannot now qualify as teachers. Many of this latter group are likely to be dropouts.

The people who enrol in summer schools and evening courses are usually those who cannot afford to take full time programs at universities. They are unable to return to university without the advantages offered under this measure. I know of many people who have been financed from the pockets of their friends in order that they could return to school. Many of them have large families. These are the people who should be given the benefit of this measure. Many others like them are not able to finance their educational requirements and as a result remain in lesser positions with low salaries. I suggest they are being discriminated against as a result of the restriction in this measure, consequently they cannot upgrade their positions.

It is extremely vital that we do everything possible to assure these individuals an opportunity to increase their education. This point was raised during the committee hearings. I was not a member of that committee, but I

have been told that this matter was a subject of discussion. I hope the government gives consideration to the suggestion that we eliminate, through an amendment or by the application of this legislation, that restrictiveness inherent in the definition of a student.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am very very happy to follow the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) and I support the appeal he has just made. In fact, the appeal I wish to make is in the same vein, though I shall demonstrate it by reference to a particular case.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I realize that on third reading it is difficult to amend a bill which is going through the House. It is even more difficult to amend something that in fact is in the act itself. In this case it may be that no such amendment to the legislation is necessary. Indeed, perhaps what we should do is to make our point to the government with sufficient merit and weight that the government will change the regulations under the legislation. On November 25, 1969, Mr. Gordon MacDonell, Superintendent of Secondary Schools of Winnipeg, wrote the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) concerning this legislation, the Canada Student Loans Act. Mr. MacDonell's particular point related to the Winnipeg adult education centre. This is a very useful and valuable operation which has been going on for a few years. It happens to be located in my constituency. This is a centre to which adults can go when they realize they did not receive all the education they might have when attending school and wish to go back and perchance complete their matriculation or, in any case, receive supplementary education which would better fit them for life.

It would seem to me that the motives of such people deserve support and that when they require financial assistance that assistance should be forthcoming. Despite the appeal made in Mr. MacDonell's letter of November 25, to which I have referred, the Minister of Finance replied in the negative, although the letter is a page and a half long, on December 29, 1969. The argument used is that the legislation is for people who are in post-secondary institutions and that definitions have been worked out which do not include this kind of program, namely mature people, adults, who go back to complete what would amount to their high school education.

Like the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) and the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) who spoke a moment ago, if we are to assist people in obtaining an education—a proposition which surely all of us support—I believe here is a group of people who deserve not only our moral but also our financial support. I regret very much the government has not seen fit to meet the request presented to it by the Superintendent of Secondary Schools for the city of Winnipeg.

I may say parenthetically, and I confess I say it with a bit of pride, that some of these people who were anxious that this should be done under the Canada Student Loans plan made their request to the government of Manitoba and the very fine new government we now have in that province—

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dinsdale: That was not me.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The last government in Manitoba was a good one, too. This one just seems to be a little better.

Mr. Dinsdale: We all learn by experience.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The government of Manitoba, at least on a temporary basis, has made a provision the effect of which is that these people are obtaining loans. We applaud the Manitoba government for what it is doing. I am sure everyone will join in that applause. But I submit this ought to be done on a federal basis. The same principles which inspired this legislation should carry through all the way.

When I first took the floor, the reason I said it may not be necessary to amend this legislation is to be found in the fact that in the letter the Minister of Finance wrote to Mr. MacDonell on December 29 there is a paragraph concerning how these definitions were arrived at. It appears they were achieved by consultations among the provinces and that there really is no barrier in the legislation itself to the defining of an adult education centre as the kind of body that could qualify under this legislation. At least, there is no barrier if the provinces can agree. I am not even sure from the wording of the letter of the Minister of Finance that that agreement must come from all the provinces. Therefore, it would seem to me that this matter might be looked into again. That was my purpose in rising to support those who have made this kind of appeal.

I think education should be supported everywhere. It is one of those motherhood qualities in which we all believe. Surely, when a group of people realize they did not receive sufficient education when at school and have the sense and vision to want to go back and pick up their education, they are doing a service not only to themselves but to society and to Canada. I do not think they should be excluded from the governmental assistance that is available because of these technicalities in respect of an act or because the regulations drawn under that act have not been drawn with sufficient latitude. I am glad the Minister without Portfolio chose to make his speech on third reading later in the debate rather than early and I hope therefore he will have a good word for those of us who have made this appeal at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. The hon. minister cannot rise unless he has the unanimous consent of the House. Does the minister have the unanimous consent of the House to speak at this time?

An hon. Member: Agreed.

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the unanimous consent of the House. It indicates the degree of interest there is in hearing me speak. It seems to me, however, that since I did not speak at the opening of the debate I would certainly have the right of reply. I just say this in the event that inadvertently a precedent might be set.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Richard): Order. I shall read from page 139 of Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 166(4):

> If a member who moves an order of the day should rise and say only a word or two,—for instance, "that he moves the order,"—he is precluded from again addressing the House;

Mr. Gray: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have the greatest respect and praise for the manner in which you have conducted yourself in the position of Acting Speaker and Chairman of the Committee of the Whole over the years. I just wanted to indicate that, so far as I was aware, I had not said anything in moving third reading. Perhaps I moved in your direction, but I do not recall making any remarks. All this is not, however, directly relevant to my rising to speak in response to some of the very interesting comments which have been made. I shall be very brief. The hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) appeared to suggest that provision for

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

the setting of scholastic standards to determine eligibility for loans by the Federal government had been taken out of the Act and that they were being given to the provinces by the amendments. I may not have heard him correctly, but if this is what he said then I would submit there is some misconception here because the setting of scholastic standards for these loans through action of the federal government was never in the Act.

The hon. member might have been referring to an amendment which takes out of one clause some references to certificates of eligibility and puts them in another clause. I should place on the record the fact that, in effect, a bank is in a position to make a loan under the Canada Student Loans Act which would qualify for the government guarantee if a student presents to the bank a certificate issued by the appropriate authority for a province. The act says that the appropriate authority of the province may issue or cause to be issued a certificate to a qualifying student for an academic year whom that authority considers—and the section as amended here states:

> (a) to have attained a satisfactory scholastic standard, and
>
> (b) to be in need of a student loan
>
> (i) for the academic year in such amount, not exceeding one thousand dollars, or
>
> (ii) for the semester in such amount, not exceeding five hundred dollars,
>
> as the case may be, as is stated in the certificate in order to pursue a course of studies at a post-secondary school level as a full-time student at the educational institution specified therein.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Therefore, I submit that the decision as to eligibility continues, as it was before these amendments, to be one basically made by the provincial authority and is a matter of provincial responsibility.

Hon. members have made very interesting suggestions about enabling part time students to be covered under this act. An hon. member made an interesting suggestion about the definition of a post-secondary institution. If I am not mistaken, in addition to a consultation with the provinces, it could well be that it would be necessary to have some form of amendment to the act to achieve this because I note that subsection (k) of section 2 of the act specifies educational institution as an institution of learning, whether within or outside a province, that offers courses at a post-secondary school level and that is designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council of that province.

The important thing to keep in mind in raising points for consideration by the government on this—and hon. members have made very useful points along the lines that were also raised in the earlier stages of the debate—is that the provincial ministers of education are carrying out a complete review of all student aid programs. I submit again, as I did in the earlier stages of the debate, that it would not be appropriate to make fundamental changes in the act until this review has been completed and the recommendations of the ministers of education in the provinces are available to the government. It could well be that the points mentioned at this stage of the debate and at earlier stages will be among those considered and there will be recommendations on them. I am sure that putting them on the record here will make it possible to bring them to the attention of the provincial ministers of education and, of course, the federal government to be available when the provincial ministers submit their recommendations to the federal government on completion of their review.

In conclusion I will say again, as other hon. members have already said, that the Canada student loans program has played a very constructive role during the past five and a half years in helping thousands of Canadian students to pursue post secondary studies. As the hon. member for Fraser Valley West pointed out, during the first loan year of 1964-65 some 42,000 students received loans valued at over $26 million, while in the loan year ending June 30, 1969, over 107,000 students obtained loans valued at almost $66 million. It is anticipated that the volume of loans could approach $90 million in the current loan year. So, the amendments before us are to help ensure that this program will operate even more effectively in the interests of students at the post secondary level and therefore, as I said on an earlier occasion, will be to the benefit not only of these students but of our entire country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to and bill read the third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

NATIONAL MARKS AND STANDARDS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-137, respecting the use of national safety marks in relation to motor vehicles and to provide for safety standards for certain motor vehicles imported into or exported from Canada or sent or conveyed from one province to another, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour I suggest that we adjourn the debate until eight o'clock, if that is agreeable to hon. members.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale)—Air Transport—Discontinuance of Western Manitoba service by Transair; the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg)—Penitentiaries—Guards pay increase—Offer by government; the hon. member for Malpeque (Mr. MacLean)—Distinguished service awards—Reference of interdepartmental study to committee.

It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, private bills.

PRIVATE BILLS

ICG TRANSMISSION LIMITED

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River) moved that Bill S-17, to incorporate ICG Transmission Limited, as reported (without amendment) from the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: When shall the said bill be read a third time, now?

Some hon. Members: By leave, now.

Mr. Reid moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I have been interested in reading the report of the Committee on Transport and Communications on this bill because of the legislation which we have been passing lately which has been giving to other boards the responsibility for much of the work that the House used to perform, and to a small extent still is performing, with regard to this type of bill. As hon. members know, this is a pipeline bill which raises a problem which occurs frequently in that the company is asking, not for a Canadian route, but for a route through the United States and therefore the establishment of a number of companies rather than of one operating on the Canadian scene. I have read the report and I think that it is interesting to note that, as pointed out by the company, two thirds of this route would pass through Canada and one third through the United States. The cost of it would be $4 million for the Canadian section and $2 million for the U.S. section. Why it is more expensive per mile in the United States than in Canada is difficult to understand. An hon. member who sits close by says that the reason for this is that the terrain there is rocky.

This leads me to the other argument made by the company when they were asked why the route did not go through Canada. The company pointed out that the alternate route would be from the Trans-Canada line through the edge of the Canadian shield and thus would be plagued by both water and rocks, which was not felt to be advantageous. This might not be the real reason for the route not crossing Canada, and this raises a problem which I wish to mention. The reason that the route is brought down through the United States is that this company intends to sell a considerable amount of gas in the United States. They have established a U.S. company to work in co-operation with the newly established Canadian company, both companies being held by Inter City Gas. The reason for this is that there is a lucrative market for gas in the United States and only a limited one in Canada. For this reason, I believe that the representative of the company would have been more accurate if he had stressed the fact that money would be derived from the route in the United States.

• (5:00 p.m.)

As we all know, there is a very limited market in that area. It is probable that the only reason the pipeline is coming back into Canada is to serve the new pulp and paper complex in the Fort Frances area. We are not opposed to this. In fact, we are pleased that this particular development is taking place and that gas can be brought in to make feasible the operation of that pulp and paper complex in the Fort Frances area.

I think one weakness of the committee discussion is the inability or lack of desire to find out the comparison in cost in terms of the service to Canada from this pipeline. I am not sure from reading the report what the distance would be as I do not know whether it is to be brought directly into the Fort Frances area from the Trans-Canada pipeline or brought from south of Winnipeg into the Fort Frances area. This is an important matter and obviously will have some relationship to the cost per cubic foot in terms of gas delivered to the Canadian pulp and paper complex at Fort Frances and the difference that will be created by the amount of gas sold in the United States from points along that pipe line. It is unlikely it will pass through a number of communities without some sales being made.

I have been pleased to note that in the main this is a Canadian operation, with a large percentage of the shares held by Canadians, approximately ten to one, and that it has been quite successful in selling gas in Minnesota and southern Manitoba. I have always been concerned with the choice of a route for either a gas or oil pipeline. We will again be faced with this problem when we consider developing an oil line across Canada to serve the eastern markets.

It seems that we are depending entirely on the National Energy Board to make the assessment of whether the costs justify the means or whether the company should decide where to build a pipeline on the basis of serving a larger area with larger sales. This shorter route should be weighed against the proposition of an all-Canadian route. There may be savings through lower cost, although there may be an increase in capital costs for installation purposes and the volume would be less than if it served a large number of communities.

I believe this company has a good record, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, it does since the committee has agreed to this proposal. However, I am still concerned about this matter. I did not have the opportunity that committee members had of seeing the map showing where the proposed structure would be. I do not know if it is to be built from the Trans-Canada pipeline on the north to the city of Fort Frances on the south, nor am I aware of

the additional route that would be necessary to bring it to Fort Frances from the south. I am not in a position to even guess what the mileage would be nor am I in a position to guess at the total sales. Both of these will have some effect on the situation.

A company could legitimately argue that if they brought their pipeline in from the south, if they had an export permit and were allowed to sell a large volume of gas en route to the Fort Frances complex, the price would be lower. However, we know from experience this is not true. This has never happened. Gas is not a lower priced commodity because every person on the street uses it. It is the same price whether there are only one or two customers on the street or if everyone uses it. It is doubtful whether a large number of subscribers would substantially reduce the cost of gas to the Fort Frances complex as well as areas situated along the pipeline.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, it could be argued that if the pipeline were built entirely in Canada, although the capital cost would be considerably higher than using an alternative route, the capital cost would eventually be written off. Through our tax structure these companies are given considerable assistance. Much of their capital cost is written off over a period of time. There would then be a short pipeline. The National Energy Board would calculate the cost on the distance involved. The transportation costs would be reduced and eventually the ultimate consumer would have the benefit of a reduction in cost.

I am not very concerned about this bill. I know the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) is very interested in it because it affects his area. We are pleased that this development is taking place. It is taking place at a very good time. For a number of years there has been a very slack market for the pulp and paper industry. Apparently this has now changed for the better and many companies intend to get into production very shortly. I hope the building of this pipeline will be of assistance to them.

I ask hon. members to give consideration to an all-Canadian pipeline. I ask them to consider the advantages we will receive in terms of reduction of costs which is very important to the ultimate consumer. Also we will have control over this facility if it is totally under one agency. Mr. Graham, who represented the company, pointed out that there will be two sister companies, one to handle relations with the federal agency in the United States and the other to handle relations with the National Energy Board in Canada. These companies will operate under significantly different criteria and often under legislation that is not necessarily designed to produce the same results. These two companies will be under the control of a third company, the parent company. Hon. members will agree this creates a complication which would not have arisen if the complete pipeline were built in Canada. When one or two committee members made inquiries about this matter, Mr. Graham commented that they had tentatively studied an alternate route but dismissed this. He did not have any figures to offer nor did he offer an alternative.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I think that the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, after he gets over being pleased to have this gas coming into the area, may be concerned about the cost. Many factors contribute to cost and one would be the shorter distance in Canada; a second would be that capital costs will eventually be written off. The pipeline will operate as a transportation facility long after the capital is repaid.

The fact that we ask questions about the ownership and control of the company by Canadians means little when we cannot write in and are not writing into the corporations act any limitations on the sale of shares. It is not like the banks and life insurance companies where we have legislation to ensure that the situation does not change. If the 300-odd Canadian shareholders should decide to sell out, then the situation would be changed.

While I am not particularly concerned with this company, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with the attitude of some Canadians and of some members of Parliament to this over-all problem. It is my opinion that we will have to face a very serious decision in the next few years regarding a new transcontinental oil line. It is my hope that the things that make up the desires and aspirations of a nation will be taken into consideration, as well as the fact that a particular company may not want to go through the rock and water of northern Ontario but would rather detour through the United States. This would mean that a foreign agency would be able to control one of our natural resources. Hon. members should give some consideration to this, not particularly because of this bill but because this bill does, in a small way, point out many of the problems we are going to have with pipelines in the future.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, in dealing with Bill S-17 on third reading, it was noted in testimony that the sponsor of the bill, the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) would make a correction in *Hansard* which I expected he would do when he closed the debate.

In a debate we had in the Committee on Transport and Communications, various things came up upon which most of us agreed. However, the basic philosophy concerning the transportation of natural resources in our country through another country and then back again to Canada is one with which I cannot agree. The pipeline is 160 miles long and 40 miles of that goes through Minnesota, then comes back to International Falls.

It seems to me when application is made by a corporation or pipeline company for a detour such as this feasibility studies should be available for the committee to consider possible alternate routes. In this particular case, there was no feasibility study made as far as building the pipeline directly from the Trans-Canada to the Canadian destination. I am very pleased to see that this company was quite prepared to table and add as an appendix, a list of the shareholders involved in the company. It is noteworthy that of 311,537 shares issued as outstanding, 307,836 are held by 817 shareholders resident in Canada and 3,701 shares are held by 20 shareholders in the United States. Mr. Speaker, I am sure none of us could have any objection to this type of corporation doing business in Canada with that type of corporate setup.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, looking at the route of the pipeline and remembering that we had a railroad trying to take our coal resources from the Kootenays to the United States and back to Roberts Bank, the analogy is too much to accept. The Great Northern would like nothing better than to obtain permission to take this coal through the United States and back to Roberts Bank. In this case, the Canadian Pacific would be left out in the distance somewhere. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have reservations about this bill before us.

We will be very glad that this pipeline will serve a portion of Manitoba which has not got natural gas at the moment, but surely feeder lines could have provided service if this pipeline company or any other were interested.

Another point that bothers me is the amount of money being spent on labour. At page 7.8 in the transcript of the hearings, we see that some $4 million will be spent in Canada and $2 million in the United States in the construction of the pipeline. I realize there are problems regarding employment of Canadians across the border, but it is only in the last few years that the United States immigration department has become so strict about visas for people working there on contracts allotted to and tendered by Canadian companies. As a result, they could not keep their employees on the United States portions of a particular job. Co-operation between Canada and the United States should relieve this situation so that our labour could complete the whole 160 miles of this pipeline without having to subcontract the 40-mile section through the United States.

I realize that there is also a problem as far as the union is concerned, but this too should be rectified. There should not be any restrictions on Canadian workers in the United States on a project such as this, any more than if a United States firm had the same opportunities here. We all appreciate that there are hardly any pipeline construction companies in Canada which are subject to United States domination in so far as the Construction contract is concerned. I am sure that all those bidding on this particular line would like to see it a completely Canadian job. I was very pleased to learn, through the evidence brought forth before the committee, that the pipe at least will be constructed by some Canadian company. This will give employment in Canada which, of course, is one of our main concerns.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to be consistent in our desire to have pipelines in Canada, then the next pipeline built, which will be one to serve the east, should be constructed by an all-Canadian group. While this one does serve a section of Minnesota and comes back into Canada some problems exist, namely that we are using the territory of another country, as well as its labour, for the transportation of our natural resource. However, I for one will never take exception to the route because I am pleased to say that this particular company has its domain in Winnipeg and its major shareholders are in Canada. This is something we can appreciate at this particular time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I see the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid) rising to speak. I might point out that he can only speak at this time with the unanimous consent of the House. Is it so agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, I rise only to make the correction in *Hansard* to which the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) referred. In *Hansard* of January 15, 1970 at page 2447 the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) asked me a question and I inadvertently gave him incorrect information. The hon. member asked if I could give him the areas to which Inter City Gas Company distributed natural gas. I replied:

My information is that it distributes natural gas throughout the southern part of Manitoba and parts of the city of Winnipeg.

That information is incorrect. The company distributes gas through the rural part of Manitoba and also the northern part of Minnesota; it does not distribute gas to parts of Winnipeg.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I should like to make a brief comment about the routing. I recognize the argument advanced by hon. members concerning that part of the pipeline going through the United States. But may I also point out that other communities in the Rainy River district such as Emo and Rainy River could not have natural gas service except as a result of this routing. Therefore, from the point of view of servicing the people of the Rainy River district, this type of routing is necessary. It would not have been possible for this part of the district to attract a pipeline running down from the Trans-Canada line because the cost would have been too much. This course was followed in a former part of my constituency and a pipe line was dropped down from the Trans-Canada Pipe Line at Ignace to Atikokan over a distance of approximately 40 to 50 air miles. Although, the cost was high it could be borne because two iron mines at Atikokan had contracted to take large amounts of the gas over a long period of time.

May I thank hon. members for their assistance in the House and during the committee proceedings when the bill was considered.

Mr. Deputy 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.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before the House proceeds to the next item of business, I point out that pursuant to Standing Order 75 (3) the House is not permitted to consider items No. 2, 3, 4 and 5 under the heading of Private Bills on the Order Paper. 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.

Since Bills S-10, S-11, S-15 and S-16 were reported only yesterday, the 40-hour provision has not been met. The House will therefore proceed to the next order of business, namely, notices of motions (papers).

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I believe there is general agreement that we stand the first three notices of motions and proceed with No. 104, in the name of the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg).

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR COPIES OF CONSULTANT STUDIES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw) moved:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all outside consultant studies undertaken for the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs as mentioned in answer to Question No. 1,323, tabled on June 25, 1969, as reported in *Hansard* on page 10597.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am utterly amazed to hear that the government refuses to supply the pertinent information the motion requests. It seems that the consumers of this nation are paying for the cost of these reports. The government seems to be ignoring the warning of the Prices and Incomes Commission. As I say, our consumers are paying the bill and it seems to me that the consumers of Canada, through their members of Parliament, are entitled to obtain the information asked for in the notice of motion. Furthermore, they are entitled to know whether the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is really concerned about the matter of costs and rising prices in this country. Question No. 1,323 reads as follows in part:

For the fiscal years 1963-64, 1964-65, 1965-66, 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69, what outside consultant studies have been undertaken or are presently in progress sponsored by the following Departments and Agencies—

A number of agencies and departments were then enumerated. The second part of the question reads as follows:

What was the cost for each outside consultant study prepared for each department and agency and were the contracts from each department or agency awarded by competitive tendering and, if not, for what reason?

The first part of the government's answer tries to show what action has been taken. The document in my hand relating to the answer shows the following:

1. (a) Task Force—Corporate Law

(b) Task Force—Securities Regulation

(c) Operations Research Incorporated: Consumer Affairs Programme Planning and Analysis Study

(d) Canadian Committee on Mutual Funds and Investment Contracts

In the second portion of the answer which relates to the cost of outside consultants and whether tenders for the work had been submitted, we see the following:

2. (a)	1967-68	$117,628	No tenders
	1968-69	60,000	No tenders
(b)	1967-68	30,078	No tenders
(c)	1967-68	83,000	No tenders
	1968-69	57,000	No tenders
(d)	1967-68	120,007	No tenders
	1968-69	65,155	No tenders

The aggregate amount spent without tenders having been received is over $500,000. The latter part of that answer indicates that consultants who were engaged were lawyers, university professors and graduate and post-graduate students completing their degrees.

I have often said that such studies ought to be tendered for, and if this government were really interested in participatory democracy it would make sure that tenders are submitted. We have often been told to wait for the report of the task force on government information. That report is now in our hands, but the government still refuses to make known to the people of Canada exactly how much has been spent on consultant studies with relation to the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. On page 1 of the task force report we read the following paragraph:

Governments feel increasingly a compulsion to compel: the single issue of environmental pollution will shortly oblige every citizen to comply with government regulations affecting cherished private routines of living.

In these circumstances, governments must acquire the power to speak persuasively and continuously, on many subjects and at many levels of comprehension. Unless this skill on the part of government is quickly acquired, there is a risk that administration will be swamped by rising tides of incomprehension and discontent.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

Unless the people of this country can obtain necessary information which will enable them to judge whether the actions of the government are to their advantage, there will be discontent. If there is to be any real democracy in Canada, then people who write to their members of Parliament for information ought to be entitled to be given that information. I also think it should be absolutely mandatory for these consultant studies to be awarded on the basis of tender.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I cannot accept for one moment that there should be a select, priority list of consultants who obtain all these jobs from the government. To tell certain consultants and contractors that they are not entitled, or are not sufficiently competent to work for the government is a disservice to those who pay taxes and play their part in a so-called democracy. What we are doing when we call for consultant studies under present arrangements amounts to bootlegging certain people into the government service.

On the basis of the relatively short time I have spent in Ottawa, I do not have to tell hon. members who have spent a considerably longer time here about the number of consultants who have benefited from choice government contracts. The public should have the right to see the results of these studies and know exactly what is going on. The same argument applies to the system of tenders; there is too much secrecy attached to the system and we do not know which firms bid for what contracts, and on what terms and conditions.

As long ago as 1937, Mr. Mackenzie King said, as recorded on page 3 of the report to which I have referred:

Where there is little or no public opinion there is likely to be bad government, which sooner or later becomes autocratic government." And though dead prime ministers and dead presidents may not necessarily be unfailing founts of current wisdom, it is still interesting that a century and a half before that, James Madison had this to say about governments and information: "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both."

The same thing applied to these tenders and studies. The government's consistent refusal to produce the papers for which we have asked means that the people of Canada are witnessing a farce or a tragedy. It is high time they realized exactly what confronts them as far as consultant studies are concerned. A number of observations on the sub-

ject have been made in various newspapers. Bob Cohen has written about it in the *Globe and Mail* and an editorial on the subject has appeared in that paper. George Bain has also written on the subject. It all boils down to this: we cannot have a true democracy unless all these studies are made public. We cannot expect any type of participation by the people of Canada in the democratic process unless the government makes sure that the information which it has available is also available to the people, so that they may know what is really happening.

I am particularly surprised that the information sought in the Notice of Motion we are now considering would not be made available to the public. This criticism relates to one department in particular in which everyone in Canada has a direct interest, namely, the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I plead with the government to make these documents available. I can think of nothing which might be contained in them which should not be made public. It is on the basis of information of this kind that people can reach informed decisions and journalists can write intelligent editorials summing up the direction in which we are moving. I urge the government to make this information available now, so that all of us can be as familiar with the subject of consumer affairs as are the government's consultants.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul Langlois (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the studies mentioned by the member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg) in his notice of motion (papers) No. 104 are confidential and they relate to the making of the policy, except one report prepared by Operation Research Inc. on the organization of the consumer program.

We would be happy to table this report, but we ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion as far as the other studies are concerned.

[*English*]

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this debate, but the hon. member whose motion this is has shown a very sophisticated lack of knowledge concerning the whole field of research and, with respect, I feel he should be put right with regard to at least one aspect of it, that is, tenders.

If the government requires steel of a certain size and weight, it is a simple matter to ask for tenders. But if it is seeking information which cannot be so easily specified, the situation becomes more complex. The government would be justified in calling for public tenders for supplies of paper or books. Having had some experience in the field of market research and research in general, I should like to point out to the hon. member that a research project is not outlined at the outset. The government or the institution concerned does not say; "Ask these questions; interview these people."

What happens is that firms of consultants are invited to make proposals. These proposals outline the type of research it is intended to conduct in order to find the answers to certain questions, together with an estimate of the cost. Some proposals may be double the cost of others. On the other hand, if what is wanted in an answer to a question, some firms might interview two persons and others would interview a thousand. The customer must decide whether, regardless of the cost, one firm or the other is likely to produce the right answer. Once this decision is made, the customer cannot go to another firm and say; "This proposal came from another firm, but you can do it cheaper." That is not the way in which it is done. If the hon. member would examine the way in which the research and consultative studies industry has developed, he will find that the tender system was dropped some years ago because it had been found to be an utter failure.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a short question? Does he believe that tender by invitation is the only way in which an operation such as the government is engaged in could be conducted?

Mr. Otto: In the field of research and consultative studies, invitation proposals are the only way which has been found to be successful over the past 22 years.

Mr. Skoberg: How do you get on the list?

Mr. Otto: Just be a researcher.

Mr. Skoberg: Is the hon. member suggesting the government should get in touch with everybody?

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

Division

• (5:40 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Burton
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)
Carter
Coates
Crouse
Dinsdale
Dionne
Downey
Dumont
Fairweather
Flemming
Gauthier
Gleave
Godin
Grills
Horner
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
La Salle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacEwan
MacLean
MacRae
McCleave
McGrath
McKinley
McQuaid
Matte
Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Nesbitt
Noble
Nowlan
Nystrom
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Rose
Scott
Skoberg
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Valade
Winch—58.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Blair
Blouin
Borrie
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieux (Labelle)
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crossman
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Émard
Forest
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goode
Gray
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Haidasz
Honey
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Loiselle
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Pepin
Pilon
Portelance
Pringle
Reid
Richardson
Robinson
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Serré
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting
Yanakis—103.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost. It being six o'clock, the hour assigned for the consideration of private members' business is now terminated. This House stands adjourned until eight o'clock this evening.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

NATIONAL MARKS AND STANDARDS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Jamieson that Bill C-137, respecting the use of national safety marks in relation to motor vehicles and to provide for safety standards for certain motor vehicles imported into or exported from Canada or sent or conveyed from one province to another, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that hon. members will understand the degree of satisfaction that I take in being able to introduce and explain to some extent the measure which is now before the House. It has been quite a while since we began our planning for what might be properly described as this auto safety bill, but I think it is one of the more important measures that hon. members will be called upon to enact during the present

session and I am sure also that it will receive widespread endorsement in all parts of the House.

On June 17 I indicated that the government was giving consideration to legislation to establish mandatory safety standards for new motor vehicles and their components at the point of manufacture or of importation into Canada. The main reason for this legislation is the government's awareness of and concern about the seriousness of the highway accident situation and about the danger to the health of citizens which may result from motor vehicle exhaust and possible noise emissions.

In this connection I may say that this is not merely a highway safety bill in the rather confined definition of that word, but in fact it will go beyond that particular objective in order to take the first steps at least in terms of emissions from automobiles that can be a danger to health. I hope in my introductory remarks to illustrate to hon. members in a few moments just how we propose to do this.

The federal government has evidence that significant reductions in motor vehicle traffic accidents, injuries and deaths can be effected through the provision of safety standards for motor vehicles and components at the point of manufacture. This is clearly the most logical point at which to attack the problem to ensure that when the automobile leaves the factory in the first instance it is as safe as it is possible for those involved, from a technological and now from a legislative point of view, to devise. Therefore, we have this legislation coupled, incidentally, with the research program which my department is undertaking, and I am confident that this should contribute significantly to increased safety in motor vehicle transportation in Canada.

The legislation itself deals primarily with those parts of the highway safety program which are designed to improve the calibre of the automobile, but I want to emphasize that simultaneously we are undertaking a stepped-up research program into all aspects of highway safety. Of course, in some respects this is perhaps even more important than the standards of the automobile itself because it is only after an automobile becomes involved in an accident that the safety measures can, in effect, come into play. What we really have to find answers to before we can move truly, in a major way, into the field of solution and improvement is what it is that causes accidents in the first instance.

While a good deal of publicity is often given to the drunken driver or the impaired driver, and while we have taken steps in an effort to improve that situation through the breathalyzer test, it is still a fact that a great deal is unknown about what causes drivers to become involved in accidents under circumstances which do not appear, on the surface at least, to contribute in any way to the actual crash.

So in addition to moving on the legislative front, through these efforts, to improve the safety standards of the vehicle itself, we will be moving as well—I am sure hon. members will get details of this at the committee stage—to step up our research efforts, because in the last analysis the prevention of accidents is the most important consideration.

In preparing this bill we recognized the need for close consultation with the provincial departments responsible for road and motor vehicle administration. As you are aware, sir, the provinces have primary responsibility for roads and road traffic as well as motor vehicle and driver registration. Here, if I may be permitted, I should like to pay tribute to the provincial ministers concerned who have shown at least as much interest in this matter as the federal government. They have also co-operated with us in every way—as the debate will undoubtedly reveal, and the subsequent questioning in committee—in order to ensure the maximum amount of co-operation between the two levels of government, because the federal effort alone would not be sufficient to make a significant improvement.

The federal-provincial discussions to which I have referred led to my meeting with the provincial ministers on September 4, 1969, when it was agreed that the federal government should assume responsibility for the safety standards for new motor vehicles manufactured in Canada and for motor vehicles imported into Canada. At this time it was also agreed that the provinces, under existing legislation, would undertake to ensure the safety of vehicles in use as well as the safety of replacement and additional parts for motor vehicles.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I think there was unanimous agreement that at the federal level we could make the biggest impact on the problem by dealing with the new car manufacturer, to ensure that as cars left the factory they were in top condition. It was also agreed that we would work closely with the provinces to ensure, wherever necessary, that they would introduce the kind of legislation which would

put their needs on all fours with ours in terms of replacement parts. The provincial ministers indicated their support of the objectives in this field and the means contemplated to impose them, and it was agreed that the federal government should proceed with its legislation as quickly as possible.

The measure that I have the honour to introduce tonight, Mr. Speaker, is a bill which the provinces and the appropriate provincial ministers have said is desirable and one with which they are wholly prepared to co-operate.

At this stage I think it is important that I set forth with some care the principle of the bill. The bill defines a "motor vehicle" as, "any vehicle designed to be driven or drawn on roads by any means other than muscular power." It does not include vehicles designed for running on rails. Perhaps the operative words are, " 'motor vehicle' means any vehicle designed to be driven or drawn on roads". In a sense, that is the outside limit of the definition.

I am sure subsequent discussion will bring out that this puts us in a somewhat uncertain position with regard to some new types of vehicles now being introduced. I refer specifically to perhaps the most remarkable phenomenon in the new automotive age, the snowmobile and the snowcruiser—that kind of vehicle. We have had discussions with the provinces as to how this kind of machine might be brought under control. At the moment, however, there is such a conflict in the various forms of jurisdiction across the country that it was not deemed advisable to do it now. Nevertheless, the legislation does provide the means by which at some future time these modes of travel to which I have referred, the off-highway vehicle and various others, can be brought within the ambit of this legislation.

The act distinguishes between a manufacturer, distributor and importer. Here I get into some legal jargon with regard to persons engaged in the business of manufacturing, distributing and importing, respectively. I think these three categories are quite important in terms of legislation. Manufacturing, of course, includes the process of assembly.

The bill would give the government of Canada the authority to prescribe safety standards which would regulate the design, construction and functioning of motor vehicles and their components for the purpose of protecting persons against personal injury, impairment of health or death. I want to emphasize again the impairment of health

[Mr. Jamieson.]

provision, which I think will prove to be extremely important. Twenty-nine standards have now been prepared which can be adopted as the initial regulations under this legislation. In other words, Mr. Speaker, if and when this honourable House chooses to pass this legislation, there are now 29 standards which officials of the Department of Transport have established and which could be introduced immediately as the first set of regulations under this measure. Subsequently, of course, there will be others as new devices are discovered, but 29 are now in place and can be introduced. I should be very pleased to make copies available to hon. members who may wish to comment upon them. The bill would give this authority to the government under these 29 standards.

These standards deal with the main safety features which would be henceforth incorporated in all new motor vehicles for sale in Canada. As of the time of implementation, they would automatically become the standard and the starting point for the new legislation. For obvious reasons—and this is one of the matters which has concerned me a good deal in planning for this legislation, and I think it will also concern other hon. members—the initial standards will be identical in intent to those currently enforced in the United States.

The reason for this, of course, is the tremendous interchange of automobiles back and forth across the border. Indeed, the situation at the moment is that many automobiles manufactured in Canada are not in fact sold to Canadians, and a great many of the automobiles bought by Canadians are manufactured in the United States. Because of this transborder traffic it is necessary at the present time to have our regulations more or less on all fours with those of the United States.

I would like to emphasize, however, that some standards could be altered to conform with special Canadian requirements, and others may be added as the need arises. The most obvious would be some necessary provision for winter conditions in this country, which might not be necessary on some cars sold in the United States. Indeed, at some point we might have to modify these regulations so that cars being sold out of Canadian plants to the tropics would not be required, as they would be under the regulations, to be sold with heating equipment. As a first step it was felt desirable to keep them on the same basis and eventually, hopefully, to introduce special conditions for Canada where they were considered necessary.

It is hoped that the initial regulation can be published in March or April, and thereby become effective at the commencement of production of the 1971 model vehicles. In other words, there is a rather important timetable, and I am quite confident that members will recognize this. I am sure if the legislation commends itself to the House at all, it will be law by that time. It is therefore important that we have the necessary authority to indicate to the manufacturers what the regulations will be, in time for the 1971 car year which begins quite a bit ahead of the point at which vehicles are put on sale.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, would the minister allow a question before he goes on to another provision of the bill? My question is not argumentative, I assure you. I wonder whether he would attach to *Hansard* a list of the 29 standards to which he referred, so that all Members of Parliament may be aware of them.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, of course, Mr. Speaker. If the House gives consent, I will be pleased to table them immediately. I have concluded my formal remarks.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Does the House agree?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): And appended to *Hansard.*

Mr. Jamieson: And appended to *Hansard,* of course.

[*Editor's Note: For list referred to, see appendix.*]

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, the definition of safety standards contained in the bill refers specifically to the impairment of health. This provision was not in our original planning, but we came to the conclusion it was the most appropriate place for us to attack the question of air pollution by automobile exhaust. This provision would allow the government to issue regulations limiting harmful exhaust emissions from motor vehicles. It is contemplated, therefore, that exhaust emissions will be included in the initial regulations under the act. This is in addition to the 29 provisions to which I have referred. We shall also study the relationship between motor vehicle noise and the impairment of health. Should the evidence indicate a need to control noise pollution from this source, regulations will be issued under this act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: So we have tried to be as all-embracing as possible in introducing these two measures. The noise problem is a little more difficult to cope with, particularly in terms of snowmobiles and so forth, but as one hon. member and I agreed this afternoon, noise emission might be the biggest single factor.

The act will establish national safety margins as trademarks which are the exclusive property of Canada. Under the act regulations will be made respecting the use of the national safety mark on prescribed classes of vehicles, such as passenger cars, multipurpose passenger vehicles, trucks, buses and motorcycles. The use of the mark—I wish to emphasize this—will imply compliance of the motor vehicle and its components with the prescribed safety standards.

• (8:20 p.m.)

It is not, if I may use an old phrase, a good housekeeping seal of approval. It does not say, in effect, "This vehicle has been inspected and has been approved by inspectors appointed under the act." The onus and the responsibility is on the manufacturer to show, by the application of this mark, that he has in fact complied with the conditions set down in such regulations as may be operable at any given moment. The form of this mark, as well as its location on the vehicle, will also be prescribed, together with the date of manufacture. Misuse of the national safety mark will be an offence. In passing, may I note that the bill provides for stiff penalties ranging from $5,000 to as much as $200,000 if convicted of offences under the act.

Manufacturers and distributors are prohibited from applying the national safety mark to motor vehicles, or from selling or possessing motor vehicles, to which has been applied the national safety mark unless those vehicles and their components comply with all safety standards applicable at the time the vehicle was manufactured. In other words, they cannot have vehicles in their possession unless these conditions have been met.

Manufacturers and distributors are also prohibited from exporting or from sending or conveying from one province to another motor vehicles to which the national safety mark has not been applied. Therefore, in the interests of Canada's good name and prestige abroad, while we are saying that we will have minimum requirements for Canada, we are also saying that we will not sell a less

satisfactory car in any part of the world. As I said a few moments ago, the only distinction is in the possibility that when cars are to be sold in tropical countries, we might not require heating equipment in them.

Safety standards will also be prescribed for motor vehicles imported into Canada. This, again, is a most important consideration. These standards will also very probably be identical to those applicable to cars manufactured in Canada. All imported vehicles and their components will be required at the time of importation to comply with the prescribed safety standards applicable at the time the vehicles were manufactured. Hence, vehicles manufactured after the proclamation of this act could be imported only if they complied with the regulations. Individuals or companies importing new or used vehicles will be required to produce evidence at the time of importation demonstrating compliance with the regulations applicable when the vehicle was manufactured.

These safety standard regulations will not apply, however, to vehicles being brought into Canada temporarily for the purposes of exhibition and demonstration, nor to vehicles being used by tourists or visitors entering or passing through Canada. In the latter case I suspect that most vehicles will come in from the United States and, since the regulations in Canada and in the United States will be more or less similar, I do not foresee any difficulty being created.

The act will make it an offence for manufacturers, distributors or importers to fail to give notice of any defect. This, too, is a most important provision. This requirement applies when the manufacturer, distributor or importer is aware of the vehicle defect affecting safety. They are then required to furnish a notice to persons who have purchased the vehicles from them, to subsequent purchasers to whom warrantees have been transferred, and also to the Minister of Transport.

Incidentally, in my arrangements with the provincial ministers I have undertaken that immediately I or whoever the minister of transport may be receives the notification, it will be passed on to the appropriate provincial minister to take whatever action is deemed necessary within the provincial jurisdiction. These notices are to be sent by registered mail and will contain a description of the defect and the evaluation of the safety risk, as well as a statement of the means to be taken to correct the defect. It will not be a notice simply telling someone that his car is inadequate. The companies will have to tell those people just how much risk the defect involves, and what they must do in order to correct it.

Clause 9 of part I of the provides:

> A copy of each regulation ... that the Govenor in Council proposes to make—

This is with respect to safety standard.

> —shall be published in the *Canada Gazette* and a reasonable opportunity shall be afforded to manufacturers, distributors, importers and other interested persons to make representations to the minister with respect thereto.

This provision will thus prevent the incorporation of any possible technical errors in our regulations and will also allow industry some time to ensure that their products comply with the regulations. We think this is a reasonable provision in view of the fact that many of the regulations promulgated under the act will require the expenditure of hundreds of thousands, and perhaps millions of dollars. We think it right to give manufacturers and other interested parties, which includes the general public, an opportunity to make submissions before the regulations become law.

Mr. Skoberg: How long is "reasonable"?

Mr. Jamieson: That is a good question and it is one which can only be determined by circumstances. In case other hon. members did not hear that remark, the hon. member asked, "How long is 'reasonable'?"

The act will provide the government with power to enter places where motor vehicles and their components are manufactured or stored, for the purpose of inspecting both vehicles and applicable records. The act will also provide for the seizure, detention and forfeiture of vehicles found to be in violation of its provisions. The act will, further, specify penalties for violations of various provisions by either corporations or individuals, under both summary conviction and conviction by indictment. As I mentioned a moment ago, the bill provides a scale of penalties ranging up to $200,000 for some violations.

I hope this is a reasonably comprehensive summary of what is involved in the bill. I consider it a major step forward in what is undeniably one of the many serious problems facing us in this country and, indeed, the peoples of all civilized countries of the world. This House spends a good deal of time, understandably, discussing the loss of life which results from tragedies such as war and conflict. But the simple truth is that the car-

nage on our highways, the loss of life as a result of accidents, is of major proportions. Motor vehicle accidents are one of the major killers of modern man. It has taken a long time—perhaps many hon. members will say too long—for us to get this legislation together. It has not been an easy task. But I believe we have come up with a satisfactory and productive approach to this major problem.

I do not wish to end without again emphasizing that from my studies of this matter over recent months it has become apparent to me that there is a great lack of information concerning the causes of accidents and a great need for research into this matter. No matter how good the automobile is in the first instance, it will not get into trouble unless there is some action or reaction on the part of the person behind the wheel. There is a surprising lack of knowledge about the motivations of people who get into accidents. Are there really people who are accident prone? Should we have a more comprehensive driver's test and a more frequent reassessment of drivers? Should we, instead of advocating simply that people who drink should not drive, also advocate that people who are emotionally disturbed should not drive?

There are all manner of items in this category which remain woefully unresearched at the present time, but I think it is vitally important that we introduce this legislation now and make the regulations as stringent as possible. However, it would be a ghastly mistake if we as legislators were to leave the matter there and say we have done our part. The responsibility, in the last analysis, rests upon us to see that the necessary research is undertaken in order that we may find out why accidents happen.

It is not merely, as we are beginning to find out, the drinking driver who fits into the category of the accident prone driver; there are thousands of other causes for accidents. Therefore, hand in hand with this legislation, which I commend to hon. members, is my undertaking to the House that within our department we will step up considerably our research efforts.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I am looking forward to outlining in more detail in committee the nature of some of these projects. I am grateful to hon. members for the kind comments they made about this bill when it was given first reading. I hope that with their help we can make it law and extend its benefits to the people of Canada as quickly as possible.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan-Boundary): Would the minister permit a question? I am not clear about the effect of clause 2(f) which contains the definition of "motor vehicle," and I should like some clarification. What is the status of farm vehicles under this definition?

Mr. Jamieson: I am sure this is the kind of question we shall deal with at great length in the committee. The operative words here appear to be "designed to be driven....on roads." The act applies to any vehicle designed for use on roads even though it might be marketed primarily for use off the road. It will thus apply to all vehicles licensed by the provinces for operation on highways, but it could be extended to cover mini-bikes, air cushion vehicles, dune buggies and the so-called all-terrain vehicles whose numbers are growing all the time.

An hon. Member: What about tractors?

Mr. Jamieson: Yes, if they are licensed for use on highways.

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all listened with much interest to the minister's interpretation of this bill. He did a capable job. I want to fill in some of the background by showing how the bill came to the House of Commons; how long ago it is since this issue was placed before Parliament.

The first and most important move made by this government in respect of highway safety was its action in making the breathalyzer test mandatory. I now have a further measure of satisfaction in the government presenting Bill C-137 to the House of Commons for approval, even with its inadequacies and after long delay. My satisfaction arises from the fact that I took the initiative in introducing highway safety to the House of Commons and appealed to the government to accept some of the responsibility for reducing the tragic toll being taken on our highways in terms of death and injury. To introduce the question to the House of Commons, on November 19, 1963, I put this question to the prime minister of the day:

> Would the Prime Minister take the first opportunity to make a television appeal to the Canadian people in order to impress upon them the great necessity for better observance of highway safety regulations, in the hope that we might reduce the traffic death toll which was so much in evidence last week end?

He replied:

> I would be glad to do anything I can along the lines suggested by the hon. member, including an appeal over television if that were appropriate in the circumstances.

To my knowledge, nothing was done. Therefore, on April 16, 1964, I made another approach by asking the Minister of National Health and Welfare the following question:

Is any research being carried on by the minister's department with a view to discovering ways and means of curbing air pollution by vehicular traffic which is becoming an increasingly serious threat to the health of our nation.

The minister replied:

My department is conducting research into air pollution generally and we are keeping a close eye on efforts aimed at reducing noxious gases from internal combustion engines. We are also in close contact with United States public health service which is spending vast amounts of money on this problem and we are expecting to benefit from any developments which may take place there. Also automobile manufacturers in Canada and the United States have intensive research projects under way with a view to introducing measures to control pollution.

As the records show, with each succeeding month the death toll on the highways has increased. Therefore, in the hope of arousing some action, on June 2, 1965, I put this question to the then prime minister:

Owing to the ever increasing death toll on the highways, will the Prime Minister consider introducing legislation making it compulsory for automobiles being sold in Canada to be equipped with safety devices currently proven practical and efficient?

He replied:

This is a very important question and I think it should be put on the order paper so it can be studied.

I put the question on the order paper and it was replied to by the minister of industry in the following manner:

It should be emphasized that the provincial governments have the responsibility of drafting and enforcing regulations pertaining to the operational standards of motor vehicles. A great deal of work has already been undertaken by various groups to determine the areas where improvement in design or vehicle construction could lead to greater safety which would be useful in the preparation of a safety code. It would, of course, be necessary to obtain the agreement of the provinces before a uniform safety code could be established for motor vehicles. The Department of Industry would be happy to co-operate with the provinces in the preparation of such a code.

On January 27, 1966, I directed this question to the minister of justice:

Would the government give consideration to amending the Criminal Code so that the breathalyzer test can be made mandatory?

The minister stated:

That is one of the several possible amendments to the Criminal Code which are now being given consideration by the government.

[Mr. Noble.]

This measure will be placed on the statute books. On February 2, 1966, on a supply motion, I spoke on highway safety. I will read into the record the following excerpt:

Mr. Speaker, the matter of highway safety deserves immediate attention. The federal government has failed to take the necessary steps to fulfil its obligations in fighting public enemy No. 1, the constantly increasing death toll on our highways. We are all aware of the appalling increase in highway accidents but it would seem these are being treated in some quarters as a course of events that should be expected. Something must be done and there should be no delay.

In my opinion, help and assistance would be readily available if this government would take the initiative and launch an all-out crusade to face up to this monster once and for all. They should pull out all stops, make the breathalizer test mandatory and increase the grant to the Canadian Highway Safety Council. A conference should also be called with provincial representatives and, in fact, representatives from all organizations willing to get together in a drive to bring about improvement in the situation.

Responsibility in highway safety has been ignored too long by all governments. Our laws and regulations have not kept pace with the times. Uniformity of laws and regulations, as well as of penalties, should apply to all provinces. Traffic signs and driver testing or any other feature having to do with our highways or driving on them should be the same.

Periodical vehicle inspection should be compulsory. Signboards, radio and television should be in constant use in an effort to keep our people alert and aware of the need for extreme caution on our streets and highways. No doubt if the people I have suggested were brought together to set up a framework or a pattern for greater highway safety, many worthwhile ideas would be brought to light.

Automobile manufacturers have shown a favourable response to highway safety through their willingness to supply cars for student training and supply them in abundance. Their designers are constantly investigating safety features and quite a number have been included in car equipment with satisfactory results. Perhaps the automobile people could be persuaded to go quite a lot further by way of extensive research on some of the recently suggested safety devices.

I suggest that in the not too distant future legislation will necessarily be passed to make anti-smog equipment a requirement. There is no way of assessing the injury being inflicted on us by carbon monoxide. However, we do know that any element which causes irritation in the lungs is a potential contributor to lung cancer. We know too that carbon monoxide is deadly when confined and may even be the cause of some highway accidents.

• (8:40 p.m.)

On February 16, March 23, and April 1, 1966, I put questions to ministers on the matter. In these questions I continued to press for some action. On May 2, 1966, I put this question on the order papers:

Has the government received representations from any provincial government or association or other

organized body asking for the calling of a federal-provincial conference for the purpose of working out a national program:

(a) to ensure that all practical safety devices be required equipment in motor vehicles,

(b) to ensure that more and better driver education be made available,

(c) to require more rigid traffic law observance,

(d) any other action that would help in reducing the accidents and loss of life on our highways. If so, has the government taken or does it intend to take any action on such representation.

The secretary of state replied:

(1) Yes. A letter dated August 12, 1965, was received from the Premier of Manitoba who urged the calling by the federal government jointly with the provinces of a national conference on highway safety.

(2) The matter is receiving appropriate consideration by the government.

Following this I asked five more questions on the subject of highway safety. On July 11, 1966, I put this question to the minister of industry:

Has the government taken any action in regard to the promotion of highway safety and, if so, what action?

The minister replied:

Yes. In so far as the departments of defence production and industry are concerned: (1) The Canadian government specifications board has prepared a draft automotive vehicle safety code in collaboration with the Canadian Good Roads Association and the traffic injury research foundation. The draft has been submitted for critical review to a committee consisting of representatives of the provinces, the motor vehicle manufacturers, safety groups, the medical profession and others. A revised draft is now being prepared.

(2) The government has undertaken to include all available safety features in the specifications governing the procurement of conventional type vehicles for both civilian departments and the military.

(3) Two consultants have been engaged: one to assist on the automotive safety code and the other to conduct research studies.

(4) Consideration is being given to what other steps the federal government can usefully take in the light of the constitutional position and the relative responsibilities of the provinces and the government in this area.

Further ... in so far as requiring of pollution control devices for motor vehicle exhaust systems is concerned, the committee recommended that the standard for the pollutants omission control be deleted from the proposed standards because: (a) it is not yet agreed that this is indeed a safety device. (b) the Department of National Health and Welfare is making a detailed study of the problem of air contamination in close consultation with their counterparts in the United States.

I could continue to enumerate many more questions asked by myself and others in the House of Commons who joined in the dialogue about that time, but I think I have made it clear to the House that the government showed much reluctance and indifference to a problem that was costing the country thousands of lives and millions of dollars.

However, the justice committee did table a report on March 27, 1967. The report was dated March 21 and a release concerning its contents read as follows:

Government intervention in the area of auto safety was today recommended by the Commons Justice Committee, when it tabled its report to the House.

The chairman ... said the main recommendation of the committee was to establish a public board. This board, with representatives from the federal government, the automotive industry, the provincial governments and universities, would be charged with the responsibility for "developing, as quickly as possible, and improving from time to time the appropriate safety standards of design of construction and equipment for all motor vehicles produced in or imported into Canada, and authorized for use in interprovincial or international transportation". Safety standards would be more in the nature of performance standards, rather than specific items of equipment.

In addition the board would be charged with the "authority to set appropriate standards on inspection and quality control" and see that they are observed by automotive producers and parts manufacturers. It would initiate the supervising of traffic safety research possibly through the National Research Council. Co-ordination of the activities of the many voluntary governmental agencies now interested in and involved in traffic safety would also be one of its functions.

The report went on to say that while this board should be established by federal legislation it is essential that the co-operation of the provincial governments and the automotive industry be obtained and that "the danger of bureaucratic control over this vital industry should be minimized". The committee's report is based on ten months of hearings, study and investigation.

At the end of November 1966 the committee made a three day visit to the Detroit-Windsor area during which they visited the laboratory and automobile testing facilities of General Motors at Milford, Mich., Ford Motor Company in Dearborn, Mich., and Chrysler Motor Company at Highland Park, Mich. The committee had two meetings while in Windsor at the University of Windsor, at which the executives from the major automobile manufacturers were questioned.

Among the many witnesses who appeared before the committee were the Canadian Automobile Association; Canadian Government Specifications Board; Canadian Labour Congress the United Automobile Workers Union.

Among the 33 documents filed with the committee was information required by the committee of the automotive manufacturers showing recall campaign figures for the last five years.

The Chairman said he felt that the Committee's recommendations would go far in answering the problem of auto safety with all its many facets. Just as important as safety devices in automotive vehicles is the co-ordination of the many voluntary agencies which are involved in education and research in traffic. From the evidence given before the committee, it would appear that there was a

definite deficiency in this area. He also pointed out that the committee does not recommend specific safety devices, but rather recommends that the public agency enforce performance standards; and quality control and production procedures. The committee was considering two private bills bringing safety devices under the Criminal Code, and four notices of motion recommending that the government take action in this area.

At his point I would like to read into the record three clippings of recent date that I think are timely. The first, taken from the Ottawa *Journal,* is dated November 28, 1969:

An executive of one of the largest automobile insurance companies in the United States predicts that within a few years insurers will set their rates according to how susceptible to damage the automobile is.

Sweden already has such a system, and reports it working well. As a preliminary move to consideration of the innovation in the U.S., the National Assocation of Independent Insurers hired a professor from the University of Detroit to determine how susceptible various cars are to damage.

Those involved in the study estimate it may be a year or more until enough data have been accumulated to make any evaluation. But they apparently agree on one point—that modern cars, particularly their bumpers, are not being made as collision-proof as they could be, or once were.

Automobile insurance premiums directly reflect the rising cost of automobile repairs. It is natural that insurers should try to place a higher cost of insurability on those products which accidents statistics and tests indicate provide the least resistance to damage.

This move might produce consternation among automobile manufacturers, but it could also be the strongest possible incentive to produce cars which not only look pretty but wear well.

The next clipping is taken from the Toronto *Telegram* of January 14, 1970. It is a press release from Detroit, and reads as follows:

A group of automotive engineers squirmed uncomfortably in their seats as an insurance safety executive stopped just short of calling them criminals.

Doctor William Haddon Jr., president of the Washington-based Insurance Institute for Highway Safety was talking about high performance, high powered cars.

"The way the auto industry is pushing muscle cars borders on criminal irresponsibility," said Dr. Haddon.

He acted as moderator for a panel discussion at the Society of Automotive Engineers Congress, which dealt with how to reduce highway losses.

"Cars with high horsepower ratings are fine on the racetrack, but it's almost criminal to use them on public roads."

• (8:50 p.m.)

Dr. Haddon was referring to such juiced-up packages as the Pontiac GTO; the Plymouth Road Runner; and the Ford Torino Cobra.

Muscle cars, or supercars, or factory hotrods as they are often called, accounted for 600,000 sales last year.

[Mr. Noble.]

"Due to advertising techniques, the image that is being sold at great expense to the buying public is why you don't have transportation, you have thrills on the highways."

Dr. Haddon said insurance losses are substantially higher on muscle cars.

"We don't know if this is because of the way they are built, or because they are used too fast" said the safety expert.

Supercars are responsible for a credibility gap involving safety and the auto industry.

"I know these cars are not the way for American business to protect the capitalistic system in the generation now coming of age in the decade of the 70s," said Dr. Haddon.

He was asked after the panel session what the future holds.

"It's the automaker's choice. They are either going to face condemnation by the public and probably restrictions by the government."

"Their only other course is to put restrictions on horsepower themselves. The blood has been accumulating for a long time," he added.

He was also critical of reports that car makers are turning away from development of safety seats with built-in belts.

Dr. Haddon favours the 3-point lap-shoulder harness, proven successful for the last 10 years in imported cars.

I have a clipping from the Ottawa *Journal* of January 28, 1970. This release is from Worcester, Massachusetts. It states:

An experimental car that would be safe in any kind of crash up to 50 mph will be built and tested within the next three years, Transportation Secretary Volpe said Tuesday.

Volpe said the "mobile crash laboratory" being planned could be rolled over at 70 mph with its passenger compartment remaining intact.

The car would offer improved handling, braking and visibility and use low-pollution fuels, he said.

"Our plan is to have 14 of these cars and tested by the end of 1972," he said. "It is our intention that the auto industry will seize on the new safety improvements we develop and incorporate them in production models."

I should now like to return to the bill. Regulations covering national safety standards for automobiles are long overdue, but I am afraid, however encouraging this bill appears at first sight, it falls considerably short of its objectives. I cannot quarrel with the fact that specifications or standards are not spelled out in this bill, although I shall have some comments later on that. I question the strange omissions that could, in the hands of certain unscrupulous car dealers, lead to death or injury for the buyers of cars which bear the national safety mark but which in fact have been transformed into deathtraps.

There must be protection for the innocent person who is lured into buying a car carrying the national seal of approval but which has become defective through wear, damage or tampering. There is nothing in the bill

which prohibits, after the initial sale, tampering or changing those parts of the auto which have met the approved safety standards. Failing this, an attempt should be made to encourage a voluntary system of standard controls within the used car trade.

We all appreciate that improved safety standards will add to the price of the automobile, but at least we will live longer. I am told that about half the cars now being produced will, during their life span, be involved in an injury-causing accident. Federal regulations can be made considerably stronger by an amendment which should be moved in committee, to the effect that this act shall apply to the shipment of motor vehicles, new or used, from one province to another, as though the shipment into the province were an import. A second amendment could be moved to the effect that the national safety mark be accompanied by the words, "As at the time of manufacture, assembly, importation and new car sale". The bill refers to components. I do not know whether this applies to tires or ashtrays. I believe the bill should spell out the difference between components and accessories, and that this must not be left to pure chance or individual interpretation of the safety code.

We have heard statements to the effect that Canadian standards to accompany this bill are similar to U.S. safety requirements, but I wonder just how compatible U.S. standards are for cars running on Canadian highways. South Carolina is different from Ontario. Consideration should be given to the climatic conditions, and in spelling out our safety standards we would be well advised to study the situation in countries which have conditions similar to those found in Canada. The bill is concerned primarily with the safety of the driver, the passenger, the pedestrian and the other driver. I hoped it would cover, by enforcement of strong, air pollution regulations, the safety of all persons in Canada.

History has shown time and again that major epidemics are stamped out only after major research efforts. At long last the public are beginning to realize that we are faced with an epidemic, the contributing factors being the driver, the road and the car. I am especially concerned with the third factor, the car. I do not suggest that the others are not just as important, but we in Parliament can control the car. This bill is not the answer to the problem.

With the exception of making the breathalyzer test mandatory, Bill C-137 is all we have to show in response to the deep desire of the Canadian people for something that will be effective in achieving a maximum reduction of the death and destruction on our highways. This bill is indeed a very vague document and leaves much to be desired. It is to be hoped that when it goes to the committee, the necessary amendments will be made so that when it returns to the House it will be more specific and meaningful.

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, the matter before us in Bill C-137 is safety standards for motor vehicles. This is potentially of extreme importance to millions of Canadians. Before dealing with some of the details of the proposals I should like to take a few moments to sketch-in the background of this matter.

The annual traffic toll now is 60,000 people killed and 3,650,000 injured—and many of the latter might as well be dead. In economic terms, this traffic toll represents a loss of approximately $2 million every hour of every day, of every week, of every month of every year. For our part, in Canada we kill 5,000 people every year and no less than 150,000 Canadians are injured, non-fatally, on our roads and highways. To put the last two figures in closer focus, let me put it this way: in a four-year period—say the life of a Parliament—20,000 Canadians die and 600,000 are injured on our roads.

There are three major factors involved in this warlike toll; the first is the car, the second is the driver and the third is the road condition. The bill we are considering tonight—and I compliment the minister for his very able introduction of it—seeks to do something to lower the death and injuries toll for which the car itself is specifically responsible. At this point it might be well for us to keep in mind that in North America there are now 100 million vehicles and that this number is increasing at the rate of about nine per minute.

Considering the toll and the economic drain involved in this highway war, it may be surprising that North Americans, Canadians included, have done so little to defend themselves against it. The fact is that on this continent we have all been assured for many years by the industry, which in many respects is as powerful as the nation, that what the industry wants is good for the public.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Inasmuch as the industry is producing cars for maximum sales, maximum profits and

quick obsolescence, this goodness to the public is not evident. The car consumer, dazzled by even greater sex, speed and prestige appeals, and having very little control over what is produced or offered to him in the way of a motor vehicle, has taken a long time to realize that public safety is more important than private profit. However, he has finally realized this; he is on the road. He has a long way to go, but in the United States and in our country legislation of this type is an indication that there has been a realization of the situation and of what will be attempted in the future.

Bill C-137 is designed to set safety standards on cars, trucks and motor cycles entering Canada or manufactured in Canada. I thought the minister and the previous speaker both did well in outlining some of the details of the legislation. The bill is a move in the right direction, but it has its weaknesses and shortcomings. We know that auto safety legislation will bear the United States stamp of approval, but the possibility of Canadian standards varying substantially from those in the United States I believe is small.

Canadian auto safety standards will be set in Washington, where the consistent opposition of the industry has slowed down progress in this field and where the United States authorities too often have tended to accept the standards the industry dictates. On that point, in fairness to the United States authorities, I should like to mention that I have in my hand a number of releases from the office of the secretary, Department of Transportation in the United States. These show an increased awareness of the need for speedy action in protecting the United States motoring public. These releases come to my desk almost daily, and I imagine they are received by other members. Here is one:

> The federal highway administration plans to improve its motor vehicle safety standard 209 dealing with seat-belt assemblies.

This is another:

> Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today announced release of the first of what will be a series of monthly reports to the public on the department's most recent vehicle safety compliance activities.

Then we have this release:

> Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe today demonstrated a modified diesel engine and exhaust system for transit buses which offers substantial improvements in eliminating pollutants, smoke, noise and odour.

I have several others. I thought I would take this opportunity to refer to the fact that in the United States, and I hope here, the department of transport has finally become aware of the pressing need for such action and is working on it. It might be of interest to us as members of this House to think back to the genesis of the bill.

It had its genesis in a previous Parliament when with the consent of the government a number of hon. members, including the hon. member who spoke last, who had private member's bills on the Order Paper with relation to one phase or another of traffic safety, took their bills off the Order Paper. The subject matter of these bills was then referred to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. This committee held a great number of meetings at which many witnesses were heard.

This resulted in a report supported, I believe, by all members of the committee. The report finds some expression in the legislation before the House tonight. Incidentally, the proposal in respect of the breathalyzer test was part of the committee's report. I have gone into this background because as one of the members who took a bill off the Order Paper I believe that in respect of non-partisan matters this is a good way to have action taken in respect of proposals, and to have a solidified result come back to the House. That is what has happened today in respect of this bill. It also is what happened last year in respect of the breathalyzer legislation. There are areas of common thinking and common opinion in respect of which unified action can be taken which results in worth while legislation. My opinion is that this is a worth while process.

We have some criticism in respect of the bill. It would seem that safety features peculiar to the Canadian climate, such as rear window defrosters, are not likely to be included. The initial safety standards to which the bill refers are not spelled out. They are to be regulated by the Governor in Council. The 29 standards the minister mentioned are those which are now required by law in the United States. At present they act as a voluntary guide for the Canadian, United States-controlled auto industry. For the present we accept the 29 standards as a basis, but we must press for a much further extension of standards.

We want Canadian auto safety standards included specifically in this legislation. We should not despair of having this done. What can be done to force a general acceptance of standards is well illustrated by the action of New York state, where safety belts were

made mandatory. Safety belts soon became standard across the continent. The same thing happened when California established tough standards for hydrocarbon and carbon monoxide emissions from vehicle motors. The standards are important and are becoming more common.

I believe a similar situation could develop here if Canadian authorities had the courage to set proper standards and enforce them. Enough cars are sold in Canada to have a significant effect on the total market. Cars sold in Canada can be fitted with safety features even if Washington fails to act. I think it is a crying shame that one need today is for such standards in respect of bumpers. Originally these appendages were designed to protect cars and passengers in case of accident.

Today, with the industry's accent on eye appeal rather than safety, and with the drive for more and more profits, bumpers perform a dual function: they are decorative devices designed to sell cars through eye appeal, and they seem to be engineered to achieve the maximum sale of spare parts.

The fact is that the fancy chrome on the front and rear of most cars is not intended to perform the bumper function. There are no standards in respect of height, and the great variety of design and shine features are completely useless as protective devices. Worse than this, however, is the fact that many bumpers have knife-edge protrusions running vertically, horizontally or both, and some have protruding snouts with the knife edges coming to a point in front of the grille. Others have a bewildering variety of knobs, gadgets and fixtures which perform no useful function to the car or its owner. All these devices perform maximum damage to both cars involved in a collision.

As far back as December, 1966, the Canadian Government Specifications Board emphasized the need to design bumpers to meet their original protective function. The board called for a standard height, flat surfaces, and shock-resistant construction. The design of the New York state safety car included such a bumper. So far, the industry has ignored bumper safety and has continued to design eye catching, cosmetic and damage-prone chrome.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Canada can set realistic standards for bumpers sold in this country—standards relating to height, surface and shock resistance. These standards should be set now, before designers of the 1972 models tell us that their new, devastating bumpers are locked into models beyond recall.

There are many phases and spheres involved in our discussion of this legislation—which is perhaps 15 or 20 years late—which is intended to grapple with car safety. There is the matter of air pollution and sound pollution in relation to the car, and I was glad to hear the minister refer to it. I remember raising the question last November in the House. I was assured by the minister's parliamentary secretary that under clauses of the proposed legislation there would be scope for prosecution in line with the legislating of vehicles whose function impairs the public health or welfare because of noise and air pollution. This is a point which we in this part of the House are most concerned about and will try to get spelled out in the legislation.

In working in the committee in trying to improve this legislation, we will keep in mind what has happened in the United States. We will think and act on the basis of the U.S. experience. We will remember that the car makers in the United States are charging higher prices, more than the actual cost of quality safety improvements. We will not forget that United States government-financed safety tests show that individual car component failures are at a rate of about 10 per cent, and we cannot overlook the fact that dozens of types of car tires have failed to comply with federal safety standards.

It seems to us important to remember that according to one expert at least, the average new car in North America has 25 to 40 deficiences, and that seat belts produced by 10 or 12 of the biggest U.S. suppliers are under investigation for what appears to be failure to meet federal standards. Let us consider this point for a minute. At 10 miles per hour, a crash between two standard model popular cars in the United States, such as you see driven around here every day, results in average estimated damage of $510 for both cars.

In addition, we believe that when we have set our car safety standards, they must not only be enforced but they must be seen to be enforced. We think that safety must not only be achieved but must be seen to be achieved by the public.

I would like to remind the minister of his reply to a question I asked last December 8. I asked, having in mind the U.S. regulation requiring manufacturers of automobiles to

provide the people of the U.S. with specific information and data on the safety qualities of their vehicles, whether the minister was giving consideration to similar legislation in this country. The minister replied:

I think this is a commendable step. As soon as we have the necessary authority and a bill is passed by this House I will be more than pleased to give it consideration ... I see no reason why we should not do so.

I think it is important, if we are to have this legislation, to convince the public that we mean business and that we are going to make it work. That is why I stress the need for open action by the administration.

In summary, and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we support the general aim of the bill, noting its lateness and its weaknesses. It is our hope that in committee or in the House we will be able to strengthen the provisions of the bill so that they will work more for the benefit of the Canadian public. May I note, Mr. Speaker, that while I have been speaking, approximately 1,200 car accidents have taken place in North America, half a million dollars damage has been done, and 55 more cars have been produced.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect I would have to speak today on Bill C-137. However, I want to make a few remarks on the principle of the bill and to assure the minister and the House that we, members of the Ralliement créditiste, are in favour of the principle of the bill and feel it will, to a certain extent, improve safety standards on our roads. I say "to a certain extent" because, as the hon. member for Surrey (Mr. Mather) said today, provincial governments, as the road network comes under their jurisdiction, are partly responsible for accidents occurring on them. We know to what extent roads in bad repair are responsible for accidents. Part of the responsibility for accidents must also be borne by drivers unaware of highway regulations or driving while their faculties are impaired by alcohol.

This bill also purports to improve vehicle safety standards to ensure the safety of drivers.

In order to illustrate the need for this bill, I would like to give the House information from the July-August 1969 issue of the Bulletin of the Canadian Highway Safety Council, where I found figures which do not tally with those supplied by the hon. member a moment ago. In 1968, there were 4,370 fatal accidents in which 5,254 people died and 172,795 were injured.

[Mr. Mather.]

• (9:20 p.m.)

Since so many people were injured or killed in the course of a single year, one can venture to say that more people are injured or kill on the highways than in any war.

In 1968 Canada reported 479,721 accidents in which people were injured or killed. That is enough to make us think and to prompt the government to take all the necessary measures to improve highway safety in Canada. That is its responsibility.

In 1959, for instance, 3,231 persons lost their lives and 84,445 were injured. In 1968, almost ten years later, 5,254 were killed and 172,795 were injured.

In view of the increasing number of accidents, the government was justified, even though it may have acted a little bit late, in taking appropriate measures to improve the safety of motor vehicles.

The minister said he had a list of 29 safety standards. Here is how the expression is defined in the bill:

—standards regulating the design, construction or functioning of motor vehicles and their components for the purpose of protecting persons against personal injury, impairment of health or death.

We must admit that since the appearance of the first automobile, there have been improvements in the construction of motor vehicles and the manufacturers, to a certain extent, are not too concerned about the safety of their products. Indeed, automobile manufacturers have often become big trusts more concerned with making profits than safer cars. Evidently, competition exists among car manufacturers and it prompts them to improve constantly the cars offered to their clients. However, it must also be realized that quite often we unfortunately have to pay for costly useless gadgets only to increase their profits.

I hope that the 29 security standards introduced by the minister have been selected so as to help the drivers rather than enable car manufacturers to make even more money.

I was saying a few minutes ago that the manufacturers have to a certain extent improved their vehicles from a safety point of view. For instance, the advent of shatterproof windshields was a great progress which surely prevented countless accidents. In spite of it, loss of life was caused by drivers travelling at excessive speed. However, there was continuous improvement of the braking

system on cars and today we have disck brakes. We have better suspension and steering systems in cars.

Power-steering and power-brakes have greatly improved motor vehicles as such.

Sometimes, though, new accessories appear on the market, such as tubeless tires, which, in my view, have come too soon, causing many accidents, fatal ones sometimes, when they blew out, as the product had not been perfected. Today, this danger no longer exists, because tires have been improved; but, for two or three years, the car driver had to try them out himself and he was the one who had to pay.

Despite all these improvements in the manufacture of cars, some control should be exercised at the drawing-board stage. Any prototype, after it is launched, should be sujected to an inspection. In fact, I believe that this bill provides for the appointment of inspectors; they should have the necessary authority to check the specifications of the new car before it is put on the market.

The rear lights of a certain make are placed in such a way that once snow-covered, they are almost invisible, which endangers the life of the driver and of the passengers in the cars behind.

These are points which a government-appointed inspector should verify before a car is built, so that the public might be protected against such hazards.

Mr. Speaker, these are the few remarks I wanted to make to show the importance of this bill. When it is deferred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, we will be able to get more information from the minister and the experts who will perhaps be invited to advise the committee members. If the bill does not meet with the wishes of the public, we will be able to ask the minister to bring in the necessary amendments.

I have just mentioned the efforts of the manufacturers in order to increase the safety of vehicles, but one should not forget the laws that the government has enacted for this purpose.

I should like to deal at this stage with the breathalizer test which I think has not yet been applied long enough to permit us to appreciate its results, but I am convinced that it will bring an improvement on the roads. A similar provision has already been applied in England. While I was discussing it with an English Tory a few months ago he told me that though he had been opposed to such a test he had to admit that it had greatly increased highway safety in England and that, therefore, the same results could be expected in our country.

The steps provided for in the bill are meant to increase highway safety. With the co-operation of automobile drivers, automobile insurance rates will decrease or, at least, will not increase, as they have over the past years.

For these reasons, we ought to concur in the motion for second reading and reference of the bill to a committee for study.

[*English*]

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about this piece of legislation. In all fairness, I think one should first point out that it is new legislation; it is not legislation which just re-enacts a measure which has been in operation. I was interested in the minister's remark that the department has gone to the trouble of researching 29 standards which will apply immediately the act is promulgated.

I was disappointed that clause 7 of the bill suggests that regulations will be drawn up. I think the 29 standards should have been examined more carefully, because I do not like buying a pig in a poke. I suppose we shall have to trust the judgment of those who will be responsible for administrating the 29 standards.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The minister dealt with the question of standards and said they will be much the same as those in the United States. Because of our different climatic conditions, our cold winters, our frosts, our methods of road-heating and so on, these standards may have to be adjusted.

The minister did not say what research would be conducted into these standards. Nowhere in the bill does it say that the branch of government responsible for research will examine the application of the 29 standards and ascertain whether, for instance, six or seven additional standards should be added in view of the winters and summers we have in this country. Before passing this legislation we should know whether bodies like the National Research Council will study these standards.

In the past the government has frowned on research, and there is an indication that this is the thinking with respect to this legislation. The former minister of transport set up what

was called, I believe, an engineering institute. It was given $250,000 and told to study road safety matters. That institute has not yet brought down its report; it is still being typed. But we have before us a piece of legislation dealing with this very matter.

Before the bill receives second reading and goes to committee, I ask this simple question: Will the members of this engineering institute, which cost $250,000 to set up, be heard by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, so that the committee may determine whether pertinent standards relating to highway hazards have been covered by this legislation? I bring my question to the attention of the minister, the chairman of the committee and to all hon. members of the House. We may derive some benefit from the studies of the institute.

According to the minister, these 29 standards are initial standards only and may be adjusted as time goes on. I throw the idea out that perhaps there should be a continuing study of this whole question. I think the engineering institute which was set up to study road safety matters should continue its study. All its members need not be kept on; perhaps only one or two of the university professors who worked on the original study should be retained. In any event, there should be a continuing examination of standards by a body whose job is to see whether this legislation will do what we want done.

As I said, it is a new piece of legislation; it is not a re-drafting or a re-enactment of something already on our statute books. Surely there is merit in having a body continuing a study of these standards. Similar bodies should undertake continuing studies of health standards, pollution standards and, as the minister suggested, noise standards.

The minister dealt partially with the question of farm tractors. He said that if they are licensed to go on highways, they will be covered, and if they are not so licensed, they may not be covered. As I understand it, any vehicle licensed to go on a highway will be covered by this legislation. The minister raised the question of snowmobiles which may or may not be licensed to go on highways. In many cases they are prohibited from going on highways. Many provinces across Canada are becoming increasingly concerned about the safety of snowmobiles and the hazards they pose to motorists and pedestrians. So far as I know, the bill does not deal with this matter; but perhaps members of the committee will examine it at the appropriate time. I understand that the list of 29 standards referred to will be included in today's *Hansard*.

Another aspect of the bill which disturbs me may be considered in committee and will no doubt be considered by those who will be responsible for enforcing the act. Unquestionably, we must have guidelines or safety standards for the manufacturer or importer, but the question is: Should we apply those standards and penalties to a distributor? The manufacturer makes the product and ships it to someone to sell. The importer imports the product and hands it over to a distributor. I wonder whether we should police the distributor as well as the manufacturer and importer. I think that the less policing there is, the better.

Mr. Jamieson: Only when importing the goods is the distributor liable in that respect.

Mr. Horner: We would then be calling the importer a distributor; that would be the effect. In my opinion an importer should import.

Let us consider farm tractors. Today component parts of farm tractors are being imported into Canada and the North American market in general and made into complete units. From my reading of the bill, it deals with component parts but not with the whole automobile. If a component part is unsafe, the inspector can make a decision about it.

Although these parts are sold by a distributor, one cannot say that in that sense he is the manufacturer; nor should he be treated as the manufacturer. I suggest that that aspect must be looked into, because I am concerned that some provision of this bill will apply to plain, ordinary distributors. I am also concerned about the application of some provisions to a manufacturer, importer and distributor.

Nowhere in the bill does it say that there will be a right of appeal. To whom will they appeal? Will they appeal to the minister? One would naturally think this would be the case, because inspectors are appointed by him.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I am surprised that in connection with a major piece of legislation, one which will be on the statute books for a long time, the minister has not felt called upon to make provision for much greater continuity with regard to the process of inspection. I am surprised that no provision has been made for

the training of inspectors and the continuity of their employment. I have never been particularly in favour of expanding the civil service, but I would point out that knowledge and continuity are built into that organization, a regular body to which people are hired by a commission.

I caution hon. members against accepting the use of the minister's prerogative to appoint inspectors at his whim. If an inspector does what the minister says he should do, if he likes his work and finds it inspiring, he will stay in that occupation. But will the minister be as thorough as he should be in guiding the inspectors? Will he be as thorough as he should be in ensuring that the inspectors are dutifully doing their jobs?

I recognize that the minister is a very competent and capable person, but I do not think his job allows him time in which to watch over the situation properly. Meanwhile, we are being asked to study a piece of legislation which concerns the safety of all our citizens who use the highway, and we are told the inspectors responsible for these 29 standards will be selected on what appears to me to be a very temporary and limited basis. I do not believe this is satisfactory.

The purpose of the legislation is good; there is no question in my mind about that. It will call for dutiful, watchful and patient inspectors with a love for their work and a regard for the purposes of the bill. As it stands, the bill smells of political patronage at the choice and whim of the minister. In this particular minister I have complete confidence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: But he may change tomorrow. I may see signs of political partisanship in his judgment. The next week it may be worse. The month after that it may be worse still, and I may become suspicious; though I am not normally a suspicious man.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: A new minister might be appointed tomorrow. The previous minister of transport resigned; he got fed up with the job. He wanted to sit as an independent backbencher in the Liberal Party because they have so much fun over there; they can participate so much. The directorate of road safety, hired and paid by this government, was set up by the former minister of transport. But that hon. member became so fed up with the job that he quit. So what assurance do we have about the permanence of the present minister, when we consider the nature of the job and the hazardous conditions which exist in his party? This is why I tell the hon. gentleman: rest assured that when this subject comes up in the Transport Committee, that is, the question of inspectors appointed at his discretion, we intend to go into it at length. I tell him, also, that the whole question of the 29 standards, the research work necessary to draft them, and any addition safety standards which seem likely to be called for will also be considered at length.

Pollution of the air by automobiles will become one of our major problems as we move into the coming decade. I believe that health and safety on the highways has been one of the major problems of the last 20 years, and that its seriousness will continue to grow. It is the duty of hon. members to examine this new piece of legislation to ensure that the measures proposed are not mere window-dressing to create a good image or to satisfy public demand, but that they will in fact bring substantial benefit, up-dated from time to time as necessary to meet changing circumstances and standards.

The whole question of pollution will be under continuous examination. We have seen standards as they apply to automobiles upgraded regularly during the past five or six years. It may be that in 1971 and 1972 vehicles manufactured and sold in the United States will have to conform with even stricter standards as far as anti-pollution devices are concerned. This illustrates the need for continuity in research, and is another reason for examining carefully the whole question of making appointments at the discretion of the minister. I do not believe that appointments made in this way are in line with the purpose of this bill, which is the safety of highway traffic for all who drive vehicles on our roads.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): This is a very important bill, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it will arouse a great deal of interest among Canadians. It is likely to have its ups and downs before it becomes effective in eliminating some of the carnage which takes place on our highways.

It is interesting to reflect that Mr. Ralph Nader and the United States "Consumer Report" have probably been more responsible for promoting recognition among the general public of the features which are unsafe in automobiles than have any of the investigations conducted in Canada or in the United States. The one thing which both depended

upon was the force of public opinion. In the course of this debate, during which a number of interesting comments were made, the National Press Club was not represented. There is a difference of opinion as to whether the attractive section of the press gallery can be counted part of that institution.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The public will not regard the safety measures being proposed as necessary unless they can be convinced that safety is a major factor in the preservation of their lives. While for the last five or six years I have not done very much travelling, I have been on the highway frequently and driven cars that were considered to have the safest possible equipment—for example, seat-belts. For four or five years I owned a Volvo and now I own another car. Although both of them had a safety-harness over the shoulder, I can honestly say that I never wore the harness in either car.

This is an admission that I am not convinced that this is necessary equipment or that it is a selling point. A number of people have asked me whether I consider the Volvo the safest vehicle on the road, and I have said it may be. They ask how I like the shoulder-harness, but I have had to reply that I have never tried it on. My son used it, but it seemed a difficult procedure.

My present car has a very elaborate safety-harness. It is an imported car and meets the safety standards not only of the United States but of European countries. I tried on the harness once but found it six or eight inches too short for me. But my point is that the public are not yet convinced that car safety is their business. Until the average man wants safety features in his automobile, I suggest our cars will not be safe.

We have always been suckers for United States advertising on television. We buy aspirins because people in the United States do. We buy Oldsmobiles because they do, and we even buy Cadillacs because they do. Continually we are bombarded with advertising claiming that U.S. cars are good cars and are the kind of cars that we should buy.

As a colleague of mine said the other day, although it is important to have safety devices on cars, it is equally important that we should be able to start our cars. Certainly we will not get into any trouble on the road if our cars do not start. My colleague was pointing out that the car that he had—and also the car I had at the time—was failing to start.

[Mr. Peters.]

It seems to me that what is required is a car made in Canada which incorporates Canadian safety equipment. I recall driving down the Queensway the other night and observing in a distance of about eight blocks five or six cars that had stalled. This had created a traffic hazard that was serious, and it would have been quite easy to cause a 50-car pile-up. It seems to me that this is certainly a factor that should be taken into account when considering car safety.

For example, in Florida a car would probably require only 100 amps to start it. The battery will be required to deliver about 40 amps for roughly two and a half minutes, and then can settle down to supplying amperage to the coil, the points, the sparking plugs and all the rest of it. Gasoline that we buy in Canada does not burn well at a temperature of 40 below zero; it is primarily intended for climates warmer than ours. But I suggest that at least our cars should have installed in them batteries which are adequate for our conditions instead of those obtaining in the tropics.

I recall observing a car parked outside the building the other night which a member of the protective staff was helping to start. When he lifted the hood he found the wind had blown up under the car and covered the engine, the distributor and ignition wiring, with three or four inches of snow. Consequently, it would not start. After the snow was brushed away, the car started.

I remember the day when I used to drive model T Fords. I am a contemporary of other members here who did the same. As a kid I bought a lot of model T's, and even that particular car was provided with splash pans between the engine and fenders to stop debris slushing up onto the ignition wires, which was precisely the trouble with the cars that were stalled on the Queensway the other night.

I suggest safety features do not just involve seat-belts, reinforced doors and safety windows. In the wintertime in Canada you turn the car one way by looking out of the window, and the other way by looking through your rear-view mirror. They now heat rear windows with a built-in element. However, they are not designed for Canadian conditions but for Florida and California. My own car is full of junk under the hood to prevent smog in California. There are six or eight contraptions I have never seen before—and I have been doing mechanical work for a number of years. There are wires and hoses

going in all directions. Cars today do not give the better gas mileage they are supposed to, but instead cut down smog. If you want to take off the air filter and put Quickstart in the carburettor, you will find it difficult even to reach the carburettor.

We are not building cars that are safe in Canadian conditions. I suggest we should have full control over cars at all times, instead of being forced to reach down to push in a choke or to scrape snow off the windows and all the rest of it. Certainly in Ottawa the roads do not lend themselves to devoting much time to the mechanics of driving.

In Canada there has been developed a studded tire that is really useful only about three times a year, though it has done some good work. It was introduced with a great promotional drive. The department of highways now tells us that it will cost a fortune to repair the roads and they will have to crack down on studs. These studs work well when changing from summer to winter driving conditions. When we get the first two inches of snow on the roads and are not sure how to drive, studded tires are very useful.

Mr. Jamieson: Ten o'clock. You are slipping the clutch.

Mr. Peters: Yes, I used to do that and it worked well. I see there is another little device for tires, which costs 99 cents and is a little like the old trucker's trick of dumping Javex on his tires in really bad weather.

The minister has outlined 29 safety points. These are not Canadian safety points but United States points. I do not criticize the minister for this; I think "Consumers Report" has detailed sufficient failings in the United States in the matter of car safety to easily compile a list of 29 inspection points.

What is required in Canada is a safety code which will enforce the installation in cars of devices that make them safe to drive on our roads, particularly in the winter time. To date no such car has been made in Canada. Even my Volvo that is imported from Sweden is unsuited to winter conditions in northern Ontario. I suggest the minister will be required to add many other points to his list to meet Canadian safety requirements, and in this regard he will receive the support of many members and of the public in general.

May I call it ten o'clock?

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been made.

AIR TRANSPORT—DISCONTINUANCE OF WESTERN MANITOBA SERVICE BY TRANSAIR

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the minister is in the House tonight, because I want to discuss briefly a question which I posed on January 14 regarding regional air policy in western Canada. In response to the question the minister indicated that as a result of recent submissions by Transair, which is the regional carrier for the Manitoba and Saskatchewan region, he would be coming up with a solution which would be entirely satisfactory to myself and those I represent. The reason I pursue the matter tonight is that as a result of a series of discussions and negotiations the picture has changed somewhat since January 14, and certain points need clarifying.

I should like to point out to the minister, and I am sure he is aware of this, that the history of the regional policy in this part of Canada starts with a period when Air Canada provided a class 1 service. It was withdrawn, and Air Canada was replaced by Transair under subsidy. Finally, there was a removal of the subsidy and Transair was carrying on the class 1 service without subsidy.

I stress the importance of the continuance of class 1 service because there is uncertainty as to whether airport operating subsidies which apply to regional carriers and large airports used by carriers providing class 1 service, as well as subsidies for a passenger terminal building which is now under discussion, are to be tied in with the continuation of class 1 service.

As a result of discussions it has been indicated that the freight and air express business on this western lateral of the regional service has been increasing substantially during the past year or so. This is directly related to the encouraging growth of the industry in this part of the west under the incentive of the regional development program. It would seem to me that adequate air transportation is basic to a regional incentive program and would run along parallel lines.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

During the discussions it became apparent that Transair has agreed to continue this class 1 service on the western lateral. The only point in doubt is whether it will continue service into the city of Brandon. Brandon is the second city in Manitoba; it has been designated as the second city for industrial growth in that province. It would be a strange anomaly if Brandon was overflown in the interests of Regina, Saskatchewan, particularly when it can be demonstrated that most of the revenue is generated between Winnipeg and Brandon, not Regina and Winnipeg.

An hon. Member: There are only coyotes there.

Mr. Dinsdale: This service is provided by four daily flights with Air Canada DC-9s. I think one can understand that when there is a choice between pure jet and turbo jet, the DC-9 service will get the business. I hope the minister—I now he is giving this matter very serious consideration—will be able to develop a policy in such a way that the revenues and losses will be equalized over the entire system.

For example, extra revenue from airmail contracts, and the possibility of an extension of this, if the eastern lateral is to go through the Lakehead to Toronto might be taken into consideration. I would suggest that an alternate service such as a seven-passenger light aircraft service would be quite inadequate to meet the industrial needs of this part of western Manitoba. Perhaps a seven-passenger service would be an excellent means by which to supplement the A-class service already in operation, and which obviously is to continue on the western lateral, so that the best connection could be made with the connecting flights out of the city of Winnipeg.

I know this would tap the substantial passenger potential out of western Manitoba which has not yet been realized, largely because Transair has been so busy surviving that it has not been able to develop an adequate market policy. The present discussion and considerations provide an opportunity to establish a regional air policy that would really work for this important developing part of Canada. I am sure under the leadership of the minister this will be achieved, and I trust the hon. gentleman will be able to give us this assurance tonight.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am always more than pleased to try to the best of my ability to accommodate the honourable and distinguished member. Indeed, he and I have had a number of exchanges on this matter over the past weeks. I believe it was at my suggestion that the Canadian Transport Commission contacted him earlier in order to give him some sort of a progress report. Despite my willingness to discuss the matter with the hon. member, may I suggest it would have been better if this exchange had occurred tomorrow night, because I understand the Canadian Transport Commission is to release its decision with regard to prairie air services some time subsequent to 10 a.m. tomorrow.

A number of hearings have been held with the air lines, and because of the hon. member's efforts and personal interest in this matter many informal discussions have been held. I do not wish to anticipate, but it is my understanding that no service will be discontinued and that the modifications and adjustments contemplated will result in a more viable service being provided to all points now being served. I think a form of rationalization has been undertaken. Once the decision of the Canadian Transport Commission is released, if my hon. friend is still of the opinion that the matter ought to be pursued further I will do whatever is in my competence to do. In the interim I think his efforts have been fruitful and I hope the results tomorrow morning will be to his satisfaction.

PENITENTIARIES—GUARDS' PAY INCREASE—OFFER BY GOVERNMENT

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, on December 8 I asked a question of the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury). The question was as follows:

> Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General of Canada.

Eventually it got to the President of the Treasury Board.

> In view of the offer by the government of a 2 per cent pay increase for prison guards in 34 federal institutions, would the minister advise the House whether he considers this offer of 2 per cent to be a reasonable basis for contract negotiations?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest that the question as asked is not in order.

Mr. Skoberg: The reason I placed this matter on the late-night show so many weeks later is that it relates to the fact that the Public Service Alliance has signed a three-year contract with Treasury Board which provides for a 22.3 per cent raise for 2,000 guards and training officers at federal penal institutions, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* of

January 15. I believe it is very important that we look at the whole area surrounding this situation. When we pick up the paper tonight we see an item to the effect that a number of CBC workers were fired because of irregularities.

• (10:10 p.m.)

If we look back to a very short time ago we will realize that the civil servants of this country were unquestionably being subjected to intimidation by the federal government. A typical example of this is the situation of people with 25 to 30 years' seniority who are receiving letters from the CNR advising them: We regret to advise you that your services are no longer required.

The only question I should like to put tonight is: Are we really trying to negotiate, or to encourage a confrontation? I should like to refer to the situation created by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) in so far as his fine specialists are concerned. The minister says he backs the force. The following appeared in a press article:

Labour Minister Bryce Mackasey is confident his new industrial peacekeeping force of five industry specialists will not get chewed up in battles between labour and management.

For one thing, the force will be backed up by Bryce Mackasey.

At a news conference today, the Labour Minister explained that the specialists will maintain regular contacts with senior union and management officials and will be able to identify obstacles to agreement long before the two parties collide in bargaining sessions.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to the President of the Treasury Board, that he should ask the Minister of Labour to assign immediately one of these specialists to the federal negotiating bargaining table, because I am certain that in the present circumstances collective bargaining will never be achieved so far as this government is concerned.

My only purpose tonight in bringing this matter forward is to try to impress upon the government its importance. According to the news release, the Minister of Labour suggested that the experience with the traditional approach to conciliation has shown that government assistance frequently came too late to prevent the development of serious disputes. In a newspaper article we find the following:

Treasury Board President C. M. Drury said Tuesday that "every effort" is being made to conclude a satisfactory working agreement with 1,500 firemen at federal airports in Canada—

Mr. Drury said that the firemen had the option of seeking arbitration.

I suggest to the President of the Treasury Board that if we are looking for confrontation, that is all we will get. But, surely, to offer a 2 per cent increase to the penal institution employees, after which they end up with a 22.3 per cent increase, demonstrates that collective bargaining in the true sense of the word has not taken place. The Minister of Labour said:

By the time one of the parties had asked for conciliation, in the manner required by law, positions had often hardened to a degree that provided little room for manoeuvre.

Again I suggest that this is exactly the position in which the government finds itself today. The minister also said:

Introduction of the new industry specialist program reflects a determination to break with the traditional approach—to shift the emphasis from the settlement to the prevention of disputes.

I sincerely suggest to the minister that to achieve a settlement of disputes requires negotiation. I believe there is a general feeling of appreciation for this approach, but I also suggest in all humility that the Minister of Labour assign one of his new industrial specialists to beguile the President of the Treasury Board in order that the latter may appreciate what is going on in so far as negotiations are concerned. I am sure that ultimately he will convince the President of the Treasury Board that sincere relations cannot be entered into as frivolously and as temporarily as has recently been the case. I suggest that this country cannot stand this type of collective negotiation. Either we are sincere in setting up negotiations, or we will cause a confrontation. In conclusion let me quote the Minister of Labour, who said:

To maintain contact with the principal management officials and trade union leaders in a specified industry or industries and become familiar with their organizations, policies and practices—

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the greatest mistake the Minister of Labour has made to date is that he has not assigned one specialist to ensure that there will be collective bargaining as we know it.

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that what I have just listened to is a request for information. The hon. member has been giving advice.

An hon. Member: How about an explanation?

Mr. Drury: As he says, he is making a plea to incorporate into the collective bargaining

process, the conciliation officers of the federal Department of Labour. He also suggests that on the basis of a report from an undisclosed source that an offer of a 2 per cent salary increase had been made to penitentiary services. That was in his view proof positive of the insincerity of Treasury Board officers in their collective bargaining.

Mr. Benjamin: That is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Drury: He suggests, furthermore, that we should never have collective bargaining in the public service unless officers of the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) are assigned to in effect, I suppose, conduct the bargaining process. I think the hon. gentleman should know that collective bargaining in the public service is substantially by mutual agreement between bargaining agents and the Treasury Board, to be conducted in private. As a consequence, any information regarding negotiations is assumed to be speculation or rumour, and those who rely on it are allowing themselves to be misled.

This was a long and sincere collective bargaining process. It resulted in an agreement which was, I am advised, satisfactory to the penitentiary staffs and is a clear example of the success, not the failure, of the collective bargaining process. I have had relatively little experience with collective bargaining, but I do know that the party who states at the outset its final position and does not budge from that is accused, and rightly so, of inflexibility. The tactic is to start out with something considerably less than what will ultimately be offered. The representatives on the other side of the bargaining unit ask for considerably more than they hope to get.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS—REFERENCE OF INTERDEPARTMENTAL STUDY TO COMMITTEE

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpèque): Mr. Speaker, during the last few days a number of questions have been asked of the ministry about the matter of distinguished service awards. While the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) has been very forthright in stating, "There is no intention whatever to downgrade the awards which gallant and brave Canadians have received in the past from the sovereign", it seems clear that the minister has not been kept fully informed or taken completely into the confidence, apparently, of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) or whoever is in charge of an interdepartmental committee studying this matter.

I regret to say that it seems the Secretary of State, by his evasive answers, wishes to hide something. I would like to be assured of three things, Mr. Speaker, and I will try to be brief. One, I think, can be taken for granted but it is well it should be on record, and that is the decorations of a given grade awarded in the past will not be downgraded by any past or future award. To take an extreme example, I want to be assured that our Sergeant-at-Arms will never be requested to wear his Canadian Volunteer Service Medal ahead of his Victoria Cross.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Second, I hope that the parliamentary secretary can assure me that Commonwealth decorations, especially the ones instituted specifically for the armed forces for peacetime acts of gallantry, will continue to be awarded to the Canadian forces. I am thinking of such decorations as the Air Force Cross. It may be that since this government has done away with the Royal Canadian Air Force, it may feel that its role in life is to do away with the Air Force Cross as well and thus tidy-up the matter. Frankly, I do not see it that way. Surely, if members of the armed forces wear with pride the United Nations service ribbons, it is at least as fitting that Commonwealth awards should continue to be granted.

Third, I should like to be assured that any further Canadian orders or awards which may be instituted will be suitably integrated as to precedence with Commonwealth awards which have been or may be awarded to Canadians by the Crown on the recommendation of the Canadian government, so that it will be recognized, as it was for instance, that the Victoria Cross and the George Cross take precedence over the Order of Canada which was instituted in 1967. Furthermore, Canadians want to be assured that a bigot has not set the termites gnawing away at the framework of our nation in some dark corner of the Department of the Secretary of State.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLean: The traditions and practises of a nation in the matter of awards are part of the symbolism which gives its citizens a feeling of belonging to their country or to their brand of civilization. There are many traditions that members of the Commonwealth, especially the older members such as Australia, New Zealand, Canada and Great Britain, have built up together. We as a country will be poorer if we go on tearing them

down on the basis of some narrow-minded bigotry growing out of a shortsighted and provincial immaturity.

This matter, Mr. Speaker, is one on which there should be a measure of consensus, if that is at all possible. It should have the approval of Canadians generally. It should be resolved in a manner that will ensure a continuation of that approval. Therefore, I hope that before any final decision is taken by the government in this matter, the report of the committee will be studied by a standing or special committee of this House.

Mr. D. W. Gross (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the hon. member made at the outset of his remarks tonight a statement to the effect that the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) has something to hide. I think that is eminently unfair to the Secretary of State. Having said that, I very much regret that I am unable to give the hon. member a complete answer to his question, much as I should like to do so.

The fact is that the entire subject he has raised is still under active consideration by the decorations committee. In these circumstances I can do little more than repeat the reply given by my minister to what was essentially the same question asked by the hon. member last Tuesday. The reply is to be found at page 2864 of *Hansard*. For greater certainty, may I also refer the hon. member to the answer given by the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Cadieux) to a somewhat similar question asked by the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair) on January 16, which is to be found on page 2478 of *Hansard*.

Since I am allowed to speak for only three minutes, I will not read those replies. I have nothing to add except to say that we shall both have to wait until these matters now under consideration are decided. I trust that the deliberations will be concluded soon. I feel sure that when the announcement is made through the traditional channels, it will be very satisfactory to my hon. friend and all members of the House.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.25 p.m.

APPENDIX

LIST OF CGSB MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS

101: Control Location and Identification—Passenger Cars.

102: Transmission Shift Lever Sequence, Starter Interlock, and Transmission Braking Effect—Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks and Buses.

103: Windshield Defrosting and Defogging Systems—Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks and Buses.

104: Windshield Wiping and Washing Systems—Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Vehicles, Trucks and Buses.

105: Service Brake, Emergency Brake and Parking Brake Systems—Passenger Cars.

106: Hydraulic Brake Hoses—Passenger Cars and Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles.

107: Reflecting Surfaces—-Passenger Cars and Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks and Buses.

108: Lamps, Reflective Devices, and Associated Equipment—Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks, Buses, Trailers and Motorcycles.

109: New Pneumatic Tires—Passenger Cars.

110: Tire Selection and Rims—Passenger Cars.

111: Rearview Mirrors—Passenger Cars and Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles.

112. Headlamp Concealment Devices—Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks, Buses and Motorcycles.

113: Hood Latch Systems—Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks and Buses.

114: Theft Protection—Passenger Cars.

115: Vehicle Identification Number—Passenger Cars.

116: Motor Vehicle Hydraulic Brake Fluids (In Preparation).

201: Occupant Protection in Interior Impact—Passenger Cars.

202: Head Restraints—Passenger Cars.

203: Impact Protection for the Driver from the Steering Control System—Passenger Cars.

204: Steering Control Rearward Displacement—Passenger Cars.

205: Glazing Materials—Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Motorcycles, Trucks and Buses.

206: Door Latches, Hinges and Locks—Passenger Cars.

207: Anchorage of Seats—Passenger Cars.

208: Seat Belt Installations—Passenger Cars.

209: Seat Belt Assemblies—Passenger Cars, Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles, Trucks and Buses.

210: Seat Belt Assembly Anchorages—Passenger Cars.

211: Wheel Nuts, Wheel Discs, and Hub Caps—Passenger Cars and Multipurpose Passenger Vehicles.

212: Windshield Mounting—Passenger Cars.

301: Fuel Tanks, Fuel Tank Filler Pipes, and Fuel Tank Connections Passenger Cars.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, January 30, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KNOWLES (WINNIPEG NORTH CENTRE)—NATIONAL PRESS CLUB INVITATION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I must again rise on a question of privilege. I do so with reference to a document that has come to all of us. It purports to be from my friend, Bruce Phillips, president of the National Press Club.

At the outset I should like to make it clear that all of us in this place know the difference between the National Press Club and the Parliamentary Press Gallery. As I say, this matter relates to the National Press Club which has its quarters in a government building located at 150 Wellington Street. This letter starts off as follows:

Honourable Members of the Senate and the House of Commons,

Gentlemen:

All of us received a copy of this letter. I checked with my friend the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). She received it although it was just stuck in the box with no envelope. She does not know whether she is invited or not. She received the document but she is no gentleman. I understand the same dilemma obtains in respect of women members of the other place.

I know that in grammatical terms the masculine includes both masculine and feminine. I know that in the Interpretation Act the masculine is to be read both ways. But in the context of current events and in view of the fact that the National Press Club has in its constitution a ban on the admission of women to its membership and in view of the fact that this matter has been raised several times recently in Parliament, it seems to me this document is either an act of gross discourtesy to Members of Parliament, particularly the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway and women members of the other place, or it is a calculated insult because of the questions we have raised about this matter.

The document is an invitation to all of us to attend an event which I should like to attend, for it has to do with recalling the anniversary of the night the House burned, but how can I? I point out that one reason for this question of privilege is that in the letter there is a specific request that the Speakers of both Houses and the leaders of all parties be in attendance. It seems to me that so long as the National Press Club practises discrimination we should consider seriously whether with propriety any of us, including Your Honour, can accept this invitation. I have not drafted a motion—

Mr. McIlraith: You are seeking publicity.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): —because it could be that this document is a fraud. It could be that we should assume that the National Press Club would not be so stupid as to send this out. In that case maybe what is necessary is an investigation to find out how this document came into our possession. In any event, I believe the matter should be considered by all of us.

• (11:10 a.m.)

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC SERVICE

STATEMENT ON ISSUING OF RETROACTIVE PAY CHEQUES

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to advise the House that most of the delays and difficulties which have recently been experienced in the government pay system have now been resolved.

In making this statement I would like to express my thanks to several hon. members who have brought particular pay problems and particular cases to our attention.

Mr. Baldwin: It is our pleasure.

Mr. Richardson: At this time I would like to report on the present position in the Central Pay Office and also on the government's plans for continuing to improve the pay process.

Public Service Retroactive Pay Cheques

During the past year the government has signed 78 collective agreements covering 185,000 of its employees. In addition, the government has negotiated another 36 collective agreements for employees in Crown Corporations, boards and agencies. Most of these agreements include retroactive pay increases back as far as two years or more. This enormous volume of pay changes imposed an unprecedented burden on the departmental personnel officers and also on our paying offices. The size of this burden is made evident by the fact that during the last nine months of 1969 the Central Pay Office alone issued over 100,000 cheques for retroactive pay increases.

It should be emphasized that at no time did the government pay offices fail to process and to issue regular salary cheques on time. The delays which have been of concern to the government and understandably frustrating to some of its employees have been with respect to the delays in receiving increases in pay.

When the backlog of pay changes began to climb as a result of the increasing flow of collective agreements, a number of steps were taken. We employed 75 additional personnel, we worked an average of 3,000 hours a month overtime, and we strengthened the management of the paying offices.

The result of these actions was that by last November we were able to meet our initial objective of having the paying offices in a current position with respect to the implementation of collective agreements; that is to say, if some employees were not receiving on time retroactive pay increases due them under a collective agreement, the problem was not in the paying offices but in other areas of the pay process. Every effort has been made through the personnel offices of the departments and through the staff associations to identify such cases and to take immediate action.

As soon as we were up to date with the implementation of collective agreements we were able to turn our full attention to the processing of normal pay changes, that is, pay changes for employees who are promoted, who go on leave without pay, who retire, or who change their medical or other deductions. Every month our paying offices receive more than 75,000 pay changes of this type. The backlog of these normal pay changes had built up to a serious level, but I am pleased to be able to report to the House that it has been reduced steadily in recent weeks and that within the next few days the backlog will be down to a very small number of unresolved cases.

Now that the current difficulties have been overcome—I want to emphasize this—because of the hard work of many people in the departments and in the paying offices, we have an opportunity to undertake a fundamental examination of the pay system. To make the most of this opportunity, and to help make certain that the recent difficulties will not recur, I intend to engage a firm of Canadian management consultants to examine all aspects of the government's pay system.

Mr. Hees: Here we go again, more Liberals on the pay roll.

Mr. Richardson: My intention is that our pay system should be re-examined in terms of its responsiveness to the present system of collective bargaining in the Public Service, in terms of its relationship to over-all government personnel policy, and in terms of the ease with which an individual can understand how his salary cheque is calculated. It is my hope that representatives of the staff associations will be actively involved in this examination to express the point of view of their members.

I hope I have made it clear, Mr. Speaker, that we intend to do everything possible to ensure that the pay system measures up to the high standards of the government and to the understandably high expectations of its employees.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note the minister now feels that the Central Pay Office is in a current position with respect to the implementation of collective agreements. I wonder whether the minister is referring to agreements affecting employees in the Ottawa area or across Canada, for I was informed this week that 13 employees in my constituency have been waiting since last May for both their retroactive pay and increases under a collective agreement and, unless they received them in the mail today, are still waiting to secure the increases agreed upon.

The minister points out the large volume of collective agreements and the tremendous volume of changes in the amount employees have received both in pay increases and retroactive pay, but there can be no excuse for the very substantial delays that have developed between the signing of agreements and the date on which such increases have

been effected. The government knew what would transpire when the system was altered but, like everything else this government does, they did not prepare themselves for the situation that did in fact develop and as a result people have suffered and continue to suffer.

Now the minister informs us that the future will be bright because another firm of management consultants will be hired by the government to examine all aspects of the government pay system. At this late date the minister has decided that the whole pay structure system should be examined. If the government continues to hire management consultants at the present rate we will soon be informed that they are hiring a firm of management consultants to study the work of the multitude of management consultant firms they have retained to study the oversights they have failed to anticipate when they undertook changes. If management consultants were required by the Department of Supply and Services, they were required before and not after they got into this mess, and surely they should be able to determine now within the government service, and without the additional expense of outside consultants, what should be done. The Department of Supply and Services should be setting an example for other departments in examining and solving problems rather than shifting the onus to agencies outside the government to solve problems that should not have been allowed to develop with such severity and dislocation in the first place.

The minister must know that his explanation is far from satisfactory with regard to the inability of his department to deal with the situation that developed. Certainly the 185,000 employees know this to be the case.

Because of the inability of the government to anticipate the problems that would ensue the taxpayers of this nation have been burdened with the expense of an additional 75 employees and payment for 3,000 hours of overtime. This, Mr. Speaker, is just not good enough and indicates the inability of this government to cope with the problems of the day.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister of Supply and Services for providing us two or three hours ago with a copy of this statement and I thank him for making it in the House this morning.

• (11:20 a.m.)

Whether or not the delays and difficulties which have been experienced recently have been resolved will be established, I imagine, within hours. If it is true, we will not hear anything about the matter but if it is not true we will continue to hear from those who have not got their retroactive pay cheques.

Other than that initial comment, there are three brief remarks I should like to make. First, I join with the Minister of Supply and Services in criticizing the other areas of government that have been far too slow with respect to the matter of pay increases. As the minister has said on two or three occasions, he is only at the end of the pipeline. It is somewhere downstream, or upstream, that the delay has taken place. I earnestly hope that the business of getting collective bargaining going and pay increases put into effect will be speeded up and that the Minister of Supply and Services will not have to level this criticism against other areas of government.

The second of my three comments I suppose has been made for me by the preceding speaker. I, too, am afraid that this firm of management consultants will get in the way. We shall have to have more of them. In the end a white paper will have to be put out and, eventually, we shall have to have a reference to a committee. It seems to me that there ought to be a simpler way of straightening out this problem.

My third comment is that the paragraph I like best in the statement is the penultimate one which says:

> It is my hope that representatives of the staff associations will be actively involved in this examination to express the point of view of their members.

I trust that the minister will turn that hope into an assertion. I have noted with interest the comments on this question which have been made, notably by the Public Service Alliance of Canada and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada. They have made it clear that the main trouble is not with those who are working in the Central Pay Office but with the system, and they have ideas as to how the system can be improved. Their approach to this question is much more practical than that of management consultants. I hope the minister will not just hope that these people can get involved but will bring them in very actively and obtain their assistance in straightening out this situation so that these delays may be a thing of the past.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the minister for sending us the French version of the statement he has just made.

We are pleased with the improvement mentioned by the minister and with the fact that the Treasury Board has always performed his task well. In his statement, the minister points out that the complaints by hon. members were given careful consideration. It is to the credit of the minister and for us encouragement to keep on asking for justice in Parliament.

We must, however, deplore the delay in payment of the 7 per cent premium to all bilingual employees. This delay, to my mind unjustified, does not further the cause of good understanding in Canada. I therefore urge the minister to give this problem special attention, particularly in the case of members of the House of Commons Protective Service who receive no recognition for being bilingual. It is so satisfying to French-speaking visitors to be welcomed in French in the parliament buildings that I feel special attention should be given to these guards who have long been deprived of something to which they are entitled.

[*English*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

COMPLETION OF COMMITTEE INQUIRY INTO PARAGRAPH 101 OF AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the representatives of the parties with respect to a possible order of the House which would permit the Public Accounts Committee to complete the work it had under way during the previous session. I think there might be found to be general agreement for an order of the House in the following terms:

That a copy of the Minutes of the Proceedings and Evidence of, and all papers produced before, the Standing Committee on Public Accounts during the first session of the twenty-eighth Parliament in relation to the committee's inquiry into paragraph 101 of the Auditor General's report for the year ended March 31, 1967, be laid before the House and referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

If there is agreement, Mr. Speaker, perhaps that could be made an order of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

AUTHORIZATION TO SUBCOMMITTEE TO TRAVEL OUTSIDE CANADA

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have also been discussions among representatives of the parties in respect of the work of the Maritime Forces Subcommittee of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. I think there might also be agreement to the following order:

That the members who comprise the Subcommittee on Maritime Forces of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence be granted leave to travel outside Canada between February 15 and February 17, 1970, namely to Norfolk, Virginia, for the purpose of visiting the Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic, and Washington, D.C., and that the necessary supporting staff accompany them.

Perhaps that could also be made an order.

Mr. Speaker: Does the House agree to the order in the terms proposed by the President of the Privy Council?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVILEGE

MR. CROUSE—STATEMENT OUTSIDE HOUSE BY MINISTER OF FISHERIES ON ATLANTIC COAST SEAL FISHERY

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting the rights and privileges of every member of the House.

At nine o'clock this morning the Minister of Fisheries held a press conference outside this House, and at that time he made a statement on the Atlantic coast seal fishery and the outcome of discussions he has held on this important matter with the Norwegian Minister of Fisheries. I contend that the Minister of Fisheries, in following this course, has been discourteous to the elected representatives of the people of Atlantic Canada and to the House of Commons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Crouse: We are thereby prevented from replying to his statement. By making the statement outside the House the Minister of Fisheries has held Parliament in contempt. This is not the first time the minister has acted in an arbitrary manner with regard to announcing regulations of concern to the sealing industry. In fact, he completely ignored a

unanimous recommendation by the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry in respect of this industry which is of vital importance to the economy of Atlantic Canada.

In our opinion, if the Minister of Fisheries had any respect for Parliament he would have waited two hours more and made his statement in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I am rising more on a question of privilege than in response to what one might call the substance of that charge. The hon. member has said that I have completely disregarded a recommendation of a committee of this House. Nothing could be farther from the truth. That committee recommended that the sealing hunt continue and it is continuing.

Mr. McGrath: You have destroyed the industry.

Mr. Davis: It recommended protection by certain conservation measures. These precautions have also been incorporated in the arrangements we have made in recent months. We have followed the recommendations of the committee of this House to the letter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: A misleading and false statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for South Shore has raised a matter by way of a question of privilege. I think he will recognize that there is not a question of privilege. In any event there has been no motion proposed.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. In connection with the hon. member's purported question of privilege I would make the ruling that it is not a question of privilege and I should not think the matter should be pursued further.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a point of order in reference to statements made on motions. In doing so I would refer to page 9 of the Standing Orders where the kind of statements that can be made is outlined. It is my personal view as a member of the House that the Minister of Manpower and Immigration yesterday and the Minister of Supply and Services today did not follow the rules of the House in respect of making brief and succinct statements of government policy. Nor did the members of the opposition follow the rules in commenting upon those statements. I believe it is most important that regulations affecting sealing on the east coast and salmon on the west coast are not dealt with at all times in the House. We have other things to deal with that—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubt whether that is a point of order. It is my impression that the hon. member is seeking to initiate a debate on a substantive question, and I feel that cannot be done either by way of a question of privilege or a point of order.

• (11:30 a.m.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

TAXATION

SUPPLEMENTARY WHITE PAPERS ON TAX REFORM

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance I should like to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio from Windsor West. It relates to the promised paper to supplement the white paper on tax reform. This supplementary paper, which it was promised would be issued before the end of January, has not arrived. Can the minister indicate to the House when the supplementary paper will be available to the House and to the people of Canada? I ask this question because of the obvious absurdity of the people of Canada having to consider the question of tax reform without knowing what the government's proposals are.

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, my recollection of the minister's words before the committee is that the paper in question could be expected probably by the end of January. Work is proceeding on it. I am sure it will be presented at the earliest possible date. I recall the minister saying that the paper was to set out various factors to be taken into account in considering one particular aspect of the white paper.

Mr. Stanfield: I am disappointed that the minister cannot give us any idea when it will

be received. May I ask the minister also whether it is the intention to present a supplementary paper relating to modifications in the white paper consequent upon discussions with the provinces, it having been indicated that this might happen? Can the minister give us any information concerning when we may expect such a supplementary paper?

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I would think it would be more appropriate to hear evidence before the committee before proceeding along the lines my hon. friend is suggesting.

Mr. Stanfield: I wonder whether the minister could say whether it would be proper for us, until we receive these supplementary papers, to pretend that the white paper does not really exist or, indeed, whether the minister would encourage us to believe that eventually the government might withdraw the white paper and start all over again?

HOUSING

PUBLIC HOUSING—REQUEST FOR INCLUSION IN POLICY STATEMENT OF REACTION TO RENTAL PROPOSAL

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question on the urgent and important matter of housing. The Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing has not been in the House for three days. I suppose I should address my question to the Prime Minister, or to any other minister who can answer a question on housing. When the minister makes his promised statement on public housing shortly, will he include a statement on the government's reaction to the proposal of the Ontario Housing Corporation for a study of revision and reduction of rentals for public housing?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to inform the House that when the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing is not present during this question period it is my responsibility to appear on his behalf, and I have been here on occasions earlier this week when he has been away on government business. I will certainly be pleased to draw the hon. member's question to the minister's attention. I am sure his question will be given consideration along with other important matters pertaining to this area of policy.

Mr. Brewin: Does the minister propose to make a statement to the House on Monday dealing with an increase in funds available for low-cost public housing?

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Gray: Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had an opportunity to check with my colleague concerning the exact date of an announcement in this area. I believe it will come forward very shortly and I think will indicate the government's intention to give emphasis to this area of housing need.

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL PARKS

POINTE FORILLON—AGREEMENT RESPECTING ESTABLISHMENT AND MINERAL EXPLORATION RIGHTS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Can he tell us whether the agreement with the Province of Quebec concerning the transfer of land for developing a national park in the Gaspé Peninsula is final, and whether work on the project is to start as planned?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the arrangement is final. However the Quebec government has not yet transferred that land to us and we can only start work if and when we are in possession of such land.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Could the minister advise the House whether or not he has met with members of the Quebec government with a view to arriving at an agreement concerning the mining rights inside the park?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, that problem was settled at the time of the agreement. In a national park, no mining or oil operations are allowed. That point should not have been raised recently for the agreement had provided for that.

[*English*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

FORT CHIMO—PROTECTION OF LANGUAGE RIGHTS IN TRANSFER OF AUTHORITY

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whose remarks on strategy I listened to with interest this morning over the CBC. Is action being taken or has action been taken by the government of Canada to protect the interests of its wards, the Eskimo-Canadians at Fort Chimo, in respect of the transferring of authority over them to the

provincial government, particularly in respect of their right to the language of their choice in the schools and, generally, to what degree are these people being given the opportunity as Canadians to determine their course rather than being placed in the position of being pushed around like chattels?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, may I point out to the right hon. member that negotiations are under way and that the first condition we make, with regard to any transfer, is that the people who live in the New Quebec territories be free to worship as they please and to speak the language of their choice.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the minister say with whom the negotiations are taking place, and will he also answer the question concerning why it is that decisions of this kind are being made without the consent of these Canadians of the Eskimo race who are entitled to be consulted and not to be pushed around?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it is not true that decisions have been taken. Discussions are presently in progress and I am pleased to inform the right hon. member that a team comprised of one provincial and one federal official is now travelling through Canada. This team will visit New Quebec in order to consider what formulas could be adopted to ensure that the Eskimos will participate fully in Quebec and Canadian life.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Have these Eskimo people at Fort Chimo consented to being pushed around in this way?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: If they are not being pushed around, then why are they going up north to the Northwest Territories?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the right hon. gentleman knows the situation very well.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have all the facts here.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: A few years ago we concluded an agreement to the effect that no change of jurisdiction would take place unless the Eskimos participated in the discussions. That is exactly what we are doing now, by sending two officials to that region.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Unless they agree.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Abitibi.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Has he received representations from parents in other New Quebec communities expressing their fear about the language in which their children will receive their education and can he assure us that Eskimos are kept well informed by Quebec authorities?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out to the hon. member that last summer, I visited four Eskimo and Indian villages in New Quebec. I heard the grievances of those citizens and I assured them there would be no jurisdictional transfer unless the protection of their language and religion was guaranteed.

We have undertaken other action to keep them better informed. We have invited Eskimos to meetings held in Quebec city, where federal and provincial officials were present. The proceedings have been translated in Eskimo, English and French, and have been sent to Eskimos for study. Discussions are going on at the moment, with the participation of one federal and one provincial official.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why are they leaving there in such numbers?

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister have his department make inquiries as to why a relatively large number of Eskimos have moved from Fort Chimo in view of the assurances given by the minister to the Eskimos that they would not be forced to change the language of their education?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the exact number of Eskimos who have emigrated from Fort Chimo to the Northwest Territories, but I shall try to get it. I know

that two or three families left Suglic last winter, and all of them, except one, returned to Suglic last summer, to start living again in their community and with their fellow-citizens.

[*English*]

STONY CREEK—FORCED ATTENDANCE OF CHILDREN AT PUBLIC SCHOOL

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I have a supplementary question to the minister regarding the rights of individuals to determine their own course of action. Is it still the intention of the government to force Indian children in Stony Creek, British Columbia, to attend the public school rather than the Roman Catholic school they have been attending for a number of years?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): No, Mr. Speaker. By the way, an official from my department stated yesterday before the committee, that the Indians had the right to attend the school of their choice. Of course, a particular situation will soon develop there because of the increasing number of school-age children. Since there may be a shortage of school rooms next year, department officials have given to understand that it might be desirable that some pupils attend public school, but I can assure the hon. member that no family will be forced to have their children attend this school.

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

FOREIGN POLICY REVIEW

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I should like to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Would he take the first opportunity on motions to advise the House of the results of the foreign policy review which he initiated nearly two years ago, in addition, of course, to the government's policy on NATO which was announced some time ago?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Thus far the results are evident in the great deal of work done by the Department of External Affairs and by the ministers who are members of the cabinet committee that is studying the recommendations and reports.

Mr. Hees: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Prime Minister expect to take the House into his confidence in the near future as to what the actual results are, and is he confident that the policy which members of the government are studying at the present time will be equally successful in antagonizing our principal allies and trading partners as our policy of withdrawing troops from NATO has been?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

GRAIN

PURPOSE OF TRIP BY MINISTER TO ENGLAND

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): I should like to direct a question to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board arising from the press release issued by the minister's office yesterday in which the minister stated:

> I am going to England next week to consult with our principal buyers there, not as a grain salesman, mind you.

My question is: What is the purpose of the minister's trip, or is he just going as a tourist?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question arises out of the question asked by the hon. member for Marquette. During the minister's stay in Britain, will he take the opportunity to discuss with that government the concern of Canadian farmers about the possible loss of markets, and will he report back on the stance the British government will take during negotiations for their entry into the European Common Market?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): I may indeed have opportunities to discuss the very important question of agricultural policy in England, Mr. Speaker, and the access to that market for Canadian wheat under a variety of circumstances in the future. I thank the hon. member for making the suggestion.

SCIENCE COUNCIL

CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF CHAIRMAN

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board. In view of the fact that Dr. Solandt has obviously come to the decision that he intends to remain as chairman of the Science Council of Canada, has the minister had any indication that Dr. Solandt is currently considering divesting himself of his

interests in the Electric Reduction Company of Canada as an alternative means of freeing himself from conflict-of-interest charges?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): No, I have had no such indication.

Mrs. MacInnis: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are members of this House to conclude that Canada is so poverty-stricken in the field of science that Dr. Solandt is the only competent and capable scientist available to occupy this very sensitive post?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that her question is argumentative.

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council. Is it the intention of the government to move shortly to implement the very important proposals and recommendations of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): We have had the proposals under consideration, and a draft proposal is now being completed which I hope will be available to the House before the end of the session.

Mr. Baldwin: I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. Would the Prime Minister use what influence he has with the President of the Privy Council to speed up the process, and would he take into account the very alarming and dangerous increase in executive dictatorial powers contained in recent government legislation and the need to provide countervailing supervisory powers to Parliament?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I wish to inform the hon. member that I do not have that much leverage with the House Leader. He is always threatening to resign if I make him do that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

OIL

CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN PANARCTIC OILS LIMITED

Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can the Minister advise the House if and when he will be making a statement regarding the government's participation or non-participation, as the case may be, in the Panarctic Oil consortium?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. I am unable to say when I shall make a statement, but the government is ready to make public its opinion on the matter. I hope to be in a position to make such a statement in the House next week.

[*English*]

[*Later:*]

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whether the government has had any firm offers for its share of Panarctic Oils Limited?

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I replied a moment ago in answer to a question by the hon. member for Kamloops-Cariboo that I would have a statement to make next week in this connection.

[*English*]

THE MINISTRY

PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE—FILLING OF REGIONAL DESK POSITIONS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the appointment of persons holding positions at the so-called regional desks in the Prime Minister's office to positions in departments in spite of the freeze on personnel hiring, will the Prime Minister advise whether the regional desk positions will remain vacant or does he contemplate making new appointments?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure that this question is urgent or that it should be asked at this time. I wonder if the hon. member might not consider the advisability of placing his question on the Order Paper.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

LISTING OF INGREDIENTS ON FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of

Consumer and Corporate Affairs, but in view of his absence perhaps I can direct it to the Acting Minister, the Solicitor General. How soon may the Canadian people expect ingredient listing on food products?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I will be very glad to take the question as notice and bring it to the attention of the minister.

TRANSPORT

NEED FOR ICEBREAKERS ON EAST COAST

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): My question is for the able and co-operative Minister of Transport.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He must feel lost over there.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): In view of the fact that only one icebreaker, the *Wolfe* is at present on the east coast where ice conditions, I am informed, are very hazardous, whereas the bulk of the icebreaker fleet is at present located on the St. Lawrence, will the minister investigate the situation and have it remedied in view of its urgency?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): We are reassessing ice conditions on a daily basis, and if it should prove necessary to put some vessels into the area in question we will be glad to do it. In the meantime, let me assure the hon. member that I will be delighted to keep the "*Wolfe*" at his door.

WATER RESOURCES

AMENDMENT OF BILL TO COVER EFFLUENT FEES

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, but in his absence perhaps I might direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary. In view of reports following yesterday's meeting between the minister and the Ontario Minister of Energy and Resources Management, does the minister propose, in addressing the Standing Committee on National Resources on Monday, to announce amendments with respect to the Canada Water Act and particularly the payment of effluent fees?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): I will be glad to bring the hon. member's representation to the attention of the minister so that he can make an announcement on Monday if he so desires.

[Mr. Noble.]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

PHASING OUT OF MARINE DIVISION

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): On Monday last the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys asked a question about the marine services of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and I undertook to bring forward further information. The situation is that the method of control of these services both as to personnel and the responsibility for the use of the boats is being re-examined. The services will now report through the divisional command in the region in which the boats are being used. I might add that in addition two of the boats will be taken out of service this spring because they are obsolescent and not suitable for the purpose for which they are being used.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister if he would go further and assure the House that the mounties will be able to get their man on sea as well as on land?

TRANSPORT

WHEAT—EXTENSION OF CHURCHILL SHIPPING SEASON

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of reports that practically all of the wheat for the port of Churchill shipping season has been sold, will he consider making representations to his colleague the Minister of Transport to immediately extend the Churchill shipping season from its present short length of time?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member knows that my colleague, the Minister of Transport, has this matter in hand for consideration. Certainly on our part we are always concerned to see that the port of Churchill is used to the maximum extent possible for the shipment of wheat.

Mr. Burton: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of this and other indications that the port of Churchill will be used more extensively than was suggested in the recent report tabled by the minister, will he consider

using his good offices, particularly as a cabinet minister from the province of Saskatchewan, to urge that the development plan for the port of Churchill be speeded up from what is proposed in the report?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a representation; it is hardly a question.

TRADE

POSSIBLE BRITISH ENTRY INTO ECM—REPRESENTATIONS TO PRIME MINISTER WILSON

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. During his discussions with the Prime Minister of Great Britain did he bring to the attention of Prime Minister Wilson the serious effects on Canadian agriculture that are bound to follow if the United Kingdom enters the European Common Market unless similar provisions are made to those agreed to by Prime Minister McMillan during my administration as Prime Minister to protect Canadian agriculture as well as that of Australia and New Zealand?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we did raise this general subject with the Prime Minister of Great Britain and I was greatly assisted in this endeavour by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The subject was discussed at some length and during the discussions the Prime Minister of Great Britain said that there had been no guarantees of that type given at the time of previous negotiations with the Common Market.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I say there were. They are fully set out and express rights were protected.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested to find out where they were set out. If they were not verbal, perhaps they were in documented form and if so I would like to have the reference.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All you have to do is look it up. So Canadian agriculture is to be sacrificed.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INCREASE IN TRUCKING RATES BY QUEBEC TRANSPORTATION BOARD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister without Portfolio from Windsor West whether he is in a position to answer the question I asked earlier in the week following a question addressed to the Minister of Finance a week ago on the attitude of the government toward the increase in Quebec-Ontario trucking rates and whether the government proposes to take any initiative at all in this regard?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I should like to apologize to my hon. friend for not having the information here for him at this time but I will have the answer for him on Monday.

TRANSPORT

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN—RETURN OF CANADIAN BOXCARS FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the genial Minister of Transport. The minister's Parliamentary Secretary took notice of this question on Tuesday during his absence. In view of current reports from the United States that the tremendous grain boxcar shortage in that country may result in legislation to rectify the situation, would the minister indicate if he is taking any steps to make sure that Canadian boxcars in use in the United States are being returned to Canada within the prescribed time limit?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have a large number of figures on the boxcar situation at the moment and I would be glad to make them available to the hon. member. I would also inform him at this time that the continuing discussions with the presidents of the two railways will go on. I should like to emphasize, as has my colleague the Minister without Portfolio from Saskatoon-Humboldt, the importance of getting as many cars back as possible.

Mr. Southam: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister consider a materially increased daily rental or demurrage charge on Canadian boxcars being used in the United States to ensure the speedy return of our rolling stock?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, this is a matter for the railways in the first instance, but I shall be very glad to discuss it with them at my next meeting which should be Monday or Tuesday.

Inquiries of the Ministry

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN—FULFILLING BY RAILWAYS OF WHEAT BOARD ORDERS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): A supplementary question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker. In view of the serious shortage of boxcars at many points in Saskatchewan and the serious lack of diesel units available to haul boxcars, could the minister now state whether there are any orders on hand issued by the Canadian Wheat Board that the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian National Railways have not been able to fulfil at this time?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the question does not permit a simple answer. First of all, the area is divided into two parts, the part fully within the block system and the part that is not. Within the block system orders are met on schedule according to the program laid out from week to week. In the case of the non-block system, orders may be outstanding for some time before cars are spotted. The block system will be fully in effect, I think, by the end of February and at that time there should be complete order in the way in which cars arrive to pick up the orders.

The question of motive power available to the railways is one of very serious concern to us. We have had discussions with the railways to ensure that they will take steps to bring their motive power into position to handle the very large number of carload orders which—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe.

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

ST. SCHOLASTIQUE—AGREEMENT BETWEEN OTTAWA AND QUEBEC

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport.

Could he advise the House if an agreement has been reached with the Quebec government respecting the international airport at St. Scholastique?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the airport is entirely within the competence of the federal government there is no necessity for such an official agreement. In terms of our working agreements and relationships and in terms of the development of various parts of the land that has been acquired, I can say that negotiations are going forward amiably and, I think, profitably, and I would hope to be able to make a full statement on the matter on Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

TANZANIA—FUNDS FOR BUILDING OF MILITARY COLLEGE

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, my question could have been supplementary to that asked previously by the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East and the answer provided by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on the possible lack of accommodation for Indian children. I should like to ask the Minister of National Defence if the Canadian government is providing funds for the building of a military college in Tanzania or any other foreign country?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

FISHERIES

COMPENSATION TO FISHERMEN FOR WHITE COAT SEAL BAN

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Now that the minister by his arbitrary decision has effectively destroyed the Canadian seal industry contrary to the unanimous wishes of the Fisheries Committee—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should not make a statement, he should ask a question.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be a very serious question and not at all frivolous as some members across the way may think. My question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is: what steps will the government of Canada take to compensate the fishermen of the Magdalen Islands and Newfoundland who will suffer economic hardship as a consequence of the minister's arbitrary decision to ban the harvesting of white coat seals?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, after a record

number of ships have returned from the seal hunt this spring, we will see how they made out.

EXTENT OF SEAL HERD—CONSERVATION MEASURES

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a couple of supplementary questions. First, can the minister indicate the extent of the seal herd in the North Atlantic, especially since he has indicated that an increase of one million seals will reduce the incomes of Newfoundland fishermen by about 25 per cent? Also, could he indicate what will be the result of the conservation measures on the increase in the seal herd?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, scientists tell us that the present seal population is of the order of 2.5 million. If there were no harvesting of seals it would increase by 1.5 million. That increase would seriously affect our other fishery activities in the North Atlantic.

Mr. Lundrigan: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister make a statement on motions to indicate what measures will be taken either to increase or control the size of the seal herd, in view of the detrimental effect on other fisheries? Will he also indicate what negotiations have taken place with the Soviet Union in order that we may be assured that benefits to be gained from conservation measures will not end up in the pockets of the Russians, since its fishing fleet could conceivably prosecute the North Atlantic fishery?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as a result of the continuation of the seal hunt, and because only older seals will be taken, there will not be any difficulty in maintaining the herd at its present level. There will therefore, be no detrimental effect as a result of any recent steps taken. The Soviet Union participated, as late as 1964, in this fishery but we do not expect that it will in future.

ROYAL VISIT

GRANTING OF AMNESTY TO INMATES OF FEDERAL PRISONS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General. He was here a moment ago. Perhaps if I ask my question slowly he will return to his seat in time to answer it. In view of the forthcoming visit of Her Majesty to Canada this year, will any arrangements be made to grant a special amnesty to inmates in federal prisons? Will their time be reduced as a result of the exercise of the royal prerogative?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to consider the hon. member's suggestion.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MAURITANIA—COMPOSITION OF CANADIAN DELEGATION TO EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In his absence, however, may I direct it to the right hon. Prime Minister?

Since Canada has received an invitation from Mauritania to attend the forthcoming conference on education, can the Prime Minister tell us whether he has decided to send a delegation and, if so, what its make-up will be?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to what the Secretary of State for External Affairs told the House in that respect. Federal officials, in co-operation with the provinces concerned, are now considering the make-up of a Canadian delegation.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, could the Prime Minister indicate to the House whether provinces other than Quebec have hinted that they would send some of their own representatives to that conference?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I could not tell. There were representatives from two or three provinces in the previous Canadian delegations. That is likely to be the case this time, but I cannot give any assurance to the House. That will of course depend on the provinces themselves.

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

ALLEGED SPECIAL ATTENTION TO CRITICS OF WHITE PAPER ON TAX REFORM

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Revenue. Will the minister look into a rather rare coincidence involving officials of his department? It seems that certain taxpayers recently visited by his tax officials were people who, just previous to the visits, had criticized the white paper on tax reform.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Perhaps that will explain why our western farmers have not been left free from the same course.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Later:*]

Mr. Barney Danson (York North): Mr. Speaker, my question is supplementary to the one asked a moment ago by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster. If all those who have criticized the white paper on tax reform are being investigated by officials of the Department of National Revenue, I wonder if the minister would consider asking the Minister of National Defence for troops to cover the whole job?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

AIR TRANSPORT

CTC DECISION RESPECTING PRAIRIE SERVICES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport? Is the hon. gentleman in a position to table the decision of the CTC on improved air service for the prairies which he indicated last night would be available at ten o'clock this morning?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have both the judgment and the press release here and, if it is so wished, I will be glad to table them. Other copies will be available. However, if the hon. member wishes me to I will be glad to table a copy of the judgment.

LOWER FARES WITHIN CANADA

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the President of Air Canada made it known publicly a couple of days ago that Air Canada is pressing very hard for lower transatlantic fares for the ordinary travelling public, is the government pressing Air Canada to make lower fares available to Canadians travelling in this country as well?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have not discussed this matter with the chairman of the board of Air Canada, but I am sure this is something that will come up in the near future. Of course, we must also make sure that the fares do not descend to the point where they become a drain on the general public. We must not reduce fares to the point where we have a deficit.

HARBOURS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SMALL VESSEL REGULATIONS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, a little earlier during the question period the Minister of Transport was receiving too much flattery for his own good. May I ask this procrastinating minister if he will make a statement with regard to changes in small vessel harbour administration on the British Columbia coast? He has been toying with this idea for many weeks, months—even years.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have been toying with it because it is a very complex problem. It has reached the point where we have designated certain harbours in British Columbia as being commercial harbours, others as being fishing harbours and still others as being pleasure harbours. I have handed the list over to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry and the Minister of Public Works. If they agree with my assignment of categories, I am suggesting that these harbours be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Department of Transport to the jurisdiction of other related departments. This would be, from my point of view, good riddance.

Mr. Barnett: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be prepared to table in the House a list of the proposed designations he has referred to, so that the rest of us in the House may have a chance of looking at them?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I will give the hon. member a map and let him make up his own list. I would also be glad to give him this list.

[*Later:*]

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. Do I understand from the minister's answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni that the harbours referred to in British Columbia will now be transferred to three different federal departments, each of which will be responsible for a certain number of them? Will there not be some co-ordination in the application of harbour policy in British Columbia?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, what I said was, and I repeat, that there are harbours in British Columbia which I should like to come under the responsibility of various departments. Some are used only as fishing harbours, and it appears to me that they could be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Department of Transport to that of the Department of Fisheries. That is a matter we are now discussing.

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Prime Minister? Has he asked the law officers of the Crown to investigate whether there was an invasion of his personal privacy by news reporters stationed outside his home last night, at whom the Prime Minister threw snowballs? Also, is the Prime Minister providing snowmobiles for these newsmen this weekend so they may be able to keep up with his fast pace in private life?

AIR TRANSPORT

REPORT ON CRASH AT WABUSH

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Will he advise the House if his department's officials have yet completed their investigation into the air crash near Wabush, Labrador, last year which claimed the lives of a number of officials of Churchill Falls Power Corporation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker. The detailed study has not been completed. When it has been and has been handed to me, I will in due course release it in the customary fashion.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ST. JOHN'S, NFLD—INVESTIGATION OF ACCIDENT INVOLVING SNOW CLEARING EQUIPMENT

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport? Will the minister undertake to have an investigation begun immediately into an accident that occurred recently near St. John's involving Canadian National snow clearing equipment?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that such investigation is undertaken as a matter of course. If it has not been, I will see that the investigation is speeded up.

POLLUTION

LAKE ERIE—RECOMMENDATION OF MORATORIUM ON OIL DRILLING

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, but as the minister is absent perhaps his Parliamentary Secretary could answer it. Would the minister advise the House whether the Canadian government intends to make a similar recommendation to the International Joint Commission as that made by the United States government two months ago when it recommended that a moratorium be imposed on oil drilling in Lake Erie because of dangerous pollution possibilities?

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the minister is meeting today with the National Advisory Committee on Petroleum. This may be one of the subjects discussed at this meeting, and I will bring the hon. member's point to the attention of the minister.

Mr. Harding: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. This very question was raised exactly two months ago. You asked me to put it on the ten o'clock show, which I did. I raised it the other night but neither the minister nor the Parliamentary Secretary were here to answer, even after arrangements had been made. Surely, a better answer than this should be forthcoming from the department.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, purely in the interests of trying to facilitate the business of this House by shortcircuiting numerous questions to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of the coming week. I ask the minister to make a statement on motions at the earliest convenient opportunity, indicating what effect the conservation measures respecting seals will have on the fisheries resources in the Atlantic region. As members from Atlantic Canada, we are entitled to some assurance that this conservation measure will not in fact reduce our fisheries income—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to interrupt the hon. member because this is not a point of order. He has asked the minister whether a statement will be made. That is the type of question which might normally be asked during the question period.

Mr. Lundrigan: I did ask it.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member says he did not have time to ask—

Mr. Lundrigan: I did ask the question.

Mr. Speaker: In any event, other questions cannot be asked now as the question period expired a few moments ago. Perhaps the hon. member might ask the question on Monday and the minister might reflect on the matter between now and then.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that I did ask the question but the minister gave us no indication of what the position is. Therefore I am trying to facilitate the business of the House. I should like a response to the question.

• (12:20 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING COST OF MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL SERVICES TO CREW

Hon. Herb Gray (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill C-10, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Bill C-10 deals, in the main, with amendments to the existing legislation provided in Part V of the Canada Shipping Act and includes an amendment to Part IV of the Canada Shipping Act.

The concept of a prepaid medical insurance and hospital insurance plan for ill or injured seafarers from vessels of foreign registry entering Canadian ports originated in the last century, in fact before Confederation, in the province of New Brunswick. The purpose of this plan was to set up a fund to defray the cost of medical and surgical treatment and hospitalization provided to a sick mariner and to prevent these costs becoming a charge on the community where such were incurred when the vessel set sail and left ill seamen behind.

At confederation, the responsibility for administration of this service was transferred to the federal government and was expanded to include other maritime provinces. This service was later extended, on an optional basis, to provide sick mariners benefits to crew members of Canadian registered fishing vessels. The fund to provide these services was accrued by the collection of dues, that is, a levy or a duty, calculated on the basis of the tonnage of the vessel. Existing legislation provides for the collection of two cents per ton on the occasion of the first three entries in a Canadian port in the calendar year. It is obligatory for certain vessels, including foreign vessels, and optional to Canadian vessels engaged in the fishing industry.

Until the early 1940's, the revenues collected closely approximated the expenditures. During the 1940's costs spiralled; revenues remained fixed by statute and could not be adjusted to meet the increased costs. This disparity developed chiefly in respect of government vessels, fishing vessels of Canadian registry and vessels operating exclusively in Canadian waters. The government departments were requested to withdraw from the plan, which they did in 1956. In recent years, the revenue collected from foreign vessels has closely approximated the costs and, in fact, in some years has exceeded the expenditures. The over-all deficit incurred in operating the service has resulted from the provision of the services to crews of Canadian fishing vessels and vessels operating exclusively in Canadian waters.

Many changes in respect of medical care and hospital insurance have occurred since this legislation was enacted. A number of schemes for medical care insurance have been available to Canadians. With the advent of prepaid medical care insurance in some provinces, a considerable number of Canadian fishermen and mariners are adequately protected. In certain provinces, they may be protected by the provisions of the workmen's compensation board and in all provinces the provisions of the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act are applicable.

Many changes in respect of the shipping industry have occurred as well. The small vessel with a large crew complement has been replaced by the large mechanized vessel with a small crew complement. In addition, medical care insurance plans are available to the owner of a vessel and many foreign shipping companies have taken advantage of these schemes to provide protection for their crews. As Canada is one of the few nations, if not the only nation, that provides sick mariners benefits, many shipping companies have appreciated the need to cover their crew with an insurance plan applicable in any port in the world. It is apparent that the obligation to pay dues in order to enter a Canadian port results in a duplication of these particular costs to the owner or agent of a foreign shipping company which, no doubt, contributes to increased transportation costs to Canadians.

The minister's decision to amend Part V of the Canada Shipping Act has followed deliberations within the department as a result of consultation with concerned colleagues in the Departments of Transport, Fisheries and Forestry, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, Manpower and Immigration and Justice.

The amendments presented as Bill C-10 effect repeal of the provision to collect dues and to provide medical treatment without charge to ill or injured crew members from vessels of foreign registry but retain, on an optional basis, provision for the collection of dues and medical care to ill or injured seamen from a Canadian vessel engaged in the fishing industry, providing these services are not available by reason of a federal-provincial cost sharing agreement under the Medical Care Act. The plan has never operated in either of the two northern territories nor in the inland waters of Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan or Alberta.

In the event a sick mariner from a foreign registered vessel is not covered by a medical care insurance plan, it is deemed necessary to amend Part IV of the act by the addition of a clause requiring ship owners to take responsibility for costs of health care to crews.

To summarize, we have legislation which was enacted, in the main, for two reasons. One of these reasons is now almost non-existent, the other is now thwarted. It is proposed to continue to provide medical care insurance but not hospitalization for crew members of Canadian fishing vessels, the masters of which elect to pay sick mariners dues before the first fishing voyage in the calendar year, in those provinces which do not have an operating medical care insurance scheme, provided Part V of the Canada Shipping Act formerly operated in that province. This results in the proposals of Bill C-10 operating in the provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, until such time as these provinces implement a medical care insurance program.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at length on this subject. This, however, is a matter which has concerned me, for some period of time particularly in respect of Part V of the Canada Shipping Act. I hope that I, perhaps, had something to do with instigating the introduction of this legislation. Over a period of time, I have been corresponding with the minister and his officials on this subject. In fact, last summer I specifically asked how long Part V of the Canada Shipping Act had been in existence and whether it had ever been reviewed. I asked why it had not been made to conform to modern conditions. There are many matters which I hope will be resolved by this bill. However, I shall raise them again in case I have not properly understood the remarks of the parliamentary secretary.

I understand that one reason for the service provided under this Act is the provision of free drugs to sick mariners. I now understand that under this legislation medical services will be provided similar to those provided to any other citizen who has access to services under a medical care insurance plan. I note that new Section 318(1) in clause 3 of the bill reads:

> The master of a Canadian ship described in section 316 in respect of which the duty prescribed in that section has been paid may apply in writing to the Customs Officer at any port to have any sick mariner on his ship provided, without charge, with the services of a designated medical practitioner that are medically required by that sick mariner.

Again, we have a situation where the master of a ship must apply in writing. I expect there is a standard form for this. He must apply to the customs officer at the port where the ship lands to have the sick mariner provided with medical help. But again, the sick mariner can be provided with help only by the designated medical practitioner of that port. I may be wrong, but it is my understanding that this does not change the existing legislation in the sense that there is still a provision that a sick mariner can be treated only by the medical practitioner of that port. If I am wrong, I hope the parliamentary secretary will correct me, but it would seem to me that this provision would not apply in a province where there is a medical care plan. In a province where there is no medical care plan, the mariner would still be treated by the medical practitioner designated by the customs officer at that particular port. I also wonder whether the latter provision applies only to fishing vessels or whether it applies to other vessels as well. I think, for instance, of ferries such as, the motor vessel *Bluenose* which operates in my constituency between Yarmouth and Bar Harbour. I am wondering whether sick mariners from such a vessel can be treated only by the designated medical practitioner at a particular port.

Under the new provisions, particularly in Nova Scotia, I believe crew members will be treated the same as any other citizens of Nova Scotia under the medical care plan of that province. However, I should like some

clarification on this point. To my mind, new section 318 still provides that a sick mariner can be treated only by the port physician. It would seem, in cases where there is no medical care plan, the sick mariner cannot go to any physician other than the physician designated by the port officer. In other words, he can be treated only in that port. For instance, if he should reside perhaps 40 miles away from that port, he cannot be treated by his local doctor. This concerns me a little. There may be cases where a sick crew member would wish to go home to be treated. It is natural, I suppose, for a sick person to want to be with his family. However, it would seem that he can be treated only by the port physician. I understand there are cases where this would not apply, but in provinces like New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, these mariners will still be able to receive medical help only from the medical practitioner designated by the customs officer. I do not like this provision.

If my interpretation is correct I would hope the bill would be amended so that a sick mariner may be treated by any physician. I should like to know whether this provision applies to ferries or simply to fishing vessels. I think the situation is clear in respect of the province of Nova Scotia, where there is a medical care plan, but I believe it should also be clear in respect of the care of crew members of ferries, particularly any ferry operating between provinces.

• (12:30 p.m.)

My big complaint is against clause 3, section 318, which still provides for an application in writing for the designation of a medical practitioner. The Parliamentary Secretary said this Provision was in the old act, and he gave several reasons for changing it. However, I do not see that it is being changed in the bill before us, particularly in respect of provinces which do not have medicare. I think that, like appointments to the Senate, this was a good way of satisfying some of the medical practitioners who were in support of the government cause. I hope that this clause can be changed.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker, and I will wait to see if my questions are answered before I put forward any amendments.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, the bill before us is asking us to put another patch on the already patched-up and hoary Canada Shipping Act. Whether or not this is a step in the right direction is something on which we in this party intend to reserve our judgment until we are able to ask our questions in the committee. By saying that, I am making it clear that, while we are prepared to agree to the passage of this bill at second reading, we do not want that to be an indication of our support of the principle of the bill, if indeed it has any principle. It is merely an indication that we are prepared to agree that this proposal has to be discussed in a standing committee in order that its real purport can be properly understood.

I think the speech that was made by the hon. member on behalf of the official opposition bears out my contention in this regard because he did raise a number of questions. I should like to say, as has been made clear by the remarks of the parliamentary secretary in introducing the bill on second reading, that this bill has a very definite impact on Canadian seamen who are involved in the fishing industry. It is a matter of concern to some of us as to just what is to be accomplished. In listening to the parliamentary secretary, it appeared to me that what he was telling us was that the Department of National Health and Welfare was trying to back out of its responsibilities under the Canada Shipping Act. Whether or not this is something that they should be doing certainly should be subject to question, particularly by members who are concerned with the well-being of our people who are involved in the fishing industry. We all know that they are having a good many difficulties in many ways, and I think this applies to both the east and west coasts of Canada. Therefore, I feel that this bill should receive a searching scrutiny in the committee.

I know that a number of fishermen on the west coast have expressed their concern over the fact that the enactment of this piece of legislation will remove from them some of the benefits of health care that they have hitherto enjoyed. I do not profess to be familiar with all the details of the operation of the sick mariners' provisions, but I should like to tell the House that one of the concerns that has been expressed to me is that the result of this bill will be the loss of protection to Canadian fishing seamen who may, for one reason or another, wish to receive medical care in ports outside of Canada. In the case of the west coast, this involves landings in the ports of the United States.

Certainly, this is one of the questions that I would want to have clarified in the committee. I would like to know just what impact, if any, the bill has on this arrangement and just

what this arrangement is. In effect, the argument advanced by the parliamentary secretary was that because of the enactment of medicare, the earlier provisions are not necessary in some respects. May I say again that the details of this will have to be carefully examined. If I heard him correctly, he made reference to the fact that it is proposed—and I noted this when I read the bill and compared it with the former sections of the act which will be repealed—to eliminate coverage for hospitalization which hitherto had been in effect under the sick mariners provisions. Here again, I think the onus will be on the department to justify the changes they are proposing before we can agree to them.

I have given some indication that we are prepared to have a fair look at this bill in committee, but I want to make it clear that this is not to be taken as meaning that we will not be proposing amendments at the report stage or that we will necessarily support the bill when it comes back to the House.

Having said that, I will resume my seat because I have indicated that this matter can better be dealt with in detail in the committee when the referral is made.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): There is a point which I wonder if the parliamentary secretary could clarify. It is of interest to the people in the port and city of Vancouver. Can he tell us how the present amendment would affect the case of the Pacific and Orient liner *Oronsay* which recently came into Vancouver harbour with typhoid cases aboard. In this particular case, a classic case in marine history in British Columbia, a giant passenger liner was found to have typhoid aboard and all the medical services of Vancouver had to be put to work to control this small outbreak. I wonder how the present act would affect this particular case.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): It is not my intention to make any extended remarks on Bill C-10, but I would like to have one matter clarified if possible by the minister. It deals with the proposal in the bill which states that the owner of every ship that is not Canadian is liable for the cost of all medical treatment and hospital care provided in Canada to a person employed by him on that ship. This puts the onus on the owners of any foreign ship to look after their crew members. I think that it is only right and proper that they should be responsible. As has been stated, formerly under the act indigent seamen were cared for by the port physician. At the present time, if the port physician looks after indigent seamen he is reimbursed by the owners of the foreign ships.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The question that comes to mind is, in what manner will the Canadian government be asked to ascertain whether foreign ships are adequately insured so that the Canadian government will be recompensed for any outlay made on behalf of indigent seamen who may need hospitalization in Canada?

I hope it will be possible for the Parliamentary Secretary who has presented this bill to give some indication later as to the manner in which this question will be handled.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask some questions, but there would be no opportunity for the Parliamentary Secretary to reply except upon closing the debate, which precludes the possibility of following up the reply. I have an interest in getting some information about the effect of the bill on those sections of the Canada Shipping Act which, to say the least, are obsolete and archaic and which raise all sorts of questions about the possibility of a continuing colonial status for Canada.

One question I have is whether this bill would apply as equally to denizens as it does to fishermen or seamen. I was rather struck by the oddness of that word and by the fact that apparently there is an opportunity for the government, exercising the royal prerogative I suppose, to grant to some people letters of denization. There is no other indication in the bill as to just what this means. How does one go about getting them? Are there any forms? Have such letters ever been issued? Are there any denizens in Canada?

The parliamentary secretary chuckles, and I do not blame him because this seems such a weird reference to have in the law of Canada. Yet there it is in the section of the Canada Shipping Act relating to the registering of ships. Apart from that section relating to the registering of ships, there is no reference to Canadian citizens. The only reference is to natural-born British subjects or persons recognized by law throughout Her Majesty's dominions as having the status of natural-born British subjects, who can register or own ships liable for registration within Canada. Also of course, the provision applies to persons who are made denizens by letters of denization.

I looked up the word in the dictionary, but even that did not help very much. I knew

that denizens were habitués of a certain area. For instance, we know that a rabbit is a denizen of the forest because he happens to live there, and there are denizens of the deep. These are supposed to be supernatural monsters of some sort and were described in imaginative terms in the early days of sailing ships. But to see this word in a statute of Canada does make valid the argument that the government is not really concerned about updating the laws of the nation but is engaged in a program of patching British law which existed before the turn of the century.

All we have done, Mr. Speaker, has been to carry that law forward, making some slight alterations as time went on but maintaining the basis of a document with colonial or imperialistic flavour. We have no Canada Shipping Act as such; it is subservient to British law.

Had the government really wanted to do something effective, it might have dealt with the Canada Shipping Act in total instead of only with a minor, insignificant part such as we are dealing with at the moment. As the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) has pointed out, this particular part is fraught with difficulty and misunderstanding. Members of the Official Opposition have indicated their doubts as to the real value of the bill itself.

If the government is only concerned with stacking-up a record of getting bills through Parliament, it could spend its whole time running insignificant pieces of legislation through the House and then point to a record of accomplishment in the passage of legislation. Of course, in reality it would not have accomplished much.

Referring to the Earl Jowitt dictionary of English law, I find the following definition of denizen:

> A denizen in the primary but obsolete sense of the word is a natural-born subject of a country, or a native or inhabitant of a city or liberty.

Then, there is a quotation which reads:

> If the King and his subjects should conquer another kingdom or dominion [they] are all citizens of the kingdom or dominion conquered.

Mr. Baldwin: How about a president?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Well, a president, I don't know. I don't know whether someone in Canada, who either thinks of himself as a president or conceives that he someday might be a president, would be considered a denizen. I gather from the preamble to the act that he would have to get a letter of denization from somebody. Now, if by the very act of becoming president he removed himself from the position of privy councillor, presumably then he would not be in a position to give himself a letter of denization—unless he did that before, and accomplished everything at the same time!

Going back to Jowitt's dictionary of English law, with regard to denizen he says "denizen in its modern sense denotes a person who is alien born." Whether that applies to the gentleman who might be president, I do not know. Certainly, some people in the province from which he comes think in those terms. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has regularly referred to English-Canadians in a hyphenated sense. That probably indicates that he, himself, feels he has come from an alien country. I am sure that citizens of Irish descent, for instance, or people in the House who are of Irish descent, would not like to be looked upon as English-Canadians. People who are of English descent do not like to be looked on as English-Canadians. I hope I have made my point clear.

• (12:50 p.m.)

In any event, denizen, in its modern sense denotes a person who is an alien born, who has obtained, *ex donatione regis* letters patent called letters of denization to make him either permanently or for a time a British subject. The granting of such letters patent is a branch of the royal prerogative and is subject to no restrictions whatever. The denizen might hold lands by purchase or devise, which an alien might not, but could not take by inheritance before the Naturalization Act of 1870. All of this, of course, refers to the English law.

Replying to the question asked by the hon. member for Peace River with regard to presidents, it is clear—and perhaps I am not answering his question directly—that a denizen cannot become a member of the House of Commons, because as Lord Jowitt says, a denizen cannot be a member of the Privy Council or of either of the Houses of Parliament.

Mr. Baldwin: That provision is pretty tough on the cabinet.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Yes, it might create difficulties for our cabinet. The point is that this type of thinking prevails in our laws relating to shipping. Our shipping act is a most archaic, dinosaur type, piece of legislation. It really was conceived in England when

Britannia ruled the waves during a time when Lord Nelson and his like were in the fore. At that time sea power gave Britain economic power and imperial power. Unfortunately, we still carry those concepts and those ideas forward into the modern day and see them reflected in our shipping legislation. We see outdated ideas relating to ships, seamen, to one ownership, to registration and to a host of other factors relating to shipping. We are still a century behind the times when it comes to the laws on our statute books that relate to shipping.

If the parliamentary secretary imagines that there is anything in this legislation that is of real value in terms of trying to do something for our own good, then he is sadly mistaken. I thought he looked rather apologetic as he introduced the legislation. I wish he were able to go before his cabinet colleagues and tell them—but perhaps this is impossible—that for many years this nation has had an archaic shipping act and it is time that we had a real Canada Shipping Act in fact as well as title.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, since I come from that great inland port of Peace River—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Barnett: It was a port before Mr. Bennett built the dam.

Mr. Baldwin: —I wish to make a few comments. I must say that it will be somewhat difficult to repeat the interesting performance that we witnessed in the delightful remarks of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard). However, I shall not find it too difficult to observe the ordinary rules of relevancy. There are two questions I wish to ask the parliamentary secretary, and perhaps he can answer them. The first is this: If this bill becomes law, if it is to be an effective amendment to our shipping legislation, then I submit some important issues involved ought to be examined. Clearly, there will no longer be available to seamen of coastal vessels in Canada the same protection that was afforded them heretofore. A provision in the amending bill indicates that there will be a measure of protection for, seamen on vessels engaged in fishing, but not for seamen on coastal vessels.

When one examines the figures, it becomes obvious that by far the smallest number of people involved in this matter are those who are seamen on coastal vessels which are not fishing vessels. There was some protection for these seamen. However, from my reading of the change in the legislation, it seems that that protection afforded to those seamen will be lost. Secondly, it seems to me that there will be lost to seamen, whether of foreign-going, coastal or fishing vessels, the benefits of certain programs. Those programs included hospital care and provision of drugs where drugs were required in hospital or for medical treatment. Clearly, the government intends to make use of the facilities of the various medicare programs. As hon. members know, the provision of drugs is not included under those programs. Perhaps the parliamentary secretary might take note of this part of my remarks. I think I am correct in assuming that, as a result of this amendment, there will be no provision of drugs for seamen, such as was the case before.

Finally, if Your Honour would undertake not to see the clock for about a minute, I shall be able to complete the latter part of my remarks. The program involved in this legislation is something that was discussed by the Glassco Commission a number of years ago, and we see here a number of very real problems. For instance, the federal government had been heretofore wholly responsible for the cost of these programs, and an inspection of figures will indicate that very substantial sums of money were involved. These were all the responsibility of the federal government. Clearly, under the alternative proposals, these programs will not be the responsibility of the federal government inasmuch as medicare will become wholly the responsibility of provincial governments. The federal government was to have assumed half of the cost involved in the medicare program but now, because the federal government wishes to opt out, the provincial governments will be taking over the whole responsibility.

I think it should be made plain by the minister that in this area the federal government is shedding certain of its financial responsibility. Secondly, in doing so, the federal government will impose on the provinces many problems. It indicated that, after a period of time, it will slide out from its responsibilities under the original medicare program. The provinces, after a period of time, will have to assume their full responsibilities under the program, and hence the provincial governments of those provinces bordering our coastlines will be faced with an increased burden when they have to pay their share of moneys that this amendment, in effect, says they must make available. I

merely point this out. I hope, too, that we shall hear, from time to time, statements on this matter from the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) who seems to be exceedingly critical of provincial governments. I hope he will remember that by employing means such as the introduction of this amendment, the federal government is attempting to crawl out from responsibilities it assumed in the first place. The federal government proposed the changes in the medicare financial provisions which has been, in the first instance, introduced by the federal government.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a suggestion to the hon. parliamentary secretary, in view of the remarks of the hon. member of Skeena (Mr. Howard) before lunch. I should like to ask him to consider consulting with the law officers of the Crown to determine whether or not the mayor of Toronto is a denizen within the definition of that hon. member of the House of Lords in England.

More seriously, I have a question in respect of clause 2 of the bill regarding section 315(c). The hon. parliamentary secretary will note that this section limits the definition of a port. Why are existing ports, as well as those likely to be constructed in the Arctic islands and along the whole North Arctic coast of Canada, except Hudson's Bay and James Bay, excluded from this definition? I am particularly interested in this in view of the government's announced determination to develop our north in a better fashion than we have in the past.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the hon. member a question in respect of his very reasonable suggestion regarding inquiries to be made by law officers of the Crown. Would the hon. member be prepared to extend that to cover the present position of the former mayor of Toronto?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier but I should like to suggest that a number of hon. members have posed questions in anticipation of the parliamentary secretary dealing with them in his closing remarks.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I might point out that if the parliamentary secretary speaks at this point he will close the debate.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Haidasz: Mr. Speaker, I should like first to thank hon. members for raising some interesting points. I hope, at least in a general way, to give them an interim answer. Other details can be obtained by questioning the officials when they appear before the committee studying this bill.

Before I answer some of these questions, I should like to state that on August 14 of last year the deputy minister of national health received a statement from the general manager of the Canadian Chamber of Shipping which read as follows:

> The Canadian Chamber of Shipping, which represents most of the deep-sea shipping interests in Canada through the Shipping Federation of Canada, the British Columbia Employers Association, the Chamber of Shipping of British Columbia, the B.C. Towboat Owners' Association, advocates repeal of Part V of the Canada Shipping Act.

As far as the questions are concerned, I will answer the hon. member for Skeena's (Mr. Howard) very interesting discourse about the obsolescence and antiquity of the Canada Shipping Act. I should like to say, however, that the shipping Act was amended in 1953, 1956, 1957, 1960, 1961 and again today we are proposing to amend it to bring it up to date as soon as possible.

The shipping act itself contains approximately 735 clauses with many schedules. I have been told that the officials of the Department of Transport are working to bring the Canada Shipping Act up to date, and I can perhaps state that we should be getting extensive amendments or perhaps a new Canada Shipping Act. I do not know personally, but I know second hand it is being revised and that the officials are very busy studying it in an attempt to bring it up to date.

• (2:10 p.m.)

The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) raised a question about coasting vessels, as did other hon. members of this House. As the proposals in this bill C-10, indicate, coasting vessels will no longer come under the new act. So far as drugs are concerned, this matter was raised both by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) and the hon. member for Peace

River. It is true that under the new section, the cost of drugs is the only major benefit that will not be provided to sick mariners. By the amendment to Part V, this benefit will not be provided except in respect of drugs administered by the examining physician.

The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra (Mr. Deachman) asked a question about the *Oronsay* and its relationship to the present bill. The only way it relates to the Canada Shipping Act is in respect of the provision of medical services to sick crew members on the *Oronsay*. So far as the public health aspect is concerned, that comes under the Quarantine Act. There is a provision in the regulations dealing with contagious diseases which covers the outbreak of typhoid fever on a ship.

The hon. member for South Western Nova also raised a question in respect of sick mariners obtaining medical attention. In answer to him, I must say that the customs officer determines simply the eligibility of the sick mariner. In other words, he determines whether or not he is eligible for medical care. After the customs officer establishes the fact, in an ordinary case which is not an emergency, that this crew member needs medical care and is eligible, he then refers the sick mariner to a physician or hospital designated not by him but by the Department of National Health and Welfare. Apparently it has been found desirable for administrative purposes to provide some checks in order to prevent certain abuses. That is the reason this regulation is again in the bill.

The hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan) raised a point in respect of clause 2 of the bill concerning designated ports in the Northwest Territories and along the Arctic shores. So far, the information available to me indicates that at the present time, in respect of Part V, there has been no necessity to include any provision such as that suggested by the hon. member for Spadina. I would not be surprised if, during the recasting of the Canada Shipping Act which I have been told is under way, there should be a good deal of consideration given to the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. Comeau: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the parliamentary secretary one final question? What happens in a case where a crew member becomes sick and does not live in the area of the port of call? A distance of 30 or 40 miles might be involved. He might be at home, require medical attention and find that the doctor at the port cannot come to his home. I have reference to a situation in a province which does not have a medical care plan. Would this sick crew member be allowed to engage the services of another medical practitioner?

Mr. Haidasz: In the case of an emergency, when there is not sufficient time to follow the procedures established by the act and its regulations, a sick mariner or member of a fishing crew would have to be taken to the emergency department of a hospital or to a physician. As soon as possible, he should communicate with the master of his ship who would get in touch with the Customs officer so that the Customs officer would be in a position to fill out the necessary papers.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

QUARANTINE ACT

MEASURE TO PREVENT INTRODUCTION INTO CANADA OF INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES

Hon. Léo Cadieux (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved that Bill S-12, to prevent the introduction into Canada of infectious or contagious diseases be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Mr. Winch: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the Minister of National Defence is to explain the bill on second reading?

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to the House for its consideration Bill S-12 a new act to prevent the introduction into Canada of infectious or contagious diseases. The short title may be cited as the Quarantine Act. This bill was given first reading in the Senate on November 18, 1969. Two days later, debate on second reading commenced during which many informative and valuable remarks were made. After study before the Senate Health, Welfare and Science Committee, the committee report was presented on December 10, 1969 which contained a few amendments clarifying some questions that had been raised. The bill was then read a third time and passed on December 16, 1969.

The Quarantine Act is now contained in chapter 231 of the Revised Statutes of Canada and was first made the subject of Canadian

legislation in 1868. Except for two amendments made at the end of World War I, the legislation has remained the same in substance and in context since first enacted more than 100 years ago.

As was reasonable at the time of its enactment, and even at the time of the amendments in 1918 and 1919, the text of the act was considered adequate to deal with inward traffic by ship to Canada, the language of the act speaking throughout of "masters of vessels", of quarantine stations at maritime ports of entry, of coasting traffic and so forth. Nowhere does the act recognize by any reference the immense degree to which inward passenger and cargo traffic entails air travel, the use of numerous international airports or the frequency with which international air traffic must be received and admitted into Canada. Other developments and changes in the area of transportation and communications have similarly rendered obsolete certain other matters of substance, as well as the language of the Quarantine Act and, for this reason also, early revision is imperative. The urgency arises out of the degree to which the obsolescence referred to is increasing in significance and the difficulty of effecting useful quarantine measures becoming more marked.

• (2:20 p.m.)

The quarantine service of Canada has a very interesting historical record which I will review only briefly. Attempts to control the introduction of communicable diseases by visiting travellers predates confederation and, indeed, most other forms of community public health services. The word "quarantine" dates back to the 14th century at least and is usually ascribed to the 40 days of isolation imposed by the local government on travellers arriving in certain Italian ports in an attempt to prevent them from infecting the local inhabitants. There were quarantine regulations in force at all major North American ports in colonial times. In Canada, the first Quarantine Act was passed by the first session of the first Dominion Parliament, and it was probably one of its first items of business. This act made the minister of agriculture responsible for administering the regulations. The first regulations made under the Canadian Quarantine Act were signed by the Governor in Council on May 23, 1868.

The original regulations make reference to only three quarantine stations located at Grosse Isle—an island in the St. Lawrence below Quebec city—at Halifax, and at Saint John, N.B. The stations at the latter two points were situated at Lawlor's Island and Partridge Island respectively. All three stations predated confederation, having been established by the cities concerned in the early 1830's. The graves which may still be seen on these islands are mute evidence of the epidemics of smallpox, cholera and typhus which raged at that time. Additional stations were opened from time to time on the east coast as increased maritime traffic required, and in 1884 the first station was established on the west coast at Victoria, or more precisely at Albert Head and subsequently removed to William Head. By 1896, additional stations had been opened on the west coast and a medical superintendent of quarantine for British Columbia appointed.

During these early years cholera and typhus from Europe, yellow fever from South and Central America and the West Indies, cholera from the Far East, and smallpox from everywhere were the most feared. The last quarantine at Grosse Isle was in 1928-29 for smallpox; at Halifax in 1937-38 for smallpox, and in 1944-45 for typhus; at Saint John in 1920-21 for smallpox, and at William Head in 1938-39 for smallpox and in 1945-46 for typhus.

Quarantine stations at Grosse Isle, Halifax, Saint John and William Head, with their full facilities for large numbers of passengers, hospitals for treatment and large staffs with disinfecting equipment became unnecessary owing to the identification of the organisms of the diseases, methods of prevention by immunisation and vaccination, new medicines and treatments and improvement of world sanitation and international travel regulations. The quarantine station at Grosse Isle was closed in 1937, and subsequently the stations at Lawlor's and Partridge Islands were closed, and in 1959 William Head was closed. Canada now has five organized quarantine stations at Quebec, Halifax, Saint John, New Brunswick, St. John's, Newfoundland, and Victoria, B.C., with their substations. In addition, there are unorganized inland and maritime quarantine stations where customs officers act as quarantine officers.

The responsibility for the quarantine service was transferred from the department of agriculture to the department of immigration and colonization for one year, then to the department of health in 1919 which in 1928 became the department of pensions and national health. In 1944, responsibility was transferred to the Department of National Health and Welfare with the passing of the National Health and Welfare Act.

The general pattern of quarantine operations remained substantially the same until after World War II, although these decades were marked by a gradual diminution of the major quarantinable diseases. During the 1940's, increased attention was given to health problems on an international scale, and on October 1, 1952 the international sanitary regulations of the World Health Organization to which Canada subscribed without reservation from the outset, came into effect. Prior to World War II the quarantine service was concerned with marine traffic only. Commercial aircraft capable of carrying passengers to Canada from outside North America did not exist.

Soon after World War II the situation began to change rapidly and the establishment of quarantine offices at airports became necessary. In the succeeding two decades, the rate of growth of commercial aviation outstripped almost all other forms of transport, and now the number of persons arriving by air cleared through quarantine each year exceeds one million. The number continues to increase by about 15 per cent annually. This development has significantly changed the entire pattern of quarantine problems.

The reduction of quarantinable diseases throughout large areas of the world, as well as the greatly improved rapid methods of reporting incidence of disease which have been developed by the World Health Organization, have substantially reduced the danger of importation of major quarantinable disease by maritime traffic as infected areas are, for the most part, located sufficiently far away from Canada and it is impossible for vessels to complete the journey within the incubation period of the disease. Aircraft, however, readily transport passengers from highly infected areas to Canadian airports within a single day.

While vigilance must be maintained in respect of marine traffic and especially to guard against the importation of plague by rodents, air traffic has become of primary concern. This is further aggravated by the natural tendency of the passenger and the carrier not to lose the advantage of speed inherent in air travel by time consuming inspection procedures on arrival, and pressures for expeditious clearance of passengers continually increase. A new age is imminent. High capacity aircraft carrying up to 500 persons will begin operating this year. Supersonic aircraft capable of crossing the Atlantic in approximately three hours will be in operation later in the decade. Both will bring with them their particular problems.

Bill S-12, a recasting of the quarantine act, is designed to minimize the risk of importation into Canada of the major quarantinable diseases which, fortunately, have been eradicated in Canada but which, if imported, could be the cause of serious morbidity and, indeed, mortality. Our major concern is in respect of smallpox, cholera and plague, and this is reflected in the clauses of Bill S-12. We are aware of the improvement in global health conditions resulting from preventive health measures applied in other states which, in certain areas, were undertaken with the assistance of the World Health Organization. However, until the major quarantinable diseases are eradicated from the world, legislation which provides authority to inspect and examine international passengers and international carriers entering Canada for the purpose of determining the risk presented to public health, is necessary.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I think there are several interesting conclusions to be drawn from this bill, but first I want to thank the parliamentary secretary for giving us a full and concise statement of the basic reasons behind the introduction of the legislation and for explaining to us what is involved. I was very interested to hear his comment that this is the first full scale amendment of the act in over 100 years. I would point out to my good friend, the hon. gentleman who is the leader on the government side of the house the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), that what this House should be interested in is good legislation, even if it takes a little longer to pass. I am not suggesting that because this act has not been amended substantially for 100 years it need not have been. Obviously, there could have been some amendments. However, measures which have been conceived in haste and often disguised for political purposes so as to get a number of measures through the House, will not replace good measures which will stand the test of time.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Obviously there was a need for amendment here, a need for change. The recent experience of passengers aboard the liner which was held up off the west coast is an indication of the difficult situations which can arise in the modern world and which give rise to a need for change. The use of aircraft was not in the contemplation of those who occupied

this chamber at the time this act was passed. This circumstance in itself is reason enough for considering changes in the regulations. It is likely that the bill will receive close examination in committee; there are many technical aspects involved which obviously are not susceptible of being dealt with adequately here.

There is one point I should like to make at this time. This bill, like so many others this session, provides that the usual wide discretionary powers be given to the Governor in Council to act by order in council, by regulation or by decree. I call this to the attention of the House as I have done in the case of so many bills in the past.

This morning I raised this particular issue by addressing questions to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) and to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in which I referred particularly to the report of the Special Committee on Statutory Instruments which goes right to the heart of the question raised by clause 19 of the bill before us. The very widest powers are given by that clause to the Governor in Council to enact various regulations, including the power to require persons arriving in Canada to produce to a quarantine officer evidence of immunization to any infectious or contagious disease.

There was an interesting discussion on this subject in the other place. One hon. Senator proposed there should be included in the regulatory power a right to provide for exemptions, and he gave certain reasons in support of his view that this power ought to be included. As I read from the proceedings of the Committee on Health, Welfare and Science in the other place, he suggested:

> That persons with eczema or diseases such as leukemia, lymphoma, or generalized malignancy or those who may have lowered resistance such as from therapy with steroids, alkylating drugs, antimetabolites or radiation, or during pregnancy in which immunization is deemed to be contra-indicated, be exempted from this section at the discretion of the quarantine officer.

This was opposed by hon. Senators who were supporters of the government. I notice that one Senator from Calgary, speaking of the need for exemption in the case of a pregnant woman, asked: "How are we going to know whether a woman is pregnant or not when a lot of them do not know themselves?" I consider this to be a very weak answer to the suggestion made by the Senator who proposed the amendment. Nevertheless, it illustrates the point I tried to make this morning, one which was evaded by the President of the Privy Council and passed off by the Prime Minister in a rather humorous way.

If we give to this government or to any government the right to legislate by order in council, as we are being asked to do in clause 19, it is imperative that Parliament be provided with the means of checking these regulations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: The committee report to which I referred was a report from an all-party committee which held a series of useful and valuable meetings characterized by a lack of partisanship highly enlightening to those who think the House of Commons is a continuous battleground. It was proposed there, for example—and I relate my remarks to this particular clause—that all these regulations should first be vetted by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to make sure they contained a measure of certainty, legality and reason. It was suggested that before regulations were made, the widest possible notice should be given so that persons interested might have an opportunity to make representations. When we are asked to pass a measure of this kind, and are aware of its implications, we must see to it that safeguards are available to the people of this country.

Someone said: Let no man stand between me and my liberty. Well, day after day, year after year, we continue, while legislating on behalf of the people of Canada, to give away rights which are theirs and which they have given us no mandate to destroy as we are now doing. It is becoming an accepted fact that in any legislative program the first thing to be prepared is the section having to do with regulations; all the rest is then built around it. It is the case here. It is the case with regard to any number of bills with which we have recently been dealing—the rules of relevancy will not permit me to give examples in detail.

There can be no doubt we are slowly eroding the rights of the people of Canada by giving to the government, in the form of a clause such as this, the power to make regulations far more detailed and far more threatening to the lives and rights of the ordinary people of Canada than any of the legislative clauses which surrounds the regulatory section.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I realize the President of the Privy Council told us that some time before the end of the

session the government proposed to bring in what it thought was the proper means of checking these regulatory powers. His answer was along these lines: A committee has brought in a report which the government is considering, and in due course measures which the government feels to be appropriate will be laid before the House. I am quite prepared to listen to the views of the government, but I would point out that I am referring now to the report of an all-party committee of the House. I think it contemptuous for the President of the Privy Council to take this position. What we are doing is building up a sort of collective tinpot dictatorship in this country. Those of us who stand idly by and let this happen without protest are not justified in accepting the position we have in this House. I especially say this to hon. members on the other side who have a greater responsibility in many ways than we to ensure that this government is called to account, and is not allowed freedom to pass these sections without some of the safeguards and protections contained in the report of the Standing Committee on Special Instruments.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I listened, Mr. Speaker, with interest to the review of the quarantine legislation which was given by the parliamentary secretary. I did not hear him go into the question of whether there were or had been any denizens in quarantine stations during the operations of the legislation. However, I agree that the legislation as it stands in chapter 231 of the Revised Statutes, which is proposed to be repealed by this bill, is outmoded in some of its wording. Perhaps in parenthesis I might say that I hope some of the anachronisms in the Canada Shipping Act illustrated by the remarks of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), will be eliminated with more dispatch than has been the case in the past. The Canada Shipping Act has been under consideration for quite a long time, but I am not sure whether we are any closer to revisions now than we were five years ago, judging from the remarks made earlier.

The bill under consideration is not directly related to the one discussed earlier, except in so far as it also deals with a very hoary piece of legislation. Anyone could see that the changing pattern of entry into Canada makes the updating of this legislation an immediate requirement and, after examination by the committee, all members of this House would probably consent to the basic idea of this bill.

I listened with some interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and as a general proposition I find myself in agreement with his ideas concerning legislation by regulation. However, it behooves us to look at the clauses of this bill which give to the Governor in Council the power to legislate of which the hon. member speaks. I find myself somewhat puzzled that he should have picked upon this particular piece of legislation to raise the question and my reaction to a comparison of this bill with the Quarantine Act is that the powers of the Governor in Council are somewhat more restricted under the proposed legislation than under the existing act.

I might make reference in particular to the definition of an infectious or contagious disease which, under the proposed act applies to the particular diseases listed in the schedule. I think the committee should have some explanation from medically competent people why it is proposed to specifically restrict the definition of contagious or infectious diseases to those set out in the schedule. Most of them are familiar to me, Mr. Speaker, but I have not encountered anybody with relapsing fever (louse borne).

In an informal discussion with the hon. member for Skeena this morning, we were speculating whether this might be some kind of political disease to which members of this House were subject, particularly those who currently sit on the government side. Upon reflection however, I decided not to push the point—at least at the second reading stage of this debate.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I conclude that, since this is basically just a piece of housekeeping legislation and generally speaking does update the provisions of our Quarantine Act, it is, to that extent at least, a bill which merits support. It may be, since it has been considered in the other place, that the bill could be reported back to this chamber without amendment. This will have to be determined when it is considered by the Standing Committee on Health and Welfare.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Services.

CRIMINAL RECORDS

PROVISION FOR RELIEF OF CONVICTED PERSONS

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General) moved that Bill C-5, to provide for relief of persons who have been convicted of offences

and subsequently rehabilitated themselves, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill represents an attempt on the part of the government to bring forward legislation that will deal with one aspect of the field of corrections that has been causing concern to all those working in the field and to public figures who have thought about the subject. The area I speak about is the apparently unjust consequences that still attach to a person who has been convicted of an offence but who has long since rehabilitated himself and become integrated into society in a wholly satisfactory way.

The consequences, in those circumstances, of having a conviction can work many injustices as well as leaving a stigma on the character of the person. This, it would seem clear, should be removed to the extent it is possible to do so. The great interest and concern in this subject was well evidenced by the private bill brought forward in the last Parliament in 1966 and dealt with in a committee of this House in the next year, as well as subsequent bills that have been brought forward in this Parliament.

The approach in this bill is quite different from that in the bill brought forward by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Tolmie). His private bill sought to deal with the matter differently; I think the term used was "expunging the records of the courts". This bill approaches the problem in a different way. It is an attempt to remove the consequences of the conviction and we believe will be more effective in achieving the desired objectives. The objectives, of course, in any of the legislation submitted for consideration by the House were never in question. It is a matter of working out the best method of achieving the objectives and, unfortunately, there is no background of statistics on this subject that is of much help. There is very little, other than the actual experience of the workers in this field.

• (2:50 p.m.)

The bill itself approaches the problem in this way: It provides that the person concerned make application and the National Parole Board, which we believe to be the body best equipped to examine into these kinds of problems and with the most experience in this field, examine into the particular case and make the recommendation for the grant of a pardon if the facts warrant it.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

The grant of a pardon, in itself, does not necessarily solve all problems but it seems to be the closest approach we know towards solving some of the problems that arise in these cases. It will be seen when the bill is examined in committee that it provides for the procedures of the board and makes significant provisions relating to the grant of a pardon. Clause 5 of the bill reads as follows:

> 5. The grant of a pardon (a) is evidence of the fact that the Board, after making proper inquiries, was satisfied that an applicant was of good behaviour and that the conviction in respect of which the pardon is granted should no longer reflect adversely on his character; and (b) vacates the conviction in respect of which it is granted, unless the pardon is subsequently revoked.

Thus, the pardon is evidence of rehabilitation of good character and it vacates the conviction. It does these three things.

There is a subsequent provision in the bill that deals with the withdrawal of records. The approach to this aspect, which we believe to be the best approach we can work out, is the following: It is not accurate to say that a record that has been made many years ago can be physically obliterated, because there are records in the memories of other persons, there are newspaper reports and there is all sorts of documentation in many places. What we have sought to do here, and we think this will prevent the improper use of old records, is to have them withdrawn to the central authority in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police where they then can be sealed and only brought out under the limited conditions, set out in the act, when it is apparent that their use would be necessary. That is the approach to that problem.

As hon. members know, there has always been a right to grant a pardon under the royal prerogative of mercy. It is interesting to know that in the whole period of 40 years from 1910 to 1959 inclusive, there were only 32 ordinary pardons granted under the royal prerogative of mercy. Perhaps I should give some more recent figures. In 1966, the year the Department of the Solicitor General was created, 21 ordinary pardons were granted. In 1967, there were 36 ordinary pardons granted; in 1968, there were 75 ordinary pardons granted and in 1969, and I shall speak about the pardons of 1969 in a particular way in a moment, some 131 pardons were recommended by the National Parole Board under the existing procedure.

So, hon. members can see the increase in the use of this prerogative. That increase in use stems from the fact that, in an effort to

find some kind of solution or get started towards a solution to this problem, we began to use the royal prerogative of mercy as a method of granting pardons. This in large measure, although not quite, is what will be achieved under the legislation. By itself, the present procedure is rather cumbersome. Actually, until this bill is passed, there is only authority for the minister to request the parole board to look into each individual case and then, in each individual case, sign a recommendation to His Excellency, the Governor General and have the individual's pardon granted by His Excellency, the Governor General.

It will be seen that that procedure is not adequate at all to deal with the problem but it was very useful in giving the parole board and those authorities concerned in the field of correction a lot of administrative experience. In addition, the procedure helped in finding out what would best meet the problems that arise with those persons who have been unfortunate enough to have a conviction registered against them but have long since rehabilitated themselves and re-established themselves. This experience, which has been sharply accelerating throughout the latter part of the year, has indeed been very useful and has confirmed us in the belief that the approach evidenced in this bill is the best approach in trying to deal with the problem.

There will be, of course, sharply increased numbers of these applications once the bill is passed. The very limited experience so far indicates or appears to indicate that it would be very useful in meeting these problems. There is a lot of detail about the bill that can best be discussed in committee when the appropriate officers who deal with these problems are available. I, for one, welcome the opportunity to have the bill before committee so that all hon. members who are interested and concerned in this subject can ask the questions they wish, obtain all the information that is available and make suggestions that may be helpful in improving the bill.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I for one do not view the bill as the final answer. I hope it will get quick passage through the House and then be re-examined at the end of two or three years experience when we will be in a better position to know what improvements can be made in the administrative procedure and what changes and other improvements should be made to its provisions.

Already we have found, since embarking on this course, that we have been able to do a great many things of a beneficial nature, particularly in the employment field. This has been the result of co-operation on the part of personnel officers and management in a great many large firms. The response and attitude in that regard have been rather good. The available information in this regard can be given to hon. members at the committee stage. One of the things we had not anticipated, which seems to have been very effective, is that we grant a pardon as distinct from trying to deny that there ever was a record. That approach seems to have been very well received.

Already there have been changes made in what we might now regard as rather offensively worded questions on this subject which appear on many applications for employment. That whole aspect of the subject should be examined in committee. It is possible that we will require further legislation on that aspect after a review of the administrative practices and some experience with the measure. I hope we will not prematurely introduce compulsory legislation forcing people to do certain things, at least at this stage. As a result of our limited experience so far, I hope we do not make the granting of a pardon an automatic process. That does not seem to create a situation most beneficial to the one who has a record but has successfully rehabilitated himself.

I do not think there is much more I can usefully add on this subject. I welcome the opportunity of putting the bill before the House and I am sorry we were not able to put it forward earlier. I welcome the opportunity of discussing this matter with hon. members at the committee stage.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister a question?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I ask this question now because I may not get the opportunity to speak on the bill before our time expires. My question relates to the last point made by the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith). I have in mind questions on application forms for Canadian citizenship, for employment in the public service and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and for visas to go to other countries.

Does the minister envisage that the effect of a pardon will be to allow a person who has

been convicted of other than a minor traffic offence to answer "No" to the question: Have you ever been convicted of an offence other than a minor traffic offence?

Mr. McIlraith: This question has been dropped from some of the forms to which the hon. member has referred. That has already been done by administrative action. In respect of some of the other matters under discussion, it has been thought that the question might be: Has the applicant ever been convicted of any offence for which a pardon has not been granted? There would then be no need to disclose an offence for which a pardon had been granted. Quite a bit of detailed information can be given to the committee on this point.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be a member of the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs during the last Parliament. This committee spent part of two sessions on the subject of the destruction of criminal records, and it considered several private bills submitted by hon. members of this House. The evidence was not completed during the first session of the 27th Parliament and the meetings carried through into the second session. Finally, a report dated December 19, 1967, was made to the House.

In the first place, I commend the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) for making a move on this subject. There was a very great divergence of opinion in the committee as to how this matter should be approached. The committee was not prepared to make an absolute and final recommendation, although it did make a report. The report recommended that legislation be enacted incorporating the principle of expunging criminal records on the basis of several considerations. I do not want to read the five or six considerations in full, because obviously they have been considered by the Solicitor General who adopted a completely different approach from that recommended by the committee.

At this stage I think we should take a brief look at this principle before it goes to the committee for further consideration. A question just raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) concerning the effect a pardon would have on a person who has been convicted of one criminal offence, with no further record for a period of five years, who had led a normal and reformed life and then applies for one of the special things for which many people apply. The individual may apply for an immigration visa to go to another country, either for a short term or to work; he may apply for a bond in connection with employment he is about to take; he may apply for employment in an agency which requires a form to be filled out.

One question almost always asked on these forms is: Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence? The wording of the bill as presented is a little vague. I should like to ask the Solicitor General, a couple of questions if I can get his attention, which perhaps he will answer when closing the debate.

The first question relates to the type of question already asked. Clause 5(a), which is the effective clause, says that the granting of a pardon vacates the conviction in respect of which it is granted. The word "vacates" is one I cannot recall having been used in legal terminology except in respect of certain actions which have been taken in the courts. Does the Solicitor General feel that if a pardon vacates the conviction, the person involved is entitled to say, "I do not have a criminal record" or, "I have not been convicted"? If the conviction is vacated, what does it mean? It certainly does not go as far as the meaning of the word "expunge," which is the word that kept coming up during the discussions in the committee.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I believe we are left pretty much in the dark in respect of the real effect of this legislation. If the granting of a pardon vacates a conviction, may we assume that the conviction has been wiped out? A question was asked of the minister concerning the forms being changed so that the question would be: Have you ever been convicted of an offence for which a pardon was not granted? If a provision were included in the legislation to require application forms to contain a question of this type, I think 99 out of every 100 doubts members of the committee had would be answered.

I hope the minister will say that in respect of a criminal offence for which a person could be subsequently pardoned, nobody may include in an application form of any kind a question other than the one set out in the act. I believe this is the meat of the whole problem. Such a clause, however, is not in the bill. I do not know whether it was considered and abandoned, or whether it was not considered.

Mr. McIlraith: It was considered at great length.

Mr. Aiken: The minister advises that it was considered, so presumably it was abandoned. I would like this matter to be reconsidered, because I think such a provision would eliminate the concern of many people. What is the use of having a procedure whereby a conviction is wiped out and it is established that a person is of good character, if that person then became involved in filling out a form which asked if he was ever convicted of a criminal offence, to which he would have to answer "Yes"? This person would then find himself in further difficulties. However, if the question, "Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence for which you have not been granted a pardon" were asked, he could answer "No" and that would be the end of the matter. I firmly believe the committee should take a very serious look at this matter when the bill comes before the committee. This is a point that everyone is concerned about.

A second point I should like to raise concerns offences for which a person was convicted in the past maybe once or maybe twice, which now have been made legal. Recently amendments to the Criminal Code were passed. I know of a number of cases in the past involving doctors who were convicted of performing abortions. I thought the convictions, as a matter of humanity, were outrageous. I agreed with some portions of the Criminal code bill, because many of these doctors were performing a service to humanity which if performed now would not involve a criminal offence.

The same argument applies to certain sexual offences which were under the Criminal Code. They were illegal one day, and on the following day they were legal. Should not a pardon be issued as a matter of course in such situations? I suggest this is another matter which the committee should examine, because in these cases the law has changed and such a person would not now be regarded as having a criminal record.

The third matter which concerns me a little is that of the one-time offender convicted some years ago perhaps of a minor offence; then years go by and he never applies for a pardon, perhaps on the ground that he does not think there is any record of the conviction or because he thinks this bill would wipe it out after five years. This is one of the dangers which arises in connection with the bill. Such a person may not apply for a pardon because he might think that because there was only one conviction of a minor nature, all he would do by applying for a pardon would be to stir up things again. This would mean that the Parole Board would have to institute an investigation, and he would fear its officers visiting his home or people inquiring whether he was still, as the act states, a person of good character.

There may be many situations in which the person whom we are really trying to protect would be discriminated against because he made such application, whereas a person who did not would not be in the same position. It might sound as if I am splitting hairs, but I do not think I am.

A number of these people probably would be very hesitant about applying for a pardon because they might think they would rather let sleeping dogs lie until the day they have a chance to obtain a better job, move to another country or provide a bond for a friend. When this day comes, they suddenly find that the record which they thought was long dead is still there. As the minister has admitted, this bill does not cover such a situation.

Also, this bill does not cover the situation in respect of the record of juveniles. A lot of time was spent on this matter during the sittings of the standing committee. I have very strong views in respect of the records of juvenile offenders. According to the Juvenile Delinquents Act, these records are not to be used. A person under age 16 in Ontario, and under age 18 in some other provinces, is deemed not to be a criminal but rather a person in need of aid and assistance. The Juvenile Delinquents Act is so framed that such a person does not have a criminal record. But the police consider that there is a criminal record in respect of such a person.

The records in some juvenille courts are made available, improperly, to the police. I think that in respect of the very few cases where there is no further record of the offence, the record in the juvenile court should die there. I believe this bill should contain a clause amending the Juvenile Delinquents Act which would make specifically clear that all records of juvenile delinquents, after these persons have reached age 16, should be expunged, sealed and not reopened. One cannot say they were never there, but one can say they will never be referred to.

• (3:20 p.m.)

A person convicted of a criminal offence may answer "No" to the question on the application form. But there is much misuse of

juvenile court records. They are misused because nowhere is it provided clearly what should be done with them. Many bills that we pass in this House contain clauses amending acts, to make them conform. I would like the juvenile delinquents problem cleared up once and for all. Amendments to the Juvenile Delinquents Act have been kicking around for a long time; they go back to long before the Liberal Party came into power in 1963. I remember that a former minister of justice, Mr. Fulton, set up a committee to deal with the matter. The whole question of juvenile delinquency seems to have died.

Mr. McIlraith: No, it is still very much alive.

Mr. Aiken: It is just as alive as it has been for a number of years.

Mr. McIlraith: But it is much more vigorous now.

Mr. Aiken: It is in a drugged state, in a state of torpor. I am glad to hear the minister say that he is considering some amendments to the act, and if he will bring in a bill shortly I will go on to another subject. There is no reason why, when we are dealing with expunging the record or getting rid of the record of past convictions, we should not touch on that subject.

This bill does not make any provision in regard to juvenile delinquents. I think that is a very serious shortcoming because so long as this situation continues the police and agencies connected with them will continue to consider juvenile delinquency records as relating to criminal offences, and this is not right. I make no exception even for a person who gets into trouble later in life; in these cases their past record should also be wiped out.

There is one other point I would like to make. It was stated during the hearings of the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs that the police in fact have two records; the official record which we are trying to expunge—or vacate, in the wording of the bill—and an unofficial record which is sometimes called a police blotter type of record, which they keep separately.

This evidence was given by Chief Mackey, chief of the Toronto police, as recorded at page 59 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the committee meeting of November 2, 1967. Chief Mackey said very clearly that these records are all in special files, not in the ordinary police files, so the argument of the police that they need them to catch up with known criminals is a fallacy. They do not need them, because they have the record in another file—a record which will never be expunged. In fact, there is no suggestion that police records will ever be expunged. They have their *modus operandi* files from which they catch up with people. They also have them in respect of juveniles.

We can never get rid of these records, and perhaps we should not. However, these records are not the ones I am talking about. I am referring to the public records which I believe should be dealt with in such a way that a one-time offender is assured that after a reasonable period of time someone will not come along and blackmail him because at one time he committed an offence about which no one has ever heard.

I would like to make one more point regarding the revocation of a pardon. Clause 7 provides that if it is established to the satisfaction of the Governor in Council that the person to whom a pardon was granted is no longer of good character, his pardon may be revoked. I think this is one of the most difficult clauses to accept. What is a person of good character, and who is to decide about it? We have always held that a person is innocent until proven guilty. In this country we do not draw a distinction between good people and bad people. They are all people, but they may have been convicted of an offence. Whether they are of good character is a matter of opinion in every case.

I think it will be very difficult to establish that a person is no longer of good character. If it were the other way round, I might not be so concerned. In other words, if the bill provided that a pardon would not be granted if a person was not of good character, perhaps there would be some argument for it. In that case it could be established to the satisfaction of the Parole Board that, in addition to being convicted of an offence, the person in question consorted with other persons who had been convicted and had engaged in activities that verge on criminal. Perhaps such a person had been found in the company of persons whose backgrounds made it obvious that he was leading a life of crime.

However, this clause is different—it relates to the revocation of a pardon. The man has been pardoned and his offence has been expunged from the record, then someone says that he is not of good character any more and his pardon will be revoked. This is a danger-

ous clause, because under these provisions a man can be convicted without trial, which is contrary to our understanding of the law.

I find acceptable that part of the clause which provides that if a person has made deceptive statements in his application, his pardon can be revoked. There is a perfectly valid ground for revoking his pardon if he has made incorrect statements, failed to disclose evidence, or information comes to light that was not revealed previously. However, the fact that a person is no longer of good character is, in my opinion, not sufficient ground for revoking his pardon.

I think that the principle of granting a pardon will be acceptable provided there are enough applications. There must be thousands and thousands of people in this country in the category of those whom this legislation is trying to help, and in favour of whom the committee made recommendations. How many of these people will apply for a pardon? If the number is small, the legislation will be a failure because it will not be achieving the effect that is desired.

I was glad to hear the minister say that the matter will be reviewed, because the number of convictions and pardons will eventually reveal the effectiveness of the statute. I agree that we must take some action. I would like these few matters to be reconsidered in the committee; therefore, I support the recommendation that the bill be referred to the committee. I hope the minister will be prepared to reconsider some of these points which do not go against the principle of the bill but which, if accepted, will make the legislation much more effective.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I should like to pay tribute to my hon. friend from Vancouver-East (Mr. Winch) for the interest he has shown throughout his life in penology and matters such as this. His activities in this connection began long before most hon. members took their seats in Parliament.

As Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in the British Columbia legislature in the forties, he pioneered in an area which was delicate and not very acceptable socially, as did his father. I refer to institutions for mental care, penitentiaries, provincial jails and the like. He took an active interest in problems of rehabilitation, recidivism, parole and related questions. As I say, my hon. friend has shown a lifelong interest in such matters, and having known him personally for some time, I think he deserves commendation on this occasion.

While I am sure the bill is acceptable to everyone in a general sense, it is really not a pace-setter. If anything, it is a bit behind the public conscience in these matters. For some time now the ice has been broken in terms of greater industrial and social acceptance of persons who have been convicted of criminal offences. In addition, we know that the Department of the Solicitor General, through the Parole Board service, has been operating in this field, developing a certain expertise and sophistication in its approach to persons convicted of criminal offences, the expunging of records and the process of pardon which is being used.

I notice that the bill is all-inclusive. It refers to persons who might have been convicted under the Criminal Code or any other federal statute, but the wording in clause 3 indicates that application might be made by a corporate structure as well. In this regard we are aware that a number of companies and corporations in Canada have been convicted of criminal offences, of criminal conspiracy, and have been sentenced in the courts and fined under the Combines Investigation Act.

Technically speaking, these organizations, these companies, would be eligible to make application for pardon. Even the Electric Reduction Company, which we have heard mentioned recently, would be able to apply for a pardon and, presumably, receive one if it applied five years from the time it was convicted of contravening the criminal law of Canada. The difficulty is that there is an element of friendliness involved in the structure of a company, because it is not a company itself which engages in these criminal activities; it is the officials of the company. It is not the Electric Reduction Company which was guilty of criminal offences; it is people like Dr. Solandt who engaged in criminal activity. But he will not have to worry about applying for a pardon. In fact, he has already received one inasmuch as he is being maintained as chairman of the Science Council of Canada, and an endorsement of that kind precludes the necessity of involving himself in the procedure of applying for a pardon.

We are really dealing with persons—with human beings who have fallen foul of the law—and we are hoping to establish machinery sanctioned by legislation which will give them an opportunity to apply for the removal of the stigma attached to the commission of a

criminal offence. The idea is that persons will apply, and thus set the process in motion. An investigation will be carried out by officers of the National Parole Board, as is done in practice at the present time.

I suggest that under the provisions of clause 4 there are two items which have been omitted. One concerns persons who are sentenced or dealt with under the Juvenile Delinquents Act. This aspect has been eloquently discussed by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) and does not need further elaboration.

The other omission relates to suspended sentences. The board can cause inquiries to be made when five years has elapsed since a sentence of imprisonment has been served, a period of probation ended or a fine paid. But in the case of a person who received a suspended sentence—and such sentences are often passed when young people are concerned, though not exclusively—I believe we are bound to recognize an area of omission.

In some ways a person who receives a suspended sentence finds himself in a situation which can last forever. Presumably, at any time in the future a court could impose two sentences, should a further offence be committed—one for the current offence and one in respect of the original offence. It seems to me there should be some mechanism by means of which a suspended sentence could be regarded as though it had been imposed and served at the time of conviction. An opportunity should be provided for an individual in those circumstances to apply for removal of the right to impose a sentence after a period of time.

What concerns us in large measure is that an individual affected shall have the right or the opportunity to obtain gainful employment. There is an added psychological element involved—the relief which enters into the person's mind, the sense of well-being he experiences on receiving a pardon. In the few cases known to me in which individuals have applied for and received pardons under the procedure which exists at the present time, this sense of relief was present, as if a shadow had been wiped out and was no longer there to haunt the memory.

The federal government undertook a while ago to remove from all its application forms in connection with employment the question relating to criminal offences. I do not know whether Canadian National Railways still has a question of this kind on its application forms, but it did until not long ago. I know there are individuals working for the CNR, as well as persons in the government service, who lied when they answered that because they wished to obtain employment and thought that if they answered the question honestly and admitted a criminal record, they probably would not obtain work. They are still employed. In some cases the employer knows about the misinformation which was supplied but has decided against taking any action; he has wiped it out and has not taken it as a reason for discontinuing the fellow's employment, which is a helpful and enlightened approach.

• (3:40 p.m.)

In some types of employment there is not any great concern on the part of the employer whether the fellow has a criminal record or not. I worked as a logger on the west coast at one time. The primary desire of logging companies is to get production going, get the logs in the water and on their way to the mills. They do not really care whether a chap has a criminal record as long as he puts in a day's work and keeps up production.

However, companies involved in handling money and valuables are quite concerned about a criminal record, not so much because of the record itself but because it will probably prohibit bonding. This is an area that the government should become involved in; it should establish a substitute bonding arrangement. This is a kind of extension of the concept, but a logical one, and I think the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) feels as strongly about it as anybody.

Perhaps it is not possible to set up this mechanism for bonding through the federal government, but at least we can explore the possibilities in committee and maybe use this bill as a prelude to some other legislative arrangement. In this way individuals who fall into difficulty about bonding would be helped to find meaningful employment in fields which would otherwise be closed to them.

I think there is a failure in the bill with respect to the question that might be asked by prospective employers about a criminal record. This has already been touched upon by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka and by the minister. Whilst on the subject, I would say that I do not agree with the proposition made a couple of years ago that we change history by expunging criminal records—in effect saying that an individual did not commit a criminal offence.

I submit, even though it is argued by the other side that this is not the case, that although a person may receive a pardon, under this legislation a prospective employer would still be in a position to ask the simple question: Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence? If the individual is honest about it, regardless of having received a pardon he would be required in conscience to answer that he had. I think we must follow the suggestion of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka and confine the type of question on applications for employment to simply: Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence for which a pardon under the criminal records act has not been received? The individual would then, in all honesty, be able to answer "No" and that would prevent any further exploration.

According to our rules, Mr. Speaker, we cannot engage in a detailed discussion of clauses of the bill, but I hope I may be permitted to say a word or two on clause 6(2). This clause speaks of keeping records of people who have received a pardon, in the hands of the RCMP in a separate, locked vault. It also states that the existence of the record or the fact of the conviction shall not be disclosed to any person. I think the fact that in clause 6(2) there is reference to the conviction and the existence of a criminal record indicates that in fact the record still exists, in fact the conviction was imposed, in fact history has not been rewritten, and that though the individual may have received a pardon, he was convicted of a criminal offence. No matter what anybody says, always he will have been convicted of a criminal offence. He may have received a pardon, but he still was convicted.

History cannot be rewritten. Newspapers still exist, memories still exist, and as the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka said, police forces still have memories. Detectives know which persons have records, and keep an eye on them. Even now, if an individual should receive parole the knowledge of the criminal background is available to the RCMP in his community. I know of two or three instances where individuals have in effect been hounded—not in the direct sense of being awakened every morning at four o'clock, but hounded by being watched and questions being asked about them. So memory exists in the police force and cannot possibly be wiped out.

Primarily, however, we are talking about employment. I think we can avoid an employer asking questions in a way that would elicit the information that a prospective employee had been convicted of a criminal offence, whether or not he had received a pardon. The bill provides that five years must elapse upon the completion of sentence, probation or payment of a fine, before the individual can apply for and receive a pardon. This leaves open to speculation and comment the period of time between his release from jail and the end of the five-year period. It is difficult enough for anybody to make a go of it upon release from jail at the completion of a sentence, but when employment opportunities are not as good all across the nation as at other times, it is even more difficult.

• (3:50 p.m.)

For the sake of argument, a person released from jail at this time of year and at this point in our history would have more difficulty finding employment than if released during a period of high employment. Also, after two years in jail unemployment insurance benefits are not carried forward, so there is not that assistance to fall back upon. Many people have difficulty obtaining social welfare assistance and, surprisingly enough, many ex-convicts have an element of pride which precludes them from applying for such assistance. Things are even more difficult, of course, in the absence of any real rehabilitation program. Although we talk about it a good deal, there is no rehabilitation program within our prison structure. Lip service is paid to the concept within our penitentiaries, but primarily our penitentiaries are places where you keep people locked up. That is their primary function and every person in authority, from the warden down to the most recently employed guard, thinks: We are here to keep the prisoners locked up, and maintain discipline. Clearly, those who are looking for any rehabilitative activity within our prison structure are butting their heads against a stone wall.

When a person receives parole there may be some hope for him, especially if he is able to obtain employment and if there are friends or individuals outside to assist him in getting off on the right foot. Where there is no such help, where there is no after care so to speak, the outlook for a former prisoner is not promising. The more people in our penitentiary structure look at a man as being a hardened criminal, the greater will be his difficulty in rehabilitating himself, no matter how much he should want that.

If I might inject my own thoughts here, it might be helpful if, for political reasons only,

candidates of political parties in elections were to visit penitentiaries. It would be helpful if we gave the inmates of penitentiaries the right to vote in federal elections, because then candidates and members of political parties would pay more than lip service to the idea of rehabilitating prisoners. I am an advocate of giving the inmates of penitentiaries the vote. After all, the federal Parliament deals with their affairs after they have been incarcerated, but they have no real opportunity to communicate with us in this House. Because they do not vote there is no pressure on political parties to consider them, whereas there would be that pressure if inmates had the right to vote.

I have grave reservations about certain parts of clause 7 which relates to the revocation of pardons. If the Parole Board which granted the original pardon feels the individual is no longer of good character, or if the minister finds he is no longer of good character—no matter what that phrase may mean—the man's pardon may be revoked. I think the pertinent words in the clause are far too vague and too difficult to interpret and should not be retained in the legislation. Perhaps they will be removed in committee, or we might substitute other words for them. In any event, I think we should explore the ideas that would govern the revocation of a pardon or the not granting of an application in the first place.

Also, there appears to be no opportunity to appeal the rejection of an application. There is no opportunity to appeal the revocation of a pardon. Here we are granting by legislation a right that individuals enjoy under our common law; we are spelling it out and adding some characteristics that will give it force and effect. Along with our common rights there is a companion right which says that individuals shall be able to appeal to a court of last resort; yet in the construction of this bill it seems that there is no such right. It is true that the man makes his application to a certain authority; someone within the Parole Board will examine that application, will check with the RCMP or the city police, with former employers and the like, and may come to the conclusion that the person should not be granted a pardon. That, then, is the end of it.

It is true that the individual whose application has been rejected may go to the minister and, for argument's sake, say, "I have applied for a pardon and have not received it. Why not?" The minister will not conduct an inquiry himself; instead, he will go back to the Parole Board, back to the same people who conducted the investigation in the first instance, and will receive from that body the grounds and premises upon which the original application was rejected. Since the minister will have no other information, he will have to advise the individual that this is all the information he has, and that will be the end of the matter.

Although the individual may have a right under law to appeal, that right is abrogated because in effect he will be appealing to that group which made the decision in the first place. I think this is not correct and that some counterbalancing factor ought to be introduced. I am sure the minister thought about this matter when preparing the legislation. Perhaps he will explore it further when we get into committee.

There is in society, as I said a while ago, a much stronger desire now to help those who have been convicted of criminal offences. If we could entice prospective employers, say to work directly with individuals who are inmates of penitentiaries and employ them, there is hope of rehabilitating those men who are lucky enough to be so employed. I do not think we should wait until a man gets out of jail and onto the street and then becomes involved in more trouble.

I have almost concluded my remarks, Mr. Speaker; it is almost four o'clock. If there is disposition on the part of hon. members to continue with the bill and proceed to its conclusion today, we will have no objection.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, in view of the last remark of the hon. member, I wonder if there is disposition to continue with public business, with the prospect of finishing this legislation this afternoon?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, this is the first I have heard about it. The bill in my name is due to be considered. Under our Standing Orders, any private members' hour that is given up on Thursdays or Fridays is lost. I am prepared to consider this on any Monday or Tuesday when there is a right of deferral. In the circumstances, since at considerable inconvenience to myself I have been prepared for the last two weeks to debate the bill that stands in my name, and since I will not be here next week, I will not stand down on this occasion and will insist on private members' hour.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. It being four o'clock, the House will

now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, notices of motions and private bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

PROVISION THAT ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSIONS GIVE REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West) moved that Bill C-19, to amend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections.

• (4:00 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of again bringing forward this point. It was discussed in November of 1968 during the debate on a motion which went much further than does this bill. If hon. members will look at Bill C-19 they will see that it calls for an amendment to section 2, the definition section of the act. I think it would be instructive to put on the record the explanatory note which appears in this bill. It is as follows:

> The purpose of this bill is to require that an Electoral Boundaries Commission for a province, when making its report, support with reasons its recommendations concerning the division of that province into electoral districts, the description of the boundaries of each such district, and the representation and name given to each district. Section 20 of the act requires that a Notice of Motion, made in the House of Commons in objection to recommendations in a commission report, must specify "the provisions of the report objected to and the reasons for the objection". Obviously, the rules of debate in the House will be better observed if the recommendations of a Commission are reasoned amendments to which debate can be directed by Mr. Speaker; obviously, too, there is less likelihood that a debate will be initiated or prolonged if the recommendations are reasonably explained.

On November 20, 1968, there was participation on the part of hon. members of this House in respect of the motion I put on the Order Paper at that time. This is to be found commencing at page 2994 of *Hansard* for that date. As I said, it went much further than this bill. I do not want to repeat the descriptions I then gave of the results of redistribution whether in the province of Alberta or elsewhere. I think I clearly set those out, and I commend to the House what was said by hon. members on that occasion. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) did not agree with about 10 per cent of what I said—perhaps that is an arbitrary figure—and other hon. members were canvassing the situation or making representations to make sure this question would not come to a vote.

Perhaps I should also propose changes to section 13 of the act as well as section 2, in order to give greater importance to demographic considerations. A number of hon. members opposite during the last debate took great exception to the considerations of demography by the various commissions. I have in mind such things as community of interest, local employment and schooling of children.

As a result of the boundary changes during the last redistribution, we experienced all sorts of mix-ups. I need not describe the terrible situation which exists in some provinces. In my own constituency there is a large area which has no logical connection with the bulk of that constituency. There has been a tremendous amount of house construction in the area. Very fine people live there. When I identify myself to them as their member, and when I talk to the children in the schools, there is absolute amazement on their part that they should be connected with the constituency of Edmonton West. As a matter of fact, there is a standing joke to the effect that Edmonton West goes further east than does Edmonton East, but that is the fact.

It seems to me that on the last redistribution the various commissions did not start from scratch. The Electoral Boundaries Commissions made changes in constituency boundaries on the basis of information prepared by their staff. They worked from census reports after consulting the staff of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and various other offices across the country. No account was taken of the many features that should be considered in respect of constituencies. Perhaps this was because the people were merely ciphers who thought that so many people should be herded into a particular area.

So far as a democratic country is concerned there should be a desire for participation by the people in government. But when you have constituencies with disparity elements, you have a degree of frustration and confusion in those communities which quite naturally do not belong to a specific constituency. It seems to me it would be much better if these demographic considerations were given some weight by the boundaries commissioner's staff who apparently work in the isolation of the

ivory tower of Ottawa. Apparently they have no conception of what they are doing in many constituencies. They engage in drawing a zigzag pattern including or excluding areas which turn out to be reserved entirely for industrial or commercial development.

This is the sort of thing experienced by my colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski), and myself. These people have engaged in designing a bewildering pattern instead of following natural divisions such as main highways. The area represented by my colleague contains land zoned for warehouse use. As a matter of fact, warehouses have been built there. That may be very nice, but we do not represent people from that area. In other areas the boundaries commission followed a different zigzag pattern, and one has difficulty explaining to people why they do not belong in one constituency or another. After explaining as best one can, they want to know who made such a crazy decision. Surely these people should consult the elected representatives.

An hon. Member: They invited you.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): That is so, but speaking to the commission is like speaking to a blank wall. I suggest that the commission should give reasons for the changes it makes. It is axiomatic that anyone desiring to make a change must justify that change, whether or not he is a commissioner appointed under a statute. If changes are to be made, or if we argue against proposed changes, reasons should be provided. The discussion will then have some pertinence. During the previous debate some members made comments which indicated they preferred the old system of members attending a committee which carved up the country. I suggest they only displayed their ignorance of what happened in that situation.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It must be remembered nothing is said about changes in the act whereby any report, while it may be debated, can be varied by motion. There is no vote. Members are able to express opinions. If a sufficient number of them wish to object to a particular distribution, limited debate may take place in this House. But no motion can be made. No decision can be made by Members of Parliament concerning the boundaries. However, they have the right to express their opinions concerning how a constituency is redistributed or given new boundaries, because they are the ones who recognize how a constituency should be serviced and whether some people would be effectively disenfranchised. Therefore, I have proposed this amendment to section 2. I hope the amendment will commend itself to the House.

In conclusion, I wish to read a paragraph of the remarks I made on the previous occasion. As recorded at page 2996 of *Hansard* for November 20, 1968, I said:

> Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say we want to have something better in the composition of commissions. We want to have something better in the way of the principles upon which a redistribution shall take place, and we want to have the reports of commissions so that we can see just why certain constituencies were put together, thus placing the onus for changes upon the commissions. They have to justify the changes. They may want to make a change by saying. "In this district the population has changes." That is perfectly valid. This is a reason; but there are other reasons that must be included.

I commend this bill to hon. members, and since adoption of the bill would refer it to the standing Committee on Privileges and Elections I move that it be adopted and do not merely say that if hon. members cannot vote in favour of the bill, at least vote to send its contents to the committee. That is not the purpose of the motion at the present time; therefore, I ask that the motion be adopted by this House.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? The hon. member indicated he thought reasons should be given by the commissions, and he said a population change would be a very acceptable reason. Would he go so far as to include an anticipated shift in population as one of the reasons? So far as the major problem relates to growth, to what extent, in the hon. member's opinion, is it feasible or proper for that kind of reason to be expressed?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I say very simply that I had occasion to point out to the commission that an area in my constituency could be one in which expansion would take place, and that effectively the boundary as drawn prevented any expansion in the constituencies of my colleagues from Edmonton Centre and Edmonton East. This is precisely what has happened since the commission made its report. Land which at that time had been vacant, now contains some 3,000 homes. Two years from now it will perhaps contain 6,000 homes. This land is on the north side of the city of Edmonton. It is an area in which I would say 80 per cent of the non-multiple

residential building is taking place. It is an area four miles in breadth and a little over a mile in depth.

In addition, the next step in redevelopment is to be on the western side of my constituency. This was also pointed out to the commission. While they left the land on the west, as I anticipated they would, in effect they prevented any possible expansion by my colleagues in the constituencies represented by them, and the people involved have an affinity with the constituencies of my colleagues rather than with mine, other than the fact that they are residents of the city. For these reasons I think the commissioners should say that they include in a constituency a particular block of land because it is forecast there will be development in the area.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this bill by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) gives us today the opportunity to discuss a matter of utmost interest to almost all hon. members. It will soon become topic no. 1 because a forthcoming census will give rise to another revision of the electoral boundaries. Thus the debate might be useful on many counts.

I know that all hon. members recognize that all constituencies are to be established in the most logical, fair and equitable manner possible. Boundaries of electoral districts should be determined in such a way as not to leave too much margin, as it should not be harder or more difficult to represent one district rather than another. That situation, unfortunately, still prevails.

On this point, I share many of the views of the hon. member for Edmonton West, sponsor of the bill. As he aptly stated, the first revision, according to the bill adopted in 1964, was not a success, particularly in some of the provinces. The criteria described in section 13 of the act could perhaps be improved upon or altered to good purpose.

• (4:20 p.m.)

But that was the first time we were using that procedure the purpose of which is to bring about viable political units, taking into account not only population but other criteria as well. To be objective, however, we must admit that it was not an easy task to divide the electoral map because of the vastness of the land, its other geographic characteristics and the number of sparsely populated areas.

Of course, as was said by the hon. member, this was a marked improvement on the old system. Previously, when a committee of the House met to redistribute the electoral map, members were often influenced by partisan considerations, which led to some illogical boundaries.

And it is quite to the honour of the 1964 Liberal government, under the right hon. Mr. Pearson, to have made adopted the principle of an impartial and independent commission to deal with this important but delicate task of reviewing periodicaly the riding limits. This action had generally been well received since it was a significant improvement on the previous system.

However, the Electoral Boundaries Commission had, in its decisions, to take into account the provisions of the act and particularly the principle under which the division of a province into ridings should be effected on the basis of population, keeping as nearly as possible to the electoral quota for the province, that is the quotient obtained by dividing the total population as ascertained by the census by the number of the House of Commons assigned to the province as calculated by the Representation Commissioner under section 12 of the act, subject and according with section 51 of the British North America Act and rules provided therein.

Now, it is to comply with the provisions of this legislation that chapter 31 of the 1964-1965 Statutes of Canada was drafted; in particular, section 13(c) stipulates that the Commission may depart from the rule I just mentioned, for geographic considerations or because of the diversity of interests of the inhabitants of various regions of the province, but the departure from the electoral quota for that province shall not exceed 25 per cent more or 25 per cent less.

Now, I think that at the time of the last redistribution, this exception provision was not used as often as it should have been or as it could be used. In most cases, this difference should have, at least, been taken into account, especially in rural ridings, which sometimes cover such a large area that it is virtually impossible for members to visit them as often as they wish and to get in touch with all their constituents.

I suggest that it is not the same thing to represent a rural district, which may include 50 or 75 rural, semi-urban or urban municipalities, with all the problems that this may imply, and to represent an urban dis-

trict, generally including a large community and sometimes being part of a large urban centre.

In such a case, this 25 per cent margin should have been fully allowed and this, I suggest, was not done at the last census. It might be advisable to amend these sections in order to give more discretionary power to the Commissioner and to take into account not only the population required to justify the establishment of an electoral district, but also the various demographic, geographic and economic factors.

Under the legislation, before drawing up its report, the Commission must hold public hearings in each province, following the publication of a preliminary report and of a map showing the proposed boundaries. During those hearings, any interested individual who has given notice within the required time can make some comments and suggest some changes.

Now, experience has shown rather clearly, I think, that once the map has been drawn up by the Commission, it is not easy to have it altered, to any great extent, because those changes would affect many neighbouring constituencies and as a result, the electoral map would become useless.

That is why, in my opinion, there have been so few changes, following the public hearings of 1965 or even following the subsequent debates in the House of Commons. In fact, the municipalities, the Chambers of Commerce and the intermediate bodies which submitted briefs often at great cost found that out the hard way. I was told many times that petitioners were not always welcomed by the Commission, even when, as was often the case, briefs revealed the existence of disparities or the inopportunity of combining some areas.

That is why it is most important, first of all, to make good appointments, to choose competent commissioners. However, we must not exclude necessarily those who were active in politics or choose only among judges or university professors as is often the case.

Commissioners have to be not only qualified but impartial also.

It has previously been said that they could be influenced by party considerations. I question that. It certainly did not happen during the latest census, at least not in the province of Quebec. Quite the contrary. As for me, the constituency I had been representing since 1963, that of Stanstead, disappeared. Following the electoral redistribution, it was divided in three. I represent Magog where I live. This region was added to the provincial counties of Brome, Missisquoi and Iberville. As for the town of Iberville it became the new federal constituency of Missisquoi.

[Mr. Forest.]

I can say that electors from the new regions which were added to the former Brome-Missisquoi constituency were quite astonished, especially those residing in the provincial county of Iberville. In fact, following the annexation which followed redistribution, part of the town of Iberville and all the adjoining rural district became the Missisquoi constituency, whereas the remaining part of the town was included in the Saint-Jean constituency.

This is only one instance. The situation should be remedied on the occasion of the next electoral boundaries readjustment. However, I got over the whole thing by getting elected in a new constituency. There, I met active, hard-working and thoroughly Canadian-minded people. In that area, English-speaking and French-speaking people work together in harmony to build a better future.

The report of the Commission was finally tabled in the House. The purpose of the bill introduced by the hon. member for Edmonton West is to require the Commission to support with reasons the proposed changes.

As far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the commissioners explaining the changes they propose to make concerning the boundaries, the description or the name of the electoral districts. That might help Canadians to understand some decisions. Perhaps, they would not have had such an easy time of it on the last occasion. As a matter of fact, I had the impression they were concerned only with demography when the time came for redistribution.

• (4:30 p.m.)

But, as indicated by other members in the debate of November 1968, especially by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the hon. member for Thunder Bay (Mr. Penner), I believe that the publication of the reasons might initiate a debate which, far from being shortened, could drag on considerably. In fact all hon. members are more or less dissatisfied and they would like to discuss the reasons given by the commissioners, because as they know their ridings they are probably very sensitive to that question.

I am afraid that this would give rise to lengthy debates with no practical results, because, as pointed out by the hon. member, the House cannot bring in any amendments. To do so, indeed, it is necessary that in the length of time prescribed by the Standing Orders, ten members should register an objection of which they ought to inform the Commission through *Hansard* or *Votes and Proceedings*. The Commission is supposed to study it in order to determine the motives advocated by the members.

Generally speaking, the members who know their area better than anybody and who, most of the time, have had talks with the people concerned, are those who can most likely make useful recommendations, without necessarily knowing what motivated the decisions of the commissioners.

I think that nothing prevents hon. members or anyone else from filing an objection with the Commission, or even previously with the Representation Commissioner, preferably before the preliminary report is tabled. It might then be for the members and other people concerned the ideal time to comment on it and to draw the attention of the Commission and of the Representation Commissioner to the blatant cases of discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, it might be advisable under the circumstances to amend the act, particularly Section 13. It is extremely important to appoint to these commissions people who have practical experience and who can draw from this experience in order to arrive at a fair delimitation of electoral constituencies, while keeping in mind the obvious difficulties which the commissioners must face.

I hope that the next revision will be a great improvement on the last one and that we will at least try to reach this aim as is no doubt the wish of all hon. members.

[*English*]

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the bill brought before the House by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). I express sympathy with the hon. member in connection with the problems he has raised for discussion and consideration.

I am aware that he and other hon. members, together with various interested people in Alberta, experienced difficulties in the most recent redistribution of boundaries because of the terms of the legislation. I have had some contact with the operation of this legislation, although I was not a member of the House when the act was debated in this chamber or when subsequent discussions took place regarding the decisions of the provincial boundary commissions. I was involved to the extent that I took part in making recommendations to the commission in my province of Saskatchewan, in my capacity as research director for the leader of the opposition in that province. I also went with him to present a brief to the commission on behalf of the New Democratic Party of Saskatchewan.

When the original legislation was passed by the House there was a fairly general feeling that hon. members wanted to do away with what had been termed gerrymandering, or the suspicion of gerrymandering. They wanted to do away with the decennial haggling which had taken place with regard to electoral boundaries. In effect, they wanted to take politics out of the process of drawing up electoral boundaries. This was very commendable and to this extent the act has represented a step forward.

Having the benefit of hindsight, however, I suggest that we lost sight of the fact that constituency boundaries are an essential feature of the political process. They cannot be separated from the political process or considered in some apolitical fashion completely apart from it. This was demonstrated when some of the shortcomings of the original act were recognized—when an amendment was introduced which at least provided for debate on the boundaries proposed by the commissions.

This amendment gave the provincial commissions an opportunity to review their proposals, taking into account objections which had been raised in the House of Commons. Final power still rested with the commissions, which were not required to give any reasons or set forth any rationale in support of their decisions.

There was considerable lack of response to some extremely valid points which were made in debate in the House of Commons at that time in objecting to proposals made by the commissions across Canada. Particular objections were raised with respect to the reports of the commissions in the provinces of Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

In some parts of Canada the reports of the commissions were sound and there was little objection to them. But in the three western provinces there were some very real difficulties. I do not think I need remind hon. members of the ghastly mistakes associated with boundaries in Alberta. There was also consid-

erable objection to boundaries in British Columbia. But after strong representations had been made, I believe only one change was brought about, and that was to boundaries affecting the Queen Charlotte Islands. In Saskatchewan, as in Alberta, no change was made in any of the boundaries, in spite of the very reasonable representations which had been put forward though the changes called for could have been implemented without any great difficulty.

I think it became clear during the course of the hearings that the initial report provided by the provincial commissions served as a basis for the final report, and that despite the soundness of any objections made to the commissions' proposals there was little chance of any change being made to the initial plan.

With respect to the commission operating in my own province of Saskatchewan, I wish to make it clear that I have the highest respect for the integrity of its members. It consisted of a well-known political scientist from the University of Saskatchewan, the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of the province of Saskatchewan and a well-known judge on the bench of that province. In my view these gentlemen gave earnest consideration to the representations which were made. Nevertheless, it seems to me their immediate reaction to a representation was to say, "Well, the trouble is this—" and from there on they would proceed to defend the original proposals they had made public.

It was difficult to get anything by way of a sympathetic response. There was no effective communication between the commission and those who were interested in the boundaries it was establishing. There is no question about the apolitical nature of the commission in my province, or for that matter in any other province to my knowledge. But I think that in the boundaries which were established in some cases, very little consideration was given to the real problems facing people involved in the political and the electoral processes.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I could cite a number of examples in my own province where the boundaries drawn simply did not relate in any way to the natural community structures. One example is the constituency of Moose Jaw, with approximately 70,000 people, one-half of whom live in the city of Moose Jaw which is in the extreme southeast corner of the constituency which then proceeds in a westerly and northerly direction to within eight miles of the city of Saskatoon, goes far west to the Saskatchewan River, takes in an area west of the South Saskatchewan dam and the river in that area, which is completely cut off from the rest of the constituency.

Another example is the constituency of Meadow Lake, which comes within a few miles of the city of North Battleford and within a few miles of the city of Prince Albert. For the people living immediately adjacent to these cities, all their activities are linked to them; but for purposes of election and political activities their contact is totally with the constituency of Meadow Lake in the northwestern corner of the province.

With respect to population, terms were written into the federal legislation providing that there should not be a variation of more than 25 per cent above or below the norm for any province. But the fact was that a considerable change in population took place between 1961 and the time the redistribution was carried out. The net effect was that when the final boundaries were settled, the variation in population in constituencies in Saskatchewan was as great as it had been prior to redistribution.

I have already commented on the hearings when a number of representations were made by very interested people, and reasonable proposals were set forth. However, there was very little response from the commission, and in its official report it did not make a single change to the original proposals which had been made public. I think we should learn from this experience and consider alternatives to or changes in the legislation.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should make it clear that I am speaking on my own behalf and not necessarily on behalf of the New Democratic Party. I think some way should be found to apply the general approach and principles involved in the legislation as originally passed, and to take into account the fact that the drawing of electoral boundaries is part of the political process. Should we not, in fact, give consideration to establishing a commission which could have as chairman a judge appointed by the Chief Justice of the province and a number of representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Commons as is presently the case?

Provision could also be made to include representatives from each of the recognized political parties within each province. A formula could be devised and used as a guide in deciding which political parties should have

representation on the commission and that would take account of the various points of view to be considered.

One other change which might be considered is giving the House of Commons the power to make a change in the report of a commission if the change receives approval of two-thirds or three-quarters of the members of the House.

Mr. Speaker, in my view all members of this House have a responsibility to try and make the process work as it is set out in the legislation approved some years ago. No one will argue with the fact that you cannot make everybody happy with any set of proposals. However, I do not think this should prevent members of the House doing everything that can be done with a very difficult task. I think it is very necessary that we consider this matter in that context, because we do need to take account of these problems if we are to make this process work and ensure its survival.

I hope the proposal placed before us by the hon. member for Edmonton West is either approved, or the subject matter referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Rocky Mountain): Mr. Speaker, this is a debate of great interest to me. It has been said of the redistribution that it affected the province of Alberta, and indeed it was the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) who raised the subject today. I should like to hear more from other hon. members from Alberta because I for one do not feel that the Electoral Boundaries Commission did a ghastly job.

Mr. Bigg: Look at the map.

Mr. Sulatycky: The hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg) suggests that I have not looked at the map. May I point out to him that I have travelled all over that particular riding, and the map is not as bad as it appears.

Mr. Speaker, the bill proposed by the hon. member for Edmonton West suggests that the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act be amended so that the report of the commission in each province gives the reason for the recommendations made. Basically, I do not object to this except to say that if it were question as to the basis on which the redistribution was made in each province.

If we opened up the discussion as widely as possible, it would not be very long before political considerations began creeping into the system again. My understanding is that the purpose of this act was to eliminate what was called gerrymandering, which we acknowledge to have taken place for the first 100 years of the political history of this country. By and large it has been eliminated with the new act.

It can readily be seen that if changes such as those proposed in Bill C-19 were made, it would not be long before changes such as the one proposed by the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), where political parties would become involved in the selection of members of the commission, could lead to a situation similar to the one prevalent for many years after confederation. On that basis I cannot support this bill. If it is supportable at all, it is only in that I believe the provinces should have control to the maximum extent, short of political considerations, over the operations of the Electoral Boundaries Commissions. On my reading of the measure as it stands, I believe it goes as far as it can reasonably and safely go toward allowing political considerations to become significant in this field.

• (4:50 p.m.)

May I say a few words about allegations that the commission did a poor job in the province of Alberta. I know that for many people in Alberta this has been a matter of contention for the last four or five years. I am not sure whether the hon. member for Edmonton West would agree with my point of view. In any event, in two elections in which I was involved the candidate for the Conservative Party went around the constituency contending that its borders showed a very good example of gerrymandering. I hope the hon. member for Edmonton West does not still adhere to this thinking, because I am sure that most hon. members would agree that the commission in Alberta, as in other provinces, was as impartial as it could be.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member will not convince anybody else.

Mr. Sulatycky: It is obvious that in talking about the poor job the commission did in Alberta, the hon. member was referring to the constituency of Rocky Mountain in Alberta. On November 20, 1968, the hon. member made these remarks, as reported at page 2995 of *Hansard*. Clearly the constituency referred to is Rocky Mountain. He said in part:

> Ridings made no sense geographically, leading to very difficult election campaigns. Often, no interior roads existed. We have one constituency that

stretches along the eastern slope of the mountains, running some 450 miles, I would say, from the United States boundary, and 36 miles south of the city of Grande Prairie. There is not a road running directly through that constituency. The people in it have no community of interest.

Those remarks clearly refer to the constituency of Rocky Mountain which I have the honour to represent in Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sulatycky: It is perhaps one of the most exciting and interesting ridings in the country. In the last election we had not only three Liberal candidates but two Conservatives as well as one socialist, all trying to win the seat. So despite what my Conservative friends say, at least two members of their party were interested enough to try and win the seat. I am proud to have won it.

Mr. Bigg: You can thank God.

Mr. Sulatycky: The hon. member for Pembina suggested I should thank God. I invite him to attempt to win the seat for his party during the next election, because then we shall also win Pembina. Having represented this constituency for a year and a half, I am now in a position to say that no constituency in Canada is more challenging or rewarding to represent.

Mr. Perrault: Other than Burnaby-Seymour.

Mr. Sulatycky: In my constituency of Rocky Mountain we have three great national parks of Canada. They stretch from the extreme south to the extreme north of the riding and are very important to the economy of the constituency. The national parks are very important from the point of view of tourism. In addition, we have an economic community of interest throughout the riding. Our people carry on coal mining. That activity commences in the southern portion or the riding and is carried on throughout the length of the region. We find that activity in the Crowsnest Pass area, the Canmore area, the Coal Valley area and in the Smoky River deposits which had not been developed when the commission was considering electoral boundaries in Alberta. They investigated the potential of the coal deposits in the northern part of the riding and now it is safe to say that we have a community of interest extending from the extreme south to the extreme north of the constituency.

As a result of the farsightedness the commissioners exercised, the constituency of Rocky Mountain may be the only constituency in Alberta which will not need to have its boundaries changed when constituencies are next considered for redistribution. There are at present in the constituency approximately 65,000 people. That is less than the optimum number for Alberta constituencies. But in the north end of the riding we have a rapidly growing population, and it will continue to grow for some time because of resource development taking place there.

It will not be necessary to change the constituency boundaries even after the next census has been taken. It has not, as have many other rural constituencies in western Canada, a great outflow of population which necessitates changes in boundaries; neither has it, as have many urban constituencies, a vast increase in population which requires a contraction of constituency boundaries. I suggest that the constituency of Rocky Mountain will not need to be changed when redistribution is considered again.

At five o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, February 2, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

HOUSING

TABLING OF CENTRAL MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION 1970 CAPITAL BUDGET

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a statement on the capital budget of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the calendar year 1970 which for the first time is being tabled this early in the year. The approved capital budget authorizes CMHC to make loans under the various sections of the National Housing Act in a total amount of $854 million. This represents an increase of $174 million over the 1969 commitment level of $680 million. As in 1969, and in accordance with the undertaking given in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of this session, the largest part of the corporation's budget will be devoted to the provision of housing for low-income families and persons. A total of $570 million has been reserved for this purpose.

An amount of $265 million has been allocated to the provincial housing authorities for the public housing program under section 35 of the National Housing Act. They were so informed last week. In almost all cases, this matches provincial requests. An amount of $105 million will be directed immediately to section 16 loans to sponsoring groups who will supply low-rental housing in limited-return, non-profit and co-operative projects. The sum of $200 million is being reserved temporarily for new innovations and a balancing of distribution based on need. It is my hope that a substantial portion of this $200 million can be used to bolster efforts in those areas where poverty is most acute and to employ new or revised techniques for reaching low-income families where the present arrangements under the National Housing Act may not be fully effective. In any event, these funds will permit the corporation to arrange in 1970 for the construction of 35,000 housing units specifically for low-income families.

So that hon. members will have some idea of the magnitude of this allocation it should be noted that during the 20 years prior to 1969, 82,000 homes for low-income families were built in Canada through the CMHC loan budget. In 1969, in line with government policy, provision was made for 27,000 units of low-rental, low-income housing in that year, a number that will be increased to not less than 35,000 units in 1970.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Andras: The total allocation of capital funds for low-income housing in 1969 and 1970 at 62,000 units therefore represents 75 per cent of the previous 20 years' performance. In addition to the specific low-income housing sections, $110 million will be for direct loans under section 40 to home owners for new and existing housing in small towns, rural areas and the remote parts of Canada where new communities are emerging as a result of the development of resource industries. It is my intention, Mr. Speaker, that the direct lending activities of CMHC under section 40 shall also be devoted to the needs of families in the lower income brackets.

An allocation of $45 million has been made for student housing, which will provide 6,500 dormitory beds on university campuses. Unfortunately, this allocation will not meet all of the demand for student housing in 1970. But in view of the pressing and greater need for housing for low-income families and because of the large amount of capital funds directed to student housing in recent years, it is my opinion that a modest decline from $55 million to $45 million this year is appropriate. In this regard hon. members will recall that $340 million has been devoted to student housing in the last nine years, an amount that has produced more than 56,000 hostel beds and nearly 5,000 units of fully served accommodation on university campuses.

• (2:10 p.m.)

In view of the increasing concern with ground and water pollution, the CMHC budget provides for loans to assist in financ-

ing sewage treatment plants and major trunk sewers in an amount of $75 million. This is an increase of 50 per cent over the 1969 figure of $50 million and represents the only major increase in the non-housing portion of the corporation's 1970 capital budget. The funds allocated for land assembly and urban renewal loans have been set at approximately the 1969 level.

Hon. members will note that, of the total budget, $724 million is being directed to housing purposes, mainly for low income families and persons, including the elderly, while $130 million has been reserved for infrastructure programs, such as sewage treatment, land assembly and urban renewal.

The 1970 CMHC capital budget is being tabled concurrently with these few remarks. May I conclude by reminding hon. members that, in addition to the large sums to which I have already referred, there is an amount of $53.7 million in the annual estimates covering grants, subsidies and losses under part V, sections 23A and 23B and 36G of the National Housing Act, as well as losses on public housing projects. I should like to add that, as I have stated on previous occasions, we, in co-operation with the provinces, are seeking to encourage and establish long-range budgeting for all NHA programs.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the statement by the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. It certainly shows some awareness of housing problems as they affect the poor. But I must state at the outset that we on this side of the House are extremely disturbed and gravely disappointed that the minister has made no mention of guidelines for public housing, which are extremely important to all. Therefore it appears that uncertainty still remains regarding size and design. I hope that the minister, in his wisdom, will look into this matter inasmuch as several questions have been directed to him over the past months as to when these guidelines would be available.

One very important point regarding the minister's statement which gives those on this side of the House some concern is the fact that, as has been said on many occasions, tenants in public housing are trapped by high rents. We must remember that public housing was never intended to be permanent but rather only a temporary means of providing housing for those at the bottom of the economic ladder until such time as they are able to move into more substantial housing on a permanent basis.

[Mr. Andras.]

I should like to point out at this time that those living in public housing who earn approximately $560 a month pay rent of approximately $160 a month. As their income increases we find that those making approximately $600 a month pay $180 a month for rent. Yet studies have shown that people living in our larger metropolitan areas where the same circumstances exist who earn $14,000 a year pay approximately $176 per month for rent. Therefore I point out to the minister that the public housing rental scale is far too high. Changes must be made to take account of differences in projects, in construction costs and in the quality of services. In this regard we have to pay specific attention to the tenant associations which are deeply involved in this matter.

I notice the Minister mentioned that some emphasis is to be placed on limited dividend housing. I point out that with $105 million to be devoted to this field we must have some regard for priority. In effect I do not think this type of home is geared to meet the needs of those in the lower income bracket but rather the needs of those in the $6,000 to $8,000 bracket. Therefore I say we should be concerned to see that at the expiration of 15 years these limited dividend housing projects will have no further governmental supervision. Charges of $100 a month for a one-bedroom apartment could conceivably increase to $200 a month.

With regard to limited dividend housing we must also be concerned about the high cost of land. In order for this type of project to be successful it is important that the government realize that we must be concerned about acquiring serviced land upon which this type of housing can be erected. We have to realize that public housing is designed to meet the needs of the poor. Therefore our policies with respect to public housing should be directed to assisting those people whom I have described as being locked in.

The amount of money now going into direct loans is of some significance in terms of the interest shown, but I would like to remind the minister that in the past—and here the only figures we have are for 1968—apparently 75 per cent of this money was directed to people who on average were making between $8,000 and $10,000 per year.

There were certain unwarranted inconsistencies in the minister's speech which I would like to bring to his attention. One concerns the fact that the government does not have an acceptable urban renewal policy. The vast

majority of poor people in this land live within areas now designated for urban renewal projects. The minister's statement on this aspect is unacceptable to many people, particularly to those on this side of the House who are concerned about helping the poor. I say with all respect to the minister that he should try to issue a policy statement at least once a year.

I believe that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) should get together with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). It appears to me there is not too much rapport between them, if that is now the acceptable word rather than dialogue, because the Minister of Finance wants to bring homes under a new capital gains tax structure, while at the same time he is talking about taxing the small businessman at the rate of 50 per cent on his profits, a step which will certainly discourage home ownership.

I must also point out that student housing is a unique problem calling for special consideration. It has been reported that there will be some 500,000 students needing accommodation by 1975. If this be true, then we must be very concerned because student housing affects the intellectual and emotional development of students. A sum of $45 million is neither practical nor adequate.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member—will the hon. member kindly resume his seat. I appreciate that the matter now under consideration is of great importance but at the same time the Standing Order requires that comments on ministerial statements should be brief. I would invite the hon. member to come to a conclusion as early as possible.

Mr. Alexander: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The matter is so complex and calls for so much involvement that perhaps I was carried away.

I welcome the statement of the minister. I point out, however, that successful public housing is not only dependent on the number of projects but also on the inter-related effect of general housing policy. Unless we begin to produce homes at reasonable cost and with a reasonable rental scale, people with rising incomes will remain locked in and dependent on public housing.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, the amiable and courteous minister read his statement with a great deal of pride, I thought. I suppose he ought to be congratulated that he did make the statement today. I remind him, however, that this is the beginning of February and that the Ontario government found it necessary to freeze its public housing program until he had tabled the CMHC budget. I see no reason in the world why he could not have done so before the end of last year instead of in the second month of the year to which the budget is intended to apply.

Everyone in this House and in the country must be glad that the minister has increased the money available for public housing in view of the fact that this is the major concern in the generally difficult field of housing. But I cannot help but be distressed and saddened by the fact that after some years of study of the problem of housing, after task forces, reports and housing conferences across the country, all we have today is the provision of a little more money in the realm of housing. Have any guidelines for public housing, any of those programs necessary to make it effective, any of the details, been made known to this Parliament, the provincial governments or the municipal authorities? What in heaven's name are we going to do for the poor people who have no housing? That is where the problem lies.

I happened to be present last Saturday, as was my leader, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, at a meeting at Trefann Court in Toronto where people concerned with urban renewal and threatened with the demolition of their houses, and people from existing public housing projects such as Regent Park, met with us and spoke of their worries. It was an experience to sit and listen to these Canadians speak of the kind of life they are forced to live in these public housing projects. Apparently the attention paid to garbage collection in these large apartments is inadequate and in some cases garbage is piled up at elevators to within two feet of the ceiling. Apparently, too, the people cannot always get adequate maintenance service and have to chase around for days to get plumbing or electrical repairs made. They complain too that the rents are much too high for people with families to support.

One cannot feel satisfied that the public housing program up to this time has accomplished anything except to provide a roof over heads that might otherwise not have had one. Surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not what we are after. Surely what we are after is to build communities into which Canadians who

cannot afford high-price homes can move and live in decency and with some sort of personal fulfilment rather than having to live in a new form of degradation, a new form of inferiority such as accompanies these public housing projects.

These people told us that they have no recreation facilities, no chance of participating in what takes place in the projects and that there is bad management. I am just reporting what they told us. I appreciate that the federal minister does not do the managing. That is done through the Ontario Housing Corporation or similar bodies in the other provinces. I am not saying it is directly his fault but I am saying that it is his fault to some extent because the government has failed to bring down guidelines for public housing demanding that there be recreational facilities and good management and laying down as a condition governing the advancing of any money the requirement that the environment be such that Canadian children can be brought up in decency. That is the main point I wished to make.

I do not wish to speak at such length that Your Honour will have to remind me to be brief. I say to the minister that what he has presented today is really no solution to those concerned about the problem of public housing. The problem is a social one. It is of concern to those living in our present public housing projects who cannot live in decency and have to pay too high a rent. Many of these people are not given any chance to make decisions which will affect their lives in these apartments.

I submit that the minister is doing only one-tenth of his job when he brings to our attention the slight and inadequate increase in the allocation of funds for public housing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I will be quite brief. I merely wish to point out some gaps in the government proposal on housing. Each time that the government announces that it is granting some kind of assistance, I wonder what it really means for Quebec. We already know that Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation provides very few loans to Quebec compared to Ontario. This depends on the fact that standards in a country as vast as Canada cannot be the same for all provinces. In the housing field, some provisions are closely related to the individual himself.

Due to the presence of various ethnic groups in Quebec, in comparison with other Canadian provinces, the government should have realized that there was already a housing corporation in that province which cannot have the necessary scope to serve the people, on account of its lack of funds. In order to solve the problem, should the government not have provided more money to the Quebec housing corporation, and thus by decentralizing the problem, it could more easily have met the needs of the population of Canada in general and that of Quebec in particular.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF BELGIAN MINISTER OF SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the presence in your gallery of Mr. Théo Lefèvre, Minister of Scientific Affairs of Belgium.

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

PRAIRIE SERVICES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House—

Mr. Barnett: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Are we still on motions?

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Comox-Alberni rising on a point of order?

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I wanted at this time to ask leave to make a correction in *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Brandon-Souris has the floor.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to move a motion under Standing Order 43 on the following grounds: On Friday last the Air Transport Committee of the Canadian Transport Commission brought down a decision which makes fundamental changes in regional air policy. Under licence No. 502/50(s), in accordance with the principles of regional policy Transair Limited has been providing a prairie regional class I air service including major centres on the western lateral such as Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Saskatoon and Prince Albert, emphasizing centres not served by Air Canada. The decision has amended con-

dition four of the licence which prohibits direct non-stop service between Winnipeg-Regina and Winnipeg-Saskatoon. This introduces a new element in regional air policy providing for competitive service with Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Airlines on main line routes rather than supplementary service to major communities off the main routes.

• (2:30 p.m.)

As a result of the decision, Brandon and western Manitoba have been downgraded from class I to class II service at a critical juncture when industry is developing to offset the decline in the agricultural industry on the Prairies. The change in policy runs counter to, and in fact works against, the government's regional development program.

Because of the serious implications of this ad hoc decision for all regions of Canada labouring under problems of regional disparity, I ask unanimous consent to have the whole question of regional air policy referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications for urgent consideration and confirmation.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, this motion cannot be put unless there is unanimous agreement. Is there unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous agreement.

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

BROADCASTING OF DEBATES BY RADIO AND TELEVISION

On the Orders of the Day: Government Notices of Motions:

January 30, 1970—The President of the Privy Council:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, in consultation with Mr. Speaker, be directed to study the question of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its Committees, including the legal, procedural, and technical aspects thereof, and the question of arrangements made for reporters for the electronic media in the parliament buildings.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 21 (2), the government notice of motion is transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders in the same sitting of the House later today.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE EMPLOYEES

Question No. 310—**Mr. Caouette:**

Among the persons earning $17,000 or more per year, and for each branch, in the Department of National Health and Welfare, how many are (a) Canadians whose mother tongue is French (b) Canadians whose mother tongue is English (c) others (d) bilingual?

[*Translation*]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Staff statistics for the Department of National Health and Welfare are maintained in a manner which would not provide the information requested. However information on bilingualism within the department is being prepared but will not be complete until early in 1970.

[*English*]

ECONOMIC COUNCIL COMBINES REPORT

Question No. 311—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. How many briefs and letters were received by mid-October in response to the Economic Council's report on combines?

2. What organizations or individuals have submitted briefs or letters?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): 1. 7.

2. Warren Allmand, M.P.; Canadian Chiropractic Association; Ivey & Dowler, London, Ontario; Imperial Oil Limited; Retail Council of Canada; Dominion Stores Ltd.; Eric B. Appleby of Fredericton, N.B.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN UNITED KINGDOM

Question No. 519—**Mr. Stewart (Cochrane):**

What was the total number of people, both Canadian and non-Canadian, employed by the Canadian Government within the United Kingdom, excluding military personnel, in 1965 and 1969?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of Privy Council): 1965: 607; 1969: 545.

WHITE PAPER ON TAXATION

Question No. 727—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How many copies of the White Paper on Taxation were printed?

2. What was the cost of printing the White Paper on Taxation?

3. Were copies of the White Paper on Taxation distributed to political parties and, if so, how many to each party?

Questions

4. Were copies of the White Paper on Taxation distributed to organizations and, if so, to which organizations and in what quantities?

5. Were copies of the White Paper on Taxation distributed by the Department to Members of Parliament and, if so, how many received (a) 1-10 copies (b) 10-25 copies (c) 25-100 copies (d) more than 100 copies?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. Two printings of the White Paper, each totalling 50,000, have been received and a further order for 25,000 is being processed by The Queen's Printer.

2. Printing costs for the 125,000 copies are expected to total about $44,000.

3. Since tabling of the document, requests have been received from political parties for varying amounts and these requests have been met. The numbers involved have not been recorded.

4. In most cases copies of the White Paper were sent to individual members of organizations, e.g. labor organizations, members of the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities, members of the Canadian Consumer Council, etc. A supply of 230 was provided directly to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association for its own distribution to members. Two commercial tax reporting services, CCH Canadian Limited and Richard De Boo Limited, received 7,000 and 1,500 copies respectively and were charged printing costs. Accounting and law firms, schools, universities and similar bodies requesting large supplies of the White Paper are billed 25 cents per copy to cover printing costs.

5. At the time of release approximately 1,800 copies were made available for Members at a special briefing and in the House of Commons post office. Since then Members' requests for copies for constituents have been met on a one-per-person basis; where possible, mailing has been handled by the Department of Finance to ensure rapid distribution. No precise record has been kept of the numbers received by individual Members, or mailed on their behalf to constituents.

NUMBER OF AMERICANS IN CYC

Question No. 777—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. How many Americans are in the Company of Young Canadians?

2. Have any Americans in the Company of Young Canadians policy-making jobs?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Company of Young Canadians as follows: 1. There are seven Americans having landed immigrant status in the Company of Young Canadians.

2. There are no Americans holding policy-making jobs in the Company of Young Canadians at the present time.

[*English*]

CBC FREE TELEVISION TIME FOR QUEBEC PARTIES

Question No. 781—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. Does CBC make available to Quebec provincial parties free television periods between elections and, if so, what Quebec provincial parties were granted such free time in 1969?

2. How many periods and how many minutes per period has CBC granted to (a) the Quebec Liberal Party (b) the Union Nationale Party of Quebec (c) the Parti Québecois?

3. What criteria are used by CBC in recognizing political parties?

4. Was Dr. Gaston Tremblay, Ralliement Créditiste Party member representing Montmorency in the Quebec National Assembly, given pro-rated free television time and, if not, for what reason and does CBC intend to correct this situation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1 and 2. Yes. CBC made available 28 periods of 5-minutes duration for free-time political telecasts by Quebec provincial political parties for the 1969-70 Fall-Winter season as follows: Union Nationale, 14 periods; Parti Libéral, 12 periods; Parti Québecois, 2 periods.

3. The Corporation has established certain guidelines to determine the eligibility of a party for free time periods. Under these guidelines it is expected that a provincial party has a program relating to a large number of questions of provincial interest and, as a result of a political convention, has a recognized provincial leader and province-wide organization which includes province-wide representation. Another consideration is the number of candidates fielded by a party during the previous provincial elections.

4. Dr. Gaston Tremblay, as a Ralliement créditiste member, was not given pro-rated free television time because of the criteria outlined in part 3 above.

[*English*]

LANGUAGE AND CITIZENSHIP COURSES FOR IMMIGRANTS

Question No. 796—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Have there been any negotiations with and, if so, have any agreements been signed with any of the governments of the provinces of Canada, other

than Quebec, respecting Language and Citizenship courses for immigrants to Canada?

2. If in the affirmative, with what provinces?

3. If in the affirmative, do such agreements differ materially from that reached with the Province of Quebec on December 15, 1969, and in what respect?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): 1. Yes.

2. British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland.

3. No.

[*English*]

CONVENTION AND ENTERTAINMENT EXPENSES —REVENUE FROM PROPOSED ELIMINATION OF DEDUCTION

Question No. 800—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, is the estimated annual amount of revenue to be gained by the federal Treasury through implementation of the White Paper proposal to end convention and entertainment expenses as tax deductible business expenditures?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Tables 15 and 16 of White Paper show revenue gain in first year from cancellation of deduction for club dues, entertainment expenses, and conventions as from personal income tax, $12 million; from corporation income tax, $5 million; total: $17 million.

This includes provincial revenue gain. It is estimated that federal revenue gain would be $13 million.

LOANS IDB FOR CATV SYSTEMS

Question No. 811—**Mr. Rose:**

For each year from 1960 to 1969 (a) how many loans (b) what size of loans have been provided by the Industrial Development Bank for the establishment or furthering of CATV systems?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The Annual Report of the Industrial Development Bank for the fiscal year ended September 30th, 1969 contains information regarding loan approvals by types of business, by number and amount for the years 1964-69 inclusive on pages 18 and 19; the Annual Report for the year ended September 30, 1965 contains similar information for the years 1960-63 on pages 20 and 21. Information on the number and amount of loans to CATV systems is not published as a separate classification.

REPRESENTATION ON WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Question No. 813—**Mr. McBride:**

1. Does the Government of Canada have any official who at any time represents the Government of Canada at the Geneva headquarters of the World Council of Churches and, if so, who is/are the person(s) involved?

2. Do they report through the Canadian Ambassador to Switzerland?

3. If the Government of Canada has no such representative, are there any plans to establish such an office?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes. The Permanent Representative of Canada to the Office of the United Nations at Geneva is also the authorized representative of the Government of Canada to the specialized agencies and other international organizations in Geneva. In this capacity, he is called upon to maintain close ties with the World Council of Churches and other non-governmental organizations located in Geneva whose activities present an interest to Canada.

2. No. The Permanent Representative reports direct to the Department of External Affairs.

3. Answered by No. 1.

*INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF GRAIN BOOTLEGGING

Question No. 825—**Mr. Diefenbaker:**

1. How many investigations have taken place since the 1st of November to date by the RCMP in connection with alleged grain bootlegging in each of the Prairie Provinces?

2. How many charges in respect of such alleged bootlegging have been laid in each of said provinces during said period?

3. Were these prosecutions taken at the instance of the Honourable Member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, the Minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board and, if not, at whose request?

4. From how many farmers were Quota Books removed by the RCMP during said period?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The answer is as follows: 1. Manitoba, 3; Saskatchewan, 75; Alberta, 5.

2. Manitoba, 2; Saskatchewan, 2; Alberta, 2.

3. No. Prosecutions undertaken by the Canadian Wheat Board are instituted by the Board on the advice of Counsel.

4. Manitoba, None; Saskatchewan, 42; Alberta, None.

Questions

CLOSURE OF POST OFFICE, RUPERT, P.Q.

Question No. 832—**Mr. La Salle:**

1. Has the Postmaster General received a petition protesting the closure of the Post Office in Rupert, in Gatineau County, that was opened more than ninety years ago?

2. Does the Postmaster General intend to carry out the wish expressed in the petition and continue the operation of this Post Office serving both the permanent population of the area and a large number of summer visitors?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): 1. Yes.

2. As the Rupert, P.Q., Post Office was eligible for closing under all three categories of the Department's program to close small unproductive post offices and as approximately $1,100 per annum savings could be realized, there was no alternative but to close the office.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES—MINESWEEPERS

Question No. 837—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. Do the Canadian Armed Forces have any minesweepers in commission and, if so, which are they?

2. Do the Canadian Armed Forces have any capability of dealing with a mining campaign carried out by foreign submarines in Eastern Canadian waters or the approaches to Eastern Canadian harbours, including Belle Isle Strait, St. John's, St. Lawrence Gulf and River, Sydney, Port Hawkesbury, Halifax and Saint John and, if so, what is it?

3. When did Canadian minesweepers last carry out any minesweeping exercises or mine warfare training?

4. If the approaches to Halifax Harbour were mined, how long would it take the Canadian Armed Forces to clear a safe channel?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, six Bay class minesweepers, *Chaleur, Chignecto, Fundy, Thunder, Miramichi* and *Cowichan.*

2 and 3. All of these vessels have a limited potential minesweeping capability although no minesweeping exercises as such have been carried out since December 1963. A portion of their minesweeping equipment has been landed for preservation and equipment aboard is not in an operative state. Over a period of time, varying from several days to several months, these ships could be readied to perform the type of tasks normally assigned to coastal minesweepers seven to ten years ago. Since 1963 several officers and senior non-commissioned personnel have attended courses with, and served in, mine counter measures forces of other allied nations. In addition, Canadian Forces clearance divers continue to train in

[Mr. Forest.]

and practice mine hunting and disposal techniques.

4. This is a hypothetical question; however, the time required to sweep a mined area depends upon many factors, some of which are, the number, location and degree of sophistication of the mines. When these factors and others are known they may be weighed against the effectiveness of the mine counter measures units and the period of time required to complete the task can then be estimated.

IMMIGRATION ACT—DELETION OF CRIME INVOLVING MORAL TURPITUDE AS REASON FOR NON-ADMISSION

Question No. 846—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Is it proposed to amend section 5 (d) of the Immigration Act to delete the words "crime involving moral turpitude" as a reason for non-admission to Canada of an applicant for entry in the light of the strictures and criticisms of this term by Monnin J. in Kings V Brooks (1960) 3 W.W.R. 673 and more recently by the Immigration Appeal Board in Turpin vs Minister of Manpower and Immigration decided February 12, 1968 (File 67-5006) reported September, 1969 and published December, 1969?

2. Since the date of the decision in Turpin have the said grounds of "crime involving moral turpitude" been used by Immigration officials to deny admission of anyone to Canada in the absence of other valid reasons and, if so, how often?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. The Immigration Act is under review. However, until this review has been completed and a firm decision has been made concerning any amendments which may be considered advisable, it is not possible to say whether any change in subsection (d) of section 5 will be recommended for the approval of Parliament.

2. During the calendar year 1968, there were 90 aliens refused admission to Canada at ports of entry where the primary cause of refusal was based on subsection (d) of section 5 of the Immigration Act. Similar data for 1969 are not available.

BILINGUAL SIGN COST, RIDING MOUNTAIN PARK

Question No. 847—**Mr. Stewart (Marquette):**

1. What has been the cost to date of installing bilingual signs in Riding Mountain National Park including all bilingual descriptions of displays in the Museum at Clear Lake Townsite?

2. Has this program been completed and, if not, what is the estimated cost to complete it?

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): 1. The cost including the normal annual replacement or refurnishing of older signs is $22,000.

2. This program will be completed during the fiscal year 1970-71 at an estimated cost of $8,000.00.

RETROACTIVE PAY INCREASES

Question No. 850—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. As of January 1, 1970, how many government employees to whom retroactive pay increases had been granted still had not received these agreed upon increases?

2. Of these employees, how many had not received their retroactive pay for (a) less than one month (b) one to two months (c) two to three months (d) three to four months (e) four to five months (f) five to six months (g) more than six months?

3. Is the government giving consideration to making some adjustment for the increased income tax such employees will have to pay as a result of the delayed payments which will be made in 1970?

4. Is the government giving consideration to extra expenses which may have been incurred by employees who, believing that they had been granted retroactive pay, made financial commitments which led to extra expenses such as bank loans because of the sometimes lengthy delay in making the retroactive payments?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): 1. As of January 1, 1970, the following collective agreements had passed the 90-day implementation period and as accurately as could be determined employees in the numbers indicated had not received retroactive adjustments: Physical Science, 20; Biological Sciences, 10; Economics, Sociology and Statistics, 77; Scientific Research, 82; Photography, 8; General Technical, 60.

As of January 1, 1970, collective agreements had been signed or arbitral awards rendered for the following groups but the 90 day implementation period or extensions where granted had not expired. Population of these groups is as shown: Communications, 923; Ships Officers, 1307; Engineering & Land Survey, 1673; Law, 41; Air Traffic Control, 1104; Electronics, 1886; Printing Operations (Supervisory), 70.

It is anticipated that these groups will be paid on or before their respective expiry dates.

2. To answer this part of the question would require the examination of each individual employee's file and entail thousands of hours of work by the very staff that is processing the retroactive pay documentation, and would delay the issuance of retroactive cheques. It is considered that the continued processing of retroactive cheques should receive a higher priority than the preparation of the detailed reply required by this part of the question.

3. No.

4. No.

RCMP STRENGTH AND MAINTENANCE COST

Question No. 858—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. What will be the cost of maintaining the RCMP for the fiscal year 1969-70?

2. What was the total strength of the RCMP at January 1, 1970?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General):
1. $113,576,995.

2. 11,669.

TRIPS BY DND EXECUTIVE AIRCRAFT

Question No. 867—**Mr. Schumacher:**

1. During the calendar year 1969, how many trips were made by Falcons and/or other executive type jet aircraft owned by the Department of National Defence?

2. What were the dates of each such trip?

3. What were the destinations in each case?

4. What was the duration of each trip?

5. Who were the passengers in each case?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The fact that the functional Commands of the Canadian Forces are spread across Canada has created a great need for air transportation, and in the interests of service efficiency and flexibility it is important that Commanders and their staffs travel between Commands and Canadian Forces Headquarters or to conferences in all parts of North America in the shortest possible time. Accordingly the Falcon was selected as the most suitable type of aircraft to provide faster and more economical transportation to replace Cosmopolitan and Dakota aircraft being withdrawn from service. Seven of these aircraft were purchased and went into service in 1968. Because of the demands of regular aircraft maintenance, the need to train new pilots and to provide continuation training for squadron pilots, only four of the seven Falcon are available for tasking at any given time. Notwithstanding this, the four aircraft in use account for an average of 92 passenger flights per month which includes a total of 24 monthly scheduled flights. These flights account for approximately 320 flying hours out of an established monthly total of 420 hours, the remainder being utilized for

the training of new pilots, for continuation training of squadron pilots and the occasional ferry flight. To provide the information requested would require the perusal of over 1100 individual flight manifests, and the necessary expert staff to undertake this large amount of work is not available to gather the necessary information.

LANCASTER VETERANS HOSPITAL—PART-TIME PHYSICIANS, SURGEONS AND SPECIALISTS

Question No. 899—**Mr. MacRae:**

Who were the part-time physicians, surgeons and other specialists employed by the Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital, Lancaster, in the fiscal year 1968-69 and how much was paid to each?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs):

	$
Keyes, Dr. S.	9,600
Nixon, Dr. M.	2,400
Touchie, Dr. H.	2,640
Bewick, Dr. J. B.	4,800
Bonner, Dr. K. J.	4,800
Branch, Dr. E. A. G.	9,560
Dysart, Dr. H. E.	4,720
Fanjoy, Dr. R. W.	5,760
Finley, Dr. J. A.	9,480
Gregory, Dr. R. A.	720
Higgins, Dr. R. B.	5,760
Karrel, Dr. I. A.	4,680
Keddy, Dr. G. W. A.	7,200
Kelly, Dr. D. C.	4,800
Lee, Dr. W. R.	4,740
McLean, Dr. J. G.	4,320
McMillan, Dr. C. C.	5,040
Maddison, Dr. G. E.	1,440
Miller, Dr. W. D.	4,880
Milrod, Dr. S.	4,387
Morse, Dr. L. R.	8,640
Polowin, Dr. M. I.	4,800
Rodger, Dr. K. C.	4,800
Seamans, Dr. K. D.	4,320
Silver, Dr. S.	5,280
Simon, Dr. L. M.	120
Stephen, Dr. W.	4,800
Sullivan, Dr. H. A.	4,800
Taylor, Dr. C. R.	4,320
Theriault, Dr. J.C.	1,920
Tonning, Dr. H. O.	7,680
Lund, Dr. G. E.	560
Tien, Dr. H.	2,425
Walker, Dr. E. P.	3,720
Moir, Dr. J. D.	200
Walters, Dr. W. C.	640
Hayes, Dr. R.	3,600
George, Dr. F. H.	2,800
Flood, Dr. J.	120
Malcolm, Dr. D. A. C.	120
McLeese, Dr. R.	160
Simoa, Dr. B.	120
Rosen, Dr. H. J.	1,800
Stevenson, Dr. J.	120
Skinner, Dr. N. S.	120
Dalhousie Professors for Consultants in training programs	2,550
Total	$172,262

[Mr. Cadieux (Labelle).]

VETERANS AFFAIRS ECONOMY CUTBACKS

Question No. 900—**Mr. MacRae:**

In reference to the government's economy cutbacks in the Department of Veterans Affairs, has any consideration been given to a review of fees paid to physicians rather than the layoffs of Department of Veterans Affairs personnel?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): There is a constant review of fees paid to physicians when these are remunerated for part-time services. However, when physicians are remunerated on a fee for service basis, they are paid 90 per cent of the prevailing authorized provincial fee schedules issued by the provincial College of Physicians and Surgeons, and we do not consider there is any option open to vary the amounts paid for each type of service.

LANCASTER VETERANS HOSPITAL—PART-TIME ATTENDING STAFF

Question No. 901—**Mr. MacRae:**

Notwithstanding the government's economy measures, has an increase been recommended for part-time attending staff of the Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital, Lancaster, New Brunswick, and if so, by what percentage?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): The Medical Advisory Committee at Lancaster Hospital passed a recommendation to the Hospital Director which requested a 25 per cent increase for part-time medical staff. This recommendation has not been actioned either by the Hospital Director locally or at Head Office.

HOG CARCASS PREMIUMS

Question No. 906—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How much money was paid out for premium quality hog carcasses in the fiscal year 1967-68 and in 1968-69, and what rates were applicable?

2. How much was paid in premiums from March 31 to December 31, 1969 and what rates were applicable?

3. Does the federal government intend to completely discontinue payments for premium quality hog carcasses and, if so, on what date?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. 1967-68, $10,250,577 paid in premiums; 1968-69, $6,438,418 paid in premiums.

Rate applicable fiscal 1967-68, $3 per grade "A" hog.

Rate applicable April 1, 1968 to December 30, 1968, $2 per grade "A" hog.

Rate applicable December 30, 1968 to March 30, 1969, $3 per hog grading Canada Index 103 or better.

2. March 31 to December 31, 1969, $2,034,482 paid in premiums.

Rate applicable March 31 to December 31, 1969, $3 per hog grading Canada Index 105 or better.

3. Yes. A date has not yet been determined.

VISIT TO CANADA BY KING HUSSEIN'S BROTHER

Question 973—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Did the brother of His Majesty King Hussein of Jordan pay a visit to Canada in 1969 or to date during 1970?

2. When did the visit take place and for how long?

3. What was the purpose of the visit?

4. How many government personnel were attached to the service of the royal personage during his Canadian visit?

5. What was the nature of the duties of the government personnel?

6. Was any announcement made of this visit to Canada?

7. If the reply to Part 6 is in the negative, what was the reason for the secrecy?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): 1. Yes.

2. January 1970. One week.

3. To visit his brother-in-law and sister-in-law who are Canadian citizens resident in Canada.

4. None. Normal security precautions were taken by the competent authorities during the Prince's visit.

5. Not applicable.

6. No.

7. The visit was private and unofficial.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

QUEBEC—HOMES FOR THE AGED

Question No. 546—**Mr. Godin:**

During the period 1965-68 inclusive, did the federal government contribute financially to the construction of homes for the aged, through CMHC, in the Province of Quebec and, if so, how many such loans were granted each year in (a) the Province (b) the Constituency of Montmorency (c) the Constituency of Champlain (d) the Constituency of Portneuf, showing the names and addresses of each of such institution in the latter.

Return tabled.

TRAINING OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

Question No. 663—**Mr. Robinson:**

1. Does the Canadian Government train members of the Armed Forces for any other country and, if so, which countries and how many have been trained and in what capacity in each of the years 1945 to 1969 to date?

2. What has been the cost to Canada for the training provided in Part 1 for each of the years from 1945 to 1969 to date?

3. Is it the intention of the government to continue to train personnel for other countries and, if so, what is the present policy?

Return tabled.

*CBC—DISPOSITION OF PROGRAM ON DRUG USE

Question No. 715—**Mr. Nesbitt:**

1. Did CBC provide radio and television facilities to record an "Open Forum" on drugs and drug abuse held at the Colonnade Theatre in Toronto on Thursday, November 6, 1969?

2. Who were the panelists appearing at this "Forum"?

3. Under whose auspices was this "Forum" arranged?

4. Who initiated the move to offer CBC coverage for this "Forum"?

5. What was the cost to the CBC of this project?

6. What was the original intention for the disposition of the material recorded by CBC?

7. Has this material been used by CBC?

8. What is the ultimate intended disposition of this material?

9. Did CBC hold any consultations or discussions with one Professor Stephen Clarkson, one of the candidates for Mayor in the recent mayoralty contest in the City of Toronto and, if so, what was the nature of such consultations or discussions?

10. Were any other mayoralty candidates provided with similar facilities by CBC and, if so, which candidate or candidates?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, as the reply to this question is particularly lengthy—it includes ten paragraphs—I am afraid that Your Honour might interrupt me if I undertook to read it. Therefore, would the hon. member agree that the reply be simply taken as read and printed in *Hansard*?

[*English*]

[*Editor's note: The above-mentioned reply reads as follows:*]

Inquiries of the Ministry

I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows: 1. No. However, on November 6, 1969, CBC Television did use a mobile television unit to videotape coverage of an open forum on drug addiction at the Colonnade Theatre, Toronto. Regular local television news coverage was also given to this event.

2. Sydney Katz, June Callwood, Dr. Stephen Clarkson, Dr. Anna Keyl, R. Gaskin and Adrienne Clarkson.

3. The Corporation understands that the forum was organized by Dr. Clarkson and the municipal Liberal party.

4. CBC "Weekend" program for the videotape and the News assignment desk for news coverage.

5. Approximately $950.

6. The news film was intended for a local news broadcast. The videotape recorded material was for inclusion in a future "Weekend" program dealing with drug problems.

7. The news film was used in a 90-second local news item; the videotape material has not yet been used.

8. See 6 above.

9. Discussions concerning arrangements for technical facilities and coverage were held with the organizers of the open forum on drug addiction. Discussions were held separately with Professor Clarkson and his agents in connection with the recent mayoralty contest, at which time the Corporation was asked to provide political free time on its local station. This was rejected.

10. No free time was allotted to any of the candidates in the municipal election. Normal arrangements were made to ensure that all major candidates received adequate and equitable campaign coverage on local programming. The news report on the open forum on drug addiction was considered to be part of this local election coverage. However, the videotape recording made by "Weekend" related solely to a larger study concerning drug addiction in Canada which was not scheduled to be aired until after the municipal election.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INCREASE IN PRICE OF MILK—PRIOR CONSULTATION—GOVERNMENT REACTION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs a question relating to an announced increase in the price of milk by one firm in the city of Toronto. Were there consultations with the government or the Prices and Incomes Commission prior to this announcement?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. I have noted the press report to which the Leader of the Opposition referred. The reasons given in the press report for the increase in the price of milk by one dairy do not seem to be very sound reasons for an immediate price increase. I hope other dairies in that district will not see fit to raise their prices.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is this action contrary to the position announced by the Minister of Finance whereby all firms were being requested not to increase their prices at least until after the meeting arranged by the Prices and Incomes Commission to see whether a program of effective restraint can be achieved?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance and other members of the government have been endeavouring to get firms contemplating a price increase not to do so until March 1 or until such time as the Prices and Incomes Commission has had an opportunity of endeavouring to work out an agreed formula. We have been meeting with a fair amount of success in that endeavour, and I am appreciative of those firms which have agreed to roll back their prices. The price increase referred to by the Leader of the Opposition was announced in the press and we were not aware of it until this morning.

Mr. Stanfield: A further supplementary. Is it the intention of the minister or the government to try to persuade the firm in question to hold the line until after the meeting arranged by the Prices and Incomes Commission or is it the position of the government that the increase is regrettable but it does not propose doing anything about it?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, as I have already indicated, only one firm has increased its price. I have asked the other firms in this market area not to increase their prices. If they do not, I anticipate the price increase will have to be rolled back.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): In view of the minister's expressed desire for consumers to ginger him up, has he

received enough ginger from the protest of the Consumers Association in Toronto to get busy and ensure that this one increase does not spread to all the dairies in the area, which it undoubtedly will if the minister does not take action?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, as I read the statement of the President of the Consumers Association of Toronto, it is that there should be price, wage and profit controls in Canada. That is the first time I have noted such a statement by the Consumers Association. It was not made by their national organization.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES ABM SYSTEM—INQUIRY AS TO CANADIAN DECISION

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. It arises out of a statement by President Nixon that his administration now proposes to proceed with the second stage of the Safeguard ABM system. In view of the Prime Minister's statement of March 19 last that the Canadian government was reviewing the matter and would decide very soon whether they would condemn this ABM program or co-operate with it, I ask the Prime Minister whether the government has now reached a decision, whether it has conveyed any protest to the United States against the ABM system or whether it has indicated its intention of co-operating with them in the construction of the Safeguard system?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that on that occasion we were concerned that the announcement by the United States of America would create an escalation of the arms race. I must say that to date our evidence has not shown that this has resulted. Therefore our main concern at that time does not appear to have been well founded thus far.

This does not mean that on over-all grounds we are happy to see the project proceed. As far as we are concerned, we have no deterrent to protect on our soil. However, in so far as it is important to protect not the deterrent but the civilian population, we feel—and I understand the fear felt by the United States is mostly coming from an Oriental direction—that our own approach to the People's Republic of China, the negotiations going on in Stockholm are certainly a better way in the long run to protect the world from war than is a continuance of the arms race.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that, as majority leader Mike Mansfield has said, this program will cost over $50 billion, which in itself is an escalation of the arms race, may I ask the Prime Minister whether we are to take his response as meaning that the Canadian government has now decided that this does not constitute any peril to the future peace of the world, and that the Canadian government does not propose to make any protest whatsoever with respect to the second phase of the Safeguard system being proceeded with?

Mr. Trudeau: I am afraid the hon. member has unintentionally misinterpreted my statement. It seems to me, on the contrary, that there was some form of protest in what I said; if the hon. member prefers to look at it otherwise, that is up to him. So far as the figure produced by Senator Mansfield is concerned, we only heard it this morning on the news and we have not had an opportunity to look into it. I also take issue with the hon. member's logic. When we talk of escalation we talk of escalation between countries rather than in terms of dollars and cents spent in one country. When we were answering this question last spring, it had to do with the danger of a decision by the United States resulting in a decision by the Soviet Union which would lead to a series of escalations. We have not seen this follow from the original United States decision. The Canadian government remains rather unhappy, however, that a friend and ally of such importance should be seeing its way to peace in this direction rather than in the direction I have just mentioned.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the Prime Minister whether any member of the cabinet is at the present time carrying on any negotiations or discussions with the United States authorities with respect to the extension of the Safeguard system? If so, which ministers are concerned and what is the purpose of those discussions?

Mr. Trudeau: There has been no consultation on this item of news, which we learned about only this morning. To answer the hon. gentleman, there has been no consultation and there is no minister engaged in consultation. We have not, since this morning, made any decision.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): May I direct this supplementary ques-

tion to the Secretary of State for External Affairs? Are we to infer from the reply just given that the presidential announcement in the United States does not involve any co-operation on the part of Canada whatsoever?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I can certainly give that assurance. This decision by the United States was made quite independently of any consultation with us.

PROPOSED U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): My supplementary question is also directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the announcement by the United States that further atomic explosions are to be set off in the Aleutians, reportedly three times as powerful as the one last October, does the Canadian government plan to make any formal protest regarding the continuation of these tests so close to Canada?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): With regard to this item also may I say I have just read the bulletin in which the announcement appeared. Again, this announcement by the United States was not made after any consultation with us. In the course of the announcement the United States authorities said they had no reason to fear, on the basis of the tests made on Amchitka Island earlier, that there would be any untoward effects—for example, the creation of an earthquake or a tidal wave. They are satisfied in this regard on the basis of previous tests. We have not had the opportunity of seeing the results of those tests yet and therefore we have had no opportunity to decide whether to make a formal protest this time as we did before.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

SHARING OF FEDERAL BUDGETARY SURPLUS WITH PROVINCES

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Prime Minister a question.

Could he tell us if the government would consent to share its budget surplus with the provinces which are facing very serious financial problems at the present time?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member does not understand why we have a surplus. If we did not want one, we could easily spend the money or reduce taxes.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

We have a budgetary surplus precisely because we want to combat inflation and this was done at the cost of great sacrifices. It would therefore not be a solution to transfer—

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

I may not have the same approach to the problem as the Prime Minister, but I know that certain provinces are beset with great difficulties.

This question will certainly come up at the conference of Finance Ministers this week. According to news reports, some provinces do not share the federal government's views on inflation.

My supplementary question is as follows: Will this issue be formally examined during the conference of Finance Ministers?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker, this matter is settled in our minds and if some provinces feel that way, their viewpoint is oversimplified. I repeat: We had to make great sacrifices in order to accumulate a surplus.

It led to lay-offs in the public service and reductions in certain programs. In brief, we have accumulated that surplus once again despite the opposition's encouragement to spend more.

This surplus was built up to fight inflation. This is an elementary rule of economics, and if the provinces, instead of reducing their own expenditures and building up a surplus, merely asked for a transfer of federal funds, they would be contributing to inflation rather than fighting it.

That matter has been settled. It should not be raised in Quebec City.

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Would the Prime Minister tell us what is the use of a federal-provincial conference on this matter, if the federal government has made a unilateral decision?

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE TO MEET HIGHER COST OF LIVING

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I have a question to direct to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. As the government has been urging organized labour to limit wage demands to 5 per cent a year, thus indicating that wage demands of that magnitude can be reconciled with the government's inflation

control program, will the Prime Minister take the first opportunity on motions to explain why, during the last five years, the government has refused to grant yearly wage increases of this amount to workers on federal minimum wages, thus enabling them at least to keep level with the annual rise in the cost of living?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubt whether this question can be admitted; the hon. member appears to be making an argument. In its present form the question does not appear to be acceptable.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I asked the Prime Minister whether he would take the first opportunity on motions to explain this important matter. I did not ask him to take the time of the House to do so now. May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Since the Prime Minister obviously refuses to answer this question—

Mr. Trudeau: It is out of order. I am not allowed to.

Mr. Hees: —and since it is reliably reported that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are the two who have blocked minimum wage increases, how does the right hon. gentleman square this reactionary attitude—

Mr. Trudeau: —with the just society.

Mr. Hees: —with his promises to introduce a just society made during the last election?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Peace River.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ACTION TO COPE WITH EXPECTED INFLUX OF COSA NOSTRA

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, in light of the statement which I understand was made by the Deputy Solicitor General that we can expect a heavy influx of the Cosa Nostra from the United States following the recent crackdown there, could the Solicitor General advise whether new steps are being taken to deal with the expected heavy immigration of the Mafia to Canada?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the text of the speech referred to before me at the moment, but I presume it has been accurately summarized or quoted. In respect of this subject we are constantly seeking to be aware of exactly what activities are being conducted in this field. No special additional steps have been taken at this time but many regular steps are being taken in the ordinary course of watching this situation.

ACTION RESPECTING MARXISM-LENINISM MOVEMENT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarkable answer just given by the minister, which indicates a desire to give the House full information, may I ask him whether the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are looking into the activities of the Canadian Communist Marxism-Leninism Movement, whose leader has said, according to the Vancouver *Sun,* that he is "conscientiously organizing and preparing for the armed overthrow of the Canadian government"?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows he cannot quote from a speech. Perhaps he might ask the question directly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I ask but I am not sure that the scriptural conclusion, "and ye shall receive" will be realized. I ask the minister: What is being done about this movement? Is he giving it the same lack of action that he has indicated in connection with the organization referred to a moment ago?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, a great deal of action is being taken to watch both these situations. I do not propose to give the right hon. gentleman detailed information as to what investigations are being undertaken by the police in connection with each particular excerpt he reads in the newspapers.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I did not ask for particulars; I asked whether the matter was being looked into or whether these people are free to advocate the overthrow of the Canadian government by force?

Mr. McIlraith: No, they are not, and the matter is being looked into.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the Prime Minister that sure? He is one of those who had similar views at one time.

Mr. Trudeau: They won't overthrow us.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON NEW OR REVISED TECHNIQUES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask a question of the Solicitor General as I find his answers a bit too difficult to take. I should like to address a question to the minister in charge of housing arising out of the statement he made earlier this afternoon. He said he was allocating $200 million of the amount he mentioned to the development of new or revised techniques in respect of public housing where the present act is not adequate. I think I paraphrased that correctly. Will he inform the House when he will be able to make a statement on exactly what he intends to use that $200 million for, and what new or revised techniques he has arrived at after discussing the idea with people who know something about the matter?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I cannot concede that the hon. member has paraphrased the statement correctly, but I can simply say that I will be happy to make such a statement soon. In the meantime I invite his ideas on new methods of providing housing for low income groups.

DRUGS

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF LE DAIN COMMISSION

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, in light of recent ministerial statements concerning laws regulating the use of drugs, can the Prime Minister inform the House whether the royal commission now inquiring into the subject is expected to report soon?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I hear a suggestion that we should legalize potash. I think we should take that into consideration. I have had no indication when the royal commission will report but I do want to emphasize that until it does the position of the government is not fixed. We have reached no decision concerning the legalizing or otherwise of the non-medical use of drugs. We are looking forward to the report and the establishment of criteria on the basis of which any decision would be made. It is on the basis of such criteria that the government will determine what action should be taken.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

MARIJUANA—ALLEGED STATEMENT AS TO LEGALIZATION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare which has to do with an article in the Ottawa *Journal* under the heading "Munro Seeking To Get Off Pot". This is an admirable objective. What did the minister mean when he said that if a reasonable minority of Canadians were found to use marijuana this would be a basis for legalizing it? What did he have in mind in respect of "a reasonable minority"?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If my recollection is correct this question was asked of the minister last week. I suggested at the time the question might be directed to the Prime Minister and it was. That is my recollection of what happened in respect of this matter last Thursday or Friday.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister spoke for the minister, and while he can speak for most of them I am sure he cannot interpret what one of his ministers has said. Surely the minister should be given an opportunity to tell us what he meant when he made this irresponsible statement.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am sure the minister will have the opportunity to do so but the rules do not allow him to do so in the way suggested by the right hon. gentleman.

FISHERIES

REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION ON BILL AMENDING ACT

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, in view of certain allegations made by the Minister of Fisheries, can he supply more information regarding the new Fisheries Act as outlined on television on Sunday?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the Fisheries Act is on the agenda of House business and will be dealt with shortly.

POLLUTION

SAINT JOHN RIVER—CO-OPERATIVE ACTION TO ALLEVIATE

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, in view of the allegation by the Minister of Fisheries that companies are polluting the Saint John River, have he or his officials taken the opportunity to meet with

management in an attempt to plan joint action to alleviate the pollution?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker. We have met with all the companies with one exception, and we have been endeavouring to meet with that company as well.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Albert): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Fisheries is dealing with this matter will he give every assurance that where vital employment is concerned in the Maritimes he will not deal with one particular aspect on the Saint John River system but will consider the problem as a whole?

Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Officials of my department, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and of other federal and provincial departments are meeting today in Fredericton to discuss that very matter today.

FRASER RIVER—MONITORING OF PULPMILL EFFLUENT

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, in view of the aggressive anti-pollution stance the Minister of Fisheries took on television yesterday, is he considering making public the results of Fisheries Department monitoring of pulpmill effluent on the Fraser River?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, my brief answer to that question would have to be no. We have had great success in working closely with companies on a confidential basis and they have been adhering to our engineering standards for clean-up plant in B.C.

FISHERIES

SEALS—RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS—COMPENSATION FOR FISHERMEN

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a question about the seal fishery. Can the minister indicate what has been his response to representations made by spokesmen for the seal fishery of Newfoundland, and can he confirm whether or not the largest firm in Newfoundland to send seal fishermen to the ice has indicated that it will not prosecute the seal fishery this year?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I do not know at this moment the intentions of that particular firm. It is having to change its operations somewhat and I am sure it will know the results of its survey in the next day or two.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate what programs the government has in mind to compensate the sealers who in 33 days last year earned approximately $1,000 and will not be taking part in the fishery this year, as well as the firms which have already made preparations but because of the lateness of the minister's decision have had to cancel their programs?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is inviting the minister to make a statement concerning what program is being considered by the government. In the circumstances outlined, I think the information might be given by way of a statement. The minister might indicate if he is prepared to do that.

Mr. Davis: My brief answer, Mr. Speaker, is that we hope and have reason to expect the seal hunt this year will be every bit as productive in terms of income as it has been in other years.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the information we have is that as a consequence of the minister's announcement on Friday—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must bring to the attention of the hon. member that he cannot indicate to the House what his information is. He may only ask a question.

Mr. McGrath: Will the minister make a statement in clarification of the very ambiguous statement he made on Friday which cast a great deal of doubt on the future of the industry in Canada and indicated that if it is to be productive it will be productive exclusively for the Norwegians—and the minister knows that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There are two members waiting to ask supplementaries. I shall allow these supplementaries, but I might remind hon. members we are running short of time and many members have been waiting for an opportunity to ask questions.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, I have a brief supplementary. Would the minister advise what plans the Canadian government has for policing the international waters—and there is an international role here—in view of the fact that in past years the agreement in respect of taking seals at the front was broken?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Davis: We will have federal fisheries officers on the vessels and we have an arrangement with the Norwegians whereby we may jointly supervise each other's fishermen.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING CAR REPAIR CLINICS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Some weeks ago the minister undertook to have his department look into the complaints of a consumers group regarding the alleged shortcomings of car repair clinics across Canada. Could the minister make a report to the House in this regard today?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to answer the hon. member's question at this point. We have been examining the matter very carefully, but the jurisdiction of my department and the federal government is somewhat doubtful at the moment, save and except as it relates to fraud under the Criminal Code. I do not think the complaints made involve fraud.

AIR TRANSPORT

CRASH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—DND SEARCH AND RESCUE OPERATIONS AND EQUIPMENT

Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence but in his absence I shall direct it to the minister answering for him today. In connection with the crash of another aircraft carrying seven passengers in southwestern British Columbia this past weekend, I should like to inquire how long it took the search and rescue operations of the department to get into operation and whether or not the aircraft was equipped with a crash position indicator?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I regret to inform the hon. member that on Mondays nobody answers for the Department of National Defence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: That is the most informative answer you have given today.

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

WOMEN

SENIORITY AND JOB SECURITY WHILE PREGNANT

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In light of the submission today by the Canadian Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, is the government preparing legislation to protect the seniority and job security of working women while bearing children?

The silence, Mr. Speaker, indicates a negative response apparently, so perhaps I might ask a supplementary. This is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In the light of the submission to which I have already referred, will the government be ratifying the convention of the International Labour Organization on maternity protection?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the submission made this morning by the Federation of Business and Professional Women, the minister stated that until the provinces had passed legislation in conformity with this convention it would be impossible for Canada to ratify it, and that the government of Canada was pressing on the provinces the desirability of such legislation.

HIGHWAYS

ALASKA HIGHWAY—CONSULTATIONS REGARDING COMPLETION OR IMPROVEMENT

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Public Works. Can he tell us whether or not, during his recent tour of the north, any consultations were held with either Canadian or United States officials regarding the completion, or improvement, of the Alaska Highway?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, no consultations were held there, but I was informed while in the north that a bill is being acted upon by Congress which would set aside certain moneys for extended studies and negotiations with the government of Canada.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, might I just answer the Minister's comment by saying that there is a private member's bill which has been on the Order Paper for a long time and in respect of which there has been no action.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether in the course of his discussions he advised his United States counterparts, despite the fear of the government to have the matter come to a vote, that a majority of the members of this House are strongly convinced that the Canadian government should declare sovereignty over the Arctic islands and the water surrounding the Arctic archipelago?

POST OFFICE

RURAL CLOSURES—PROVISION OF OTHER SERVICE

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications. In view of the confusion and consternation in the minds of rural patrons, and in view of the wholesale closing of many rural post offices, may I ask the minister whether there is any proposed change in respect of the rural carriers and whether he is prepared to make a statement in the House indicating how these rural patrons would be affected—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's question is acceptable procedurally only to the extent it invites the minister to make a statement on motions. The minister might like to reply to that part of the question.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I do not anticipate making any statement on motions. Where we do close post offices we always provide alternative service.

HOUSING

POLICY RESPECTING REHABILITATION OF HOMES

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. It has to do with a matter he did not mention in his statement. In view of the tremendous importance of maintaining the existing stock of housing as well as building new housing, will the minister make a statement relating to government policy to encourage or assist home owners to rehabilitate their existing houses.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, in my statement I believe I referred to the application of section 40 loans. One of the things we did last year was to provide for loans to a maximum of $18,000 for the rehabilitation of existing homes. We hope to use a larger number of section 40 loans for the benefit of people on low incomes.

PUBLIC HOUSING—PROVISION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, would the minister assure the House that in respect of the building of low-rent public housing, outside and inside recreational facilities will be built in in every case?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether this question is in order at this time.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether he would make a statement shortly concerning the type of public housing to be built and the details of the program?

Mr. Andras: I shall be very happy to make a statement soon which will probably be very favourable with regard to the question raised.

WELFARE

INQUIRY AS TO WHITE PAPER ON SERVICES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare whether we can count on receiving the government's white paper on welfare services before the end of the session and whether we can count on receiving it, for example, not later than June?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it has not yet been determined whether or not it will be presented before June.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare a supplementary question. I am not sure I heard his response to my other question correctly but I assumed the date in June was the aim, not necessarily a commitment. I wish to ask the minister whether the advisory committee which has been named has been given any firm indication as to how long it will have to work, or does it have an indefinite duration for expressing views or giving advice on what should go into the white paper?

Mr. Munro: There is no direct relationship between the advisory committee and the

white paper. The committee is a statutory body set up under the Government Organization Act and it is of a continuous nature. They meet three times a year to advise the government, and myself in particular, on efficiency and on the merits of current welfare policies and to initiate advice on their own, not necessarily to act on questions that I might put to them. Therefore they may, of their own volition, have suggestions to offer with respect to the white paper.

Mr. Stanfield: I have one further question. If there is no relationship at all between the June date and the appointment of the advisory committee, then any delay in bringing out the white paper is purely an internal matter within the government?

Mr. Munro: That is correct, Mr. Speaker, but may I indicate that I do not believe the Leader of the Opposition heard me when I indicated, in reply to his first question, that no firm decision has been taken by the government on the timing of the publication of the white paper.

BILINGUALISM AND BICULTURALISM

POLICY FOLLOWING THIRD REPORT OF COMMISSION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Has the government decided on its policy in respect of the third report of the B and B Commission?

Mr. MacInnis: No.

Mr. Nowlan: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the right hon. Prime Minister has delegated the responsibility for answering to the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Just this once.

Mr. Nowlan: If no decision has been made, does government policy now permit senior public servants, as it permits cabinet ministers, to give their personal views on this matter?

Mr. MacInnis: The Prime Minister makes a good dummy.

Mr. Trudeau: May I say, in answer to the hon. member's question, yes, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Munro.]

AGRICULTURE

INQUIRY AS TO REPORT OF TASK FORCE

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Is the final report of the task force on agriculture in the hands of the government and, if so, can the minister inform the House when this important and long-expected document will be tabled and made public?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I received a copy of the report last Friday, but at this point I cannot indicate precisely how long it will take to translate and print it.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NIGERIA—PRESENCE OF CANADIAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs a question.

Could he tell the House whether Catholic priests of Canadian origin are in Nigeria at present?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there are no Canadian missionaries in the enclave, and therefore there is no problem in this respect. The House may recall that I reported some weeks ago that there were two or three who were evacuated in Biafran planes.

CANADIAN SOVEREIGNTY

ASSERTION OF CONTROL OVER ARCTIC WATERS

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the announcement that the *Manhattan* will make a second voyage, and in view of the fact that this second trip in Canada's waters may establish a precedent, does the government intend to make a declaration on Arctic sovereignty before any such voyage?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): As the House is aware, legislation was included in the Speech from the Throne. I hope it will be introduced before very long.

In answer to the first part of the question may I say that I have also read these reports.

I do not know, as a result of my own inquiries, that in fact this ship is making another trip.

[*Later:*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary question to that of the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley. I wish to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether officials of the Humble Oil Company or the United States State Department have been in consultation with the minister's department regarding the proposed second trip of the *Manhattan,* and whether or not the Canadian government indicated to those responsible what regulations the Canadian government would lay down with respect to the possible pollution of Arctic waters?

Mr. Sharp: Of course there have been some exchanges between the U.S. administration and the Canadian government arising out of various statements made by the Prime Minister and by other ministers on the whole subject of Arctic pollution and sovereignty over the Arctic.

With regard to the specific question whether the U.S. government has asked us about a second trip of the *Manhattan,* I think I made it quite clear in my previous answer that I did not know the *Manhattan* was to make another trip. Indeed, I do not know also whether the U.S. government would in fact make such inquiries. It is the *Manhattan* itself which would be making the voyage, not the U.S. government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the government intend to lay down strict provisions or regulations with respect to the trip of the *Manhattan* as it might affect the possible pollution of Arctic waters?

Mr. Sharp: The House will recall that last year when the *Manhattan* made its voyage it was made with the concurrence of the Canadian government. It was an experimental trip in order to test whether there is passage and under what conditions it could be made. I should think that if the *Manhattan* passes through there again, the trip would be part of the same experiment and one which we should welcome, not protest against, because it is most important that we should all know the conditions under which Canadian waters can be used.

Inquiries of the Ministry

POLLUTION

INQUIRY AS TO NEW MEASURES

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): I have a question for the President of the Privy Council. Since, as I noticed, he was chatting with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources a while ago, I should like to ask the minister whether new anti-pollution legislation or measures will be announced soon. I am not asking whether the legislation will be dealt with in this session, but whether the announcement will be made soon?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): The program for the balance of this session has been indicated. At present there is nothing I can indicate that will be added.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS

STEPHENVILLE, NFLD.—CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): My question is for the Minister of Public Works. Would he indicate whether a decision has been made to construct new federal facilities in Stephenville, Newfoundland, in line with recommendations of the Post Office Department and other federal agencies to improve the capabilities as projected in relation to the potential growth of the area?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question should be put on the Order Paper.

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

COMPLAINTS RESPECTING HARASSMENT OF PORTUGUESE SHIPS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I have a question for the Solicitor General. Has he received complaints of what appears to be excessive harassment by the RCMP of Portuguese ships in the port of St. John's?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, complaints on that subject were received.

Mr. McGrath: In view of the fact that Portugese ships have been using the port of St. John's for 400 years, may I ask the minister what he proposes to do about these complaints?

Mr. McIlraith: We had the matter investigated and found that the complaints were not

substantiated. But I am pursuing the investigation further.

Mr. McGrath: Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I was hoping to be recognized by you, Sir, before the question period ran out in view of the importance of the Prime Minister's answer to a supplementary question, an answer which I am not sure I heard correctly. I was trying to be recognized again by Your Honour to ensure that I heard what I thought I heard in answer to the supplementary question. Because of the confusion between the two sides of the House, I honestly do not know whether the Prime Minister heard my question and I would not want any confusion to arise with regard to the answer he gave. If I heard the answer correctly, federal civil servants can publicly express their views on matters of public policy; this might be an important precedent.

Mr. Speaker: I have to suggest to the hon. member that I heard the question clearly and I also heard the answer. Perhaps he might wait to see what appears in *Hansard*.

Mr. Trudeau: It might be helpful if I were permitted to answer the question, but when the Opposition wants to volunteer answers I can only sit down and let them do it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is also rising on a point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: There is still my question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising again on the same point of order?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it may be in anticipation of another question of privilege, but Your Honour said yourself that you heard the question and the answer. I should like to clarify what happened for the record. It seems to me that if the Prime Minister uttered something he cannot suggest the answer came from hon. members on this side. He is one of the leaders of the land and must be responsible.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do so essentially for the purpose of putting a caveat on the record. When the hon. member for Okanagan-Boundary asked a question a few minutes ago of the Minister of National Defence the Prime Minister replied, if I heard him correctly, that no one answers today for the Department of National Defence. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that that comment should not stand without some remark about it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It has become apparent that we cannot force ministers to be here to answer questions, but I trust it is still clear that by the rules, in particular Standing Order 39(5), any member of the House has a right to ask a question of any minister any day of the week. Incidentally, since the second Acting Minister of National Defence is present, I thought he might have answered the question.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might make it clear as well that the situation you had cause to rule on during the course of this Parliament has come into general acceptance, and the caveat of the hon. member has no application.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am suggesting there should be no debate. I would not agree readily with the statement made by the President of the Privy Council.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The Standing Order referred to by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has not been changed or amended. It is still there.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I might suggest that the only intention in applying this system was to ensure that the question period could be orderly. As a gesture of goodwill, I think I might invite the acting minister to answer the question, if such is the desire of the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Of course, the question period has expired and it is only with the unanimous agreement of the House that this could be done.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no such agreement. The hon. member may have an opportunity tomorrow to ask the question again.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

NATIONAL MARKS AND STANDARDS

The House resumed, from Thursday, January 29, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jamieson that Bill C-137, respecting the use of national safety marks in relation to motor vehicles and to provide for safety standards for certain motor vehicles imported into or exported from Canada or sent or conveyed from one province to another, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, when this bill was under discussion the other night, I mentioned one of the problems that will not be solved by our acceptance of the legislation. Some failures have already become apparent in the counterpart U.S. legislation, and in addition this bill does not take into account certain driving conditions in Canada. Mr. Speaker, since there is considerable conversation taking place in the chamber, perhaps you might invite some of those concerned to leave.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I notice the hon. member is looking pleadingly in the direction of the Chair. I assume he is hoping that the conversations will be somewhat more subdued so that we can hear him. I would invite hon. members to hold their conversations behind the curtains so that we can listen to the hon. member's very interesting speech.

Mr. Peters: I appreciate your assistance, Mr. Speaker. One factor that has not been covered in the 29 points concerning safety factors in the United States, and which is unique to Canada, concerns our weather conditions. All the cars that one sees stalled on the Queensway, and on all the other highways and byways because of weather conditions, are an added hazard to traffic in wintertime, a hazard that does not exist in most of the United States. These stalled cars cause many serious accidents in Canada.

When a slight drizzle and foggy conditions are forecast, one can expect an increase in the number of road accidents. On cold mornings there will probably be as many rear-end collisions on the Queensway, even on dry pavement, as there are when conditions are slippery, so slippery as to make stopping impossible. The fact that some cars will not run in this type of weather adds to the seriousness of the problem.

In the United States, it is reported that the cost of installing mandatory safety devices on cars came to $46, but a sum of $107 was charged to automobile purchasers. It is interesting to note that a survey of motorists disclosed that 54 per cent of those 20 to 49 years of age indicated a willingness to pay a higher price for safety devices, but only 50 per cent of those over age 50 indicated a similar willingness. I believe if drivers aged 60, 65 and 70 had been surveyed, a majority would have indicated a marked degree of reluctance to pay for additional safety features.

No doubt this bill will be examined thoroughly in committee. Members may draw attention to studies done in the United States which indicate that 10 per cent of safety devices produced by United States factories are rejected as unsafe following inspection. Members will certainly hope this will not be the case in Canada.

No doubt members will also raise the question of car bumpers. I am sure that even if a motorist in Toronto had a piece of steel railway track welded all around his car he would still not find it safe to drive on some of the freeways there. It appears most car bumpers are installed just for wives to polish. They certainly are not installed for protection.

When I looked at the bumper on a car I previously owned I was amazed to see a big dent in it. I was sure I had not hit anything, and that nothing had hit me. When I looked at a number of similar type cars, I found they all had a dent in the same place. Another example of this was the little Karmann Ghia Volkswagen. It always had a dent in the hood. This was not because I drove it under a truck, but simply because the bumpers did not coincide.

I like the advertisement, although I do not believe it, which shows a guy with a sledge hammer banging upon a car bumper, and nothing happens to it. Such a bumper might withstand a five or ten miles per hour impact, without everything being scattered all over the pavement.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I would like to see the hammer he uses.

Mr. Peters: If a little more cobalt were put in the bumper, it might produce a stronger alloy and make it last longer. That would help some of the mines in my area.

Another reason I have for speaking on the bill today is that it makes no provision with

respect to snowmobiles and snowmobile safety. The snowmobile is one of the greatest inventions the Canadian people have seen in many years, and many people are riding them for sport. I noticed the other day that two old ladies, one over 70 and the other over 60, were out on their snowmobile and ran into a car. Clearly, people of mature years as well as those not so mature are using snowmobiles which are growing in popularity. For that reason, I think it will be necessary for us to introduce legislation governing the safety of snowmobile operation. This matter comes under federal jurisdiction. I am also pleased to note that, since snowmobiles in large part are manufactured in Canada, the regulations governing their safety can be brought under federal jurisdiction. I have a number of suggestions to make with respect to the safety of snowmobiles.

• (3:30 p.m.)

You know, Mr. Speaker, one cannot believe everything one hears about horsepower. It seems to me that some manufacturers lie like the dickens when they speak about the horsepower of their cars. You see tractors rated at 15, 20 or 25 horsepower, and yet you will see a Buick rated at 450 horsepower. The Cadillac people now have on the market a car with a motor said to develop 500 horsepower. A few years ago, an engine of that size would power an aeroplane of some size; it was enough to run a diesel plant which would supply electric power for a town of some 10,000 inhabitants. Clearly, when manufacturers talk of horsepower they are not talking about the power you can use to pull your neighbour out of the ditch; they are talking about concepts of speed and weight.

Advertising of a similar sort is applied to snowmobiles. These little vehicles are about 6 or 7 feet long, probably 2 or 3 feet wide, and weight anywhere between 250 and 1,000 pounds. They are now powerful enough to reach speeds of between 105 and 115 miles per hour. Of course, these fast snowmobiles are basically ordinary machines which have been souped-up, to use the vernacular. I think the minister ought to interest himself in this area and try to inform the public of the dangers through a program of advertising. As I say, horsepower really has little to do with how much power you have to pull your neighbour out of the ditch or pass the car ahead of you. It is based on engine capacity and the type of gasoline you use. I think our advertisers have been emphasizing the wrong things when advertising snowmobiles. The size of snowmobile power plants ought to be limited by law, and there ought to be some distinction between snowmobiles used on the race track and those used for every day purposes.

Another problem is the noise of snowmobiles. Although some municipalities have bylaws governing noise, those bylaws are difficult to enforce insofar as snowmobiles are concerned. I know that some municipalities say snowmobiles may not be used in city streets, yet these snowmobiles which are kept at home must pass through city streets on their way to the country or to open spaces. One of my constituents complained about noisy snowmobiles going past his window on Sunday mornings. On the morning in question he tried to watch television but, because of the noise from snowmobiles outside, he could not do so. He went to the window and within one hour had counted 82 snowmobiles going past his house. In a subsequent letter he told me that he became more disturbed on learning that wheels could be fitted to snowmobiles, enabling them to be used in the summer as well as in winter. Clearly, some kind of engine muffler must be fitted to snowmobiles. You are not allowed to drive a car in any town without an engine muffler; neither are you allowed to operate a power lawnmower without some kind of muffling device. The same sort of regulation ought to apply to snowmobiles.

The question of headlights is also important. People approaching a snowmobile on the highway at night very often cannot tell if the vehicle approaching is a motorcar with only one headlight, a motorcycle or a snowmobile. Just as we would not appreciate hearing, say, 200 Model T Fords going by without engine mufflers, so I submit our motorists do not appreciate meeting vehicles in the dark with only one headlight. It is often impossible to tell, as I say, whether the vehicle you are meeting is a car with only one headlight. Sometimes a motorist may think he is meeting a car which has only its left headlight working. Clearly, if he pulls to the side of the road in order to take evasive action he may be doing the wrong thing if the approaching vehicle turns out to be a snowmobile. I, therefore, advocate that for snowmobiles as well as for motorcycles, two headlights set fairly close together ought to be mandatory.

My next point has to do with the survival of those who may be stranded in the bush. This ought to be of particular interest to the

Department of Transport. Very often these days, snowmobiles travelling in the bush break down. In temperatures of between 30 below and 40 below zero, it is often impossible for a man to survive in the bush unless he is equipped with snowshoes, knowledge of the environment and survival equipment. This equipment ought to include an axe and, I submit, some sort of radio oscillating device costing about $20 which could be switched on and guide rescue forces to him. Snow conditions in the bush often make it impossible for a man to walk far. If he could switch on some kind of oscillating device, which could work on the citizens radio band or a police band, his rescue would be more easily directed. These bands, for instance, could be monitored on a continuing basis, so that in an emergency we would not have to wait until a person was known to be lost before setting rescue operations in motion. We could provide adequate penalities in case children played around with such devices.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Of course, repairing one of these devices would probably cost as much as the original purchase price, but nevertheless it should be on the machine. It should be sealed so that once it is turned on it cannot be turned off until the rescue is effected. If this simple device were installed in an aeroplane, one could locate the aircraft very quickly. It has a range of 20 miles and is operated by a flashlight battery on one particular band. I understood they were to be installed on aircraft so that if a crash occurred, causing an impact of a certain magnitude, this device would automatically start operating.

There are several other considerations, Mr. Speaker. I am sure the municipalities will have to give consideration to installing guy wires parallel to the roads. I heard of a girl who was riding behind her boyfriend on a skidoo who ended up with his head in her lap after hitting a guy wire. A friend of mine, skidooing on his own farm, hit a barbed wire fence and had to have 40 stitches put in his face. He nearly lost an eye. Imagine what could happen when one is not familiar with the terrain! This bill may be concerned with safety devices such as roll bars or reinforced windshields. In the case of skidoos, we have an opportunity right now to make safety devices of this type available to the public before any more damage is done. It is no use waiting until a dozen people have their heads tucked under somebody else's arm.

We have this opportunity, and I think the minister is well advised to follow the American safety program in the initial stages. In Canada, perhaps we are more interested in a car that will operate safely and satisfactorily in northern climates. Features such as rear window defrosters, battery chargers and block heaters are much more important to us than some of the smog devices installed in California. Perhaps, we should consider these as well, but there are some purely Canadian problems on which we will have to act independently of the United States.

I am not sure what we should do about studded tires. In the United States, 10 per cent of the tires tested failed in one out of six tests but I am not clear how many of these failures were related to heat or cold. You will remember that after the war everybody was begging, borrowing or stealing tires because they were in short supply. On a cold morning it was not unusual to find all four tires flat. They were just not made for cold conditions. Perhaps studded tires are a northern problem, but they are costing provincial taxpayers large amounts of money if the report on highway damage is correct. The tungsten studs appear to be fine for the first snowfall, but I am not sure of their effectiveness in deep snow or ice. The safety requirements for tires in Canada would be totally different from those of the United States. Tires should be tested under Canadian winter conditions and the results would probably differ greatly from tests conducted in the United States.

The minister has shown some initiative in presenting this bill, as have some members in drafting private members' bills. One is my colleague from Surrey (Mr. Mather) who has had experience with the National Automobile Associations and has been interested in promoting highway safety for quite some time. The fact that the minister has taken some of the better points from a number of bills, and that there has been some Canadian consideration of this problem, leads me to believe that the minister will give consideration in committee to the extension of this investigation into some other fields, particularly snowmobiles and water safety. I am very surprised how many people wearing life-preserving equipment bearing the stamp of approval of the Department of Transport lose their lives. Some improvement could be brought about in this bill.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-137 introduced a day or two ago by the Minister of Transport is a very important bill.

I should like to make a few suggestions which I trust will be accepted by the House, particularly in view of the fact that I spent some 23 years in law enforcement and came in contact with some of these problems under the most distressing circumstances. It is a disgrace that in North America we kill upwards of 60,000 people every year on our highways, not to mention innumerable cases of impairment, maiming and property damage running into millions of dollars. No law can stop this, but it certainly is a step in the right direction.

As we all know, it is very difficult to enforce law because once the manufacturer has sold the automobile to the public, often he feels that is where his responsibility ends. This bill, Mr. Speaker, purports to plug one or two of those gaps.

It may be dangerous to have safety stickers or safety marks put on automobiles by the manufacturer because sometimes these automobiles are defective when they leave the factory. The previous speaker mentioned bumpers, and everyone who drives an automobile knows that the present bumpers are entirely inadequate. A bumper should be able to absorb the shock of an automobile running into a solid object at 30 miles an hour without danger to the automobile. We cannot be sure that there will not be danger to the occupants, but shock absorbers or a properly built bumper would reduce damage both to the automobile and the occupants.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I see no reason why a safety sticker should be put on an automobile when the bumper, one of the most important parts of the automobile when it is in motion, is nothing more than a piece of tinsel. Although it is extremely high priced, it is absolutely useless for the job for which it is intended. The amount that we pay for these chrome beauties could very well be used for devices made from reinforced rubber and steel. There could be some form of shock absorber or oil recuperating system similar to the one on large guns which we had in the army. The modern automobile is as lethal a weapon as a piece of artillery. The committee should give priority to bumpers when considering safety factors.

Some attention should be given to the danger caused by frost. I do not see any reason why windshields could not be lined with an arrangement of very fine heating wires to keep them free of frost. In cold climates such as we have in Canada, I suggest this should be mandatory for all windows.

[Mr. Bigg.]

It has always seemed strange that trucks are obliged to have all sorts of safety devices, but these are not mandatory on automobiles. One such item that comes to mind is a proper flasher. Most automobiles today have a flasher system, but this becomes inoperative when the battery goes dead. I think a mandatory provision should be incorporated in this bill that every automobile should have a double safety feature. If the electrical flashers are inoperative, there should be manual devices such as fire flares or the ordinary battery operated flashers. These flares could be put out for protection when changing a flat tire or if the vehicle is abandoned in a snowdrift with part of the car protruding. These flares could be used any time the automobile is a menace to traffic.

It should be mandatory that all automobiles have a proper towing hitch on both the front and rear of the car. When a vehicle becomes stalled in traffic which is proceeding at 60 miles an hour, it immediately becomes a menace. There should be a steel hook for towing purposes located in an accessible location so that it is not necessary to crawl underneath the car. The vehicle could then be towed by another vehicle with a strong nylon cord or chain.

I am sure law enforcement officers would support me when I say that many serious accidents occur after some minor breakdown, such as a flat tire, running out of gas, becoming stuck in a snowdrift or on the icy slope of a hill. The danger arises when people are on the highway trying to get the vehicle clear. Often, another vehicle comes over a hill or cuts out from other traffic and collides with the stalled vehicle.

Perhaps all these safety features cannot be incorporated at one time, but I feel they are long overdue. I feel they are necessary if the vehicle is to receive a government approved safety sticker. The only argument against these features at the moment is their cost. I feel there should be a little less soap opera advertising, and more value and safety for the purchasers of these vehicles.

I am glad the minister contemplates spending some government money on research. If we are to have safety devices, then by all means we should have our more intelligent people working on the cheapest and most effective devices so that the cost can be kept to a minimum. This would give some of our bright young people an opportunity to pursue this matter in the Canadian research councils, universities and in the automobile factories.

I am delighted to see that a step forward is being taken on the question of pollution. A day or two ago I made a gloomy speech on this subject. I pointed out that our atmosphere is being endangered by the emission of an enormous quantity of exhaust fumes, and that perhaps we are destroying forever our very limited oxygen supply. I think there should also be research on this subject. A great deal could be done to ensure that the most efficient fuels are used in our automobiles, such as those hydrocarbon fuels which create the least carbon dioxide and use the least amount of oxygen to propel the vehicle.

There has been a great improvement in storage batteries. Such batteries might well be incorporated into a vehicle as a subsidiary electrical driving device. This would be valuable on long trips. When driving from here to Toronto, upon reaching the outskirts of Toronto this electrical device could be switched on and used to drive through the city where the problem of pollution is the greatest. This system would not be necessary when driving in the country where the vehicle would be using up oxygen, but not endangering the health of the people.

This whole matter of safety on the highways is not confined to Bill C-137. There should be a continuing, concentrated educational program which could also be used to teach our children safety values. Safety programs can be effective. I hope hon. members will forgive an old man for reminding them of a situation which occurred in 1938 and 1939 in greater Winnipeg. Even in those days, the population of that city was 350,000. By co-operation of the public and the police, a safety record was established, which I think is an all time world safety record, of 228 days without a fatal accident—two-thirds of a year without anyone being killed. I have no hesitation in saying that if one picks up the newspaper today or tomorrow, there will be a report of a fatal accident in the greater Winnipeg area. I believe this to be true of any major city. In this instance, there was a period of eight months without a fatality. The automobiles of that day were very much the same shape and size as those of today. I do not think the driving public were greatly different. They were hurrying home for their dinner, and many of them used alcohol. However, with a concentrated effort, co-operation between the police, the local authority and those responsible for the administration of the law, a magnificent safety record was set up and there is no reason why any other city cannot equal it or do better.

• (4:00 p.m.)

We have better machinery today, better safety facilities. It is true that automobiles are more powerful but they are equipped with better safety devices—better brakes, power steering. Often there is two or three times as much contact between the automobile and the highway, resulting from the use of much wider tires.

Then, there is the question of what can be done by concentrating on safety. Speaking as a former police officer, I believe the first responsibility rests on the law enforcement officers. I know there are certain roads in Canada today which are considered to be revenue lanes the public is reluctant to drive down them for fear of being picked up for some picayune traffic offence. Motorists figure they are paying the cost, to the municipality, of running the police force. This results in bad liaison between the police and the public. If the minister, and all hon. members present will take cognizance of what I am saying and use their influence in the right way to make sure this sort of attitude is discouraged, I think the result would be beneficial. There is nothing in my opinion, next to the courtesy of one man toward another, which prevents accidents on the highway so much as a proper respect for the law. I admire a police force which enforces the law, but it should not engage in a game of hare and hounds in which it is continually hounding the public. The force is there to serve the public, to make sure that traffic flows properly back and forth. It is a sad thing when motorists get the idea that they are being forced, by a police force which is not doing its proper job, to pay municipal taxes that is, by a force which is raising revenue instead of making the highway safer.

I want to say something about the breathalyzer test. I have always been a strong supporter of civil rights and liberties, but when we are killing up to 60,000 people a year on the highways I say it is time we all put false pride in our pockets and said: If I have been drinking so much that the policeman thinks I am drunk, I owe it to the public to blow into the little balloon. It is a question of co-operating in the effort to reduce this terrible toll of our highways. Let us hear no more about motorists being assaulted when asked by the police to take this test. Instead, let each motorist resolve not to be one of those who carelessly risk other people's lives because

they insist on mixing gasoline and alcohol. I believe the breathalyzer test is a very fair experiment.

People have told me that with .08 per cent of alcohol in their bloodstreams they are just as capable of driving as if they had not taken any alcohol, or just as capable of driving as anyone else. I challenge this assertion. If they could see the films made of drivers who thought they could drink and still drive well, or the safety films put out by the research institutes, I am sure they would be convinced no one is safe behind the wheel of a car travelling at 60 miles per hour when he has .08 per cent of alcohol in his system.

It is not alcohol alone which is entirely responsible for the high death toll. I bring the word down: the word I should like hon. members to take home with them is "courtesy". It is when alcohol is mixed with bad manners that it is most explosive. When alcohol is added to bad manners, and the motorist gets out on the highway with a tired, jaded feeling, determined to hog the road and race the other fellow home, the combination is often fatal. In all the years I was a policeman I cannot remember a fatal accident involving two cars when alcohol was not involved in the case of either one or both drivers. I did not always find physical evidence in the form of bottles, or alcohol in the cars, but I cannot recall any fatal accident—and I was present at far too many—when there was not at least a strong suspicion of impaired driving on the part of one or both drivers involved. This, in itself, should be sufficient justification for accepting the breathalyzer test. Surely, we owe it to others to drop the keys into the mailbox after we have been drinking, or to give them to the wife and let her drive home.

Mr. Jamieson: She may be drunker than you.

Mr. Bigg: Money might well be spent on public education, or on the provision of safety awards. I like that idea. When I read that a bus or truck driver has won a 20-year safety award I am ready to take my hat off to him. Anyone who can drive through our cities and on our highways for 20 years, or cover a million miles without an accident, has got to be a superman. When these drivers have travelled a certain number of miles I suggest they might even be considered for one of the Canadian awards. To me, a bus driver who has driven two million miles without an accident is a public hero who deserves not only to be honoured but given a salary increase of 20 per cent. Some wonderful films are available. Our national research people, the Mounted Police and the municipal police all have films on road safety which deserve the widest publicity. Everyone in a position to make use of them should draw out these films and show them at service clubs or at scout meetings.

I should like to see a reinstatement of the old youth and police programs begun by the Mounted Police some 25 years ago. Members of the force who were then, and still are, very highly respected, especially among young people, spent a great deal of their own time, with a minimum of assistance from the government as to time, vehicles at their disposal and the use of films, talking to young people and showing them films—how the force trained their dogs; how they made policemen; the kind of policemen who were true servants of the public, out to maintain the safety and happiness of the public. And they very much resented this modern trend of using the policeman as a revenue officer. It should never be done, and whenever it is done it should be discouraged.

This bill will go to the committee. I, for one, think the committee system has some very valuable uses, though it is still in the experimental stage. Let us get hold of this bill, take the 29 main points which the minister has outlined, examine them carefully and enlarge upon them. It might be well to spend a little money on research and upon the education of the public, because the prevention of automobile accidents is far more important than anything we can do after they have occurred.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I close by reminding you once more that in 1938 Winnipeg managed to get through two thirds of the year without one fatal accident among 350,000 people. If that could be done then, it can be done again now. The money that was spent in those days represents only a very small proportion of the amount of money we are spending every day to clean up this mess after it has occurred.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on Bill C-137, I find myself in a position somewhat similar to those hon. members who, from a sense of dignity or of duty, were obliged to point out the inadequacies of the Canada water bill which we sent to a committee a few days ago.

While this bill is a very timely and important piece of legislation, as many hon. members have pointed out it lacks teeth and effec-

tive administrative measures to cope with the serious problems it was designed to alleviate. This bill merely seems to be a copy of United States safety standards, and a governmental compliance with standards already effected by most major car companies. There is no real, clear evidence of a truly Canadian safety standards code, in spite of the fact the department has allegedly been deeply involved in a comprehensive research program to determine and prescribed various minimum safety regulations and standards for vehicles operating in Canada.

Some of the safety devices we now have on our automobiles as standard equipment may be effective. Some, on the other hand, raise some degree of doubt, perhaps not totally in principle, but in design. For example, it was just last week that the Winnipeg police department removed the headrests from their patrol cars as a safety and convenience measure. This was done for safety because the officials of the department found the design of the headrests to be a hindrance to vision which more than offset the appreciable protection factor for which the headrest was intended.

I could also refer to the use of seatbelts. In a recently conducted survey in the province of Alberta it was found that only 18 per cent of the motorists interviewed actually used their seatbelts, in spite of the fact they knew of their existence and were aware of their function. If a motorist is grossly endangering his life or health by not using seatbelts, then perhaps we should consider legislation forcing the use of this device. The use of any safety innovation such as this should be enforced if it is to be effective. If, on the other hand, only 18 per cent of the motoring public choose to use this device, with no indication of a possible increase in usage, it then would appear to be merely another factor contributing to the cost of manufacturing a car. This being the case, then the customer should be given the choice of purchasing a car with or without seatbelts. Seatbelts could be considered an option rather than mandatory item to be included in the price of the automobile.

Having regard to the stepped-up research program to which the minister referred, I must say Canada could certainly stand some improvement in this area. In substantiating this fact, I should like to point out that not so long ago the two-ply tire was introduced as standard equipment on all passenger cars and light trucks. This tire was to be safer because it supposedly had all the qualities of a four-ply tire plus many other side benefits. It was to have been safer because it ran cooler; it was to have been shock-resistant and impact resistant because it was more flexible and had a tougher core, and it was supposed to give longer wear. In short, it was totally engineered to meet existing highway travel demands, freeway operation, gravel and dirt roads. The simple fact is that this tire was not only unsatisfactory in a performance or economy sense, it was totally unsafe. It was not long before blowouts, ruptures and separations became a rather common occurrence.

The interesting point I should like to bring to the attention of the House relates to the great selling job that automakers and tire manufacturers did in the United States and in Canada, particularly with the governments. They fell for this so-called revolutionary breakthrough, hook, line and sinker, and without hesitation placed their designated mark of approval on these tires to indicate that they met government safety standards.

After these so-called "rags" appeared, as they were commonly referred to in automotive circles, it was not long before the consumer found that these tires were totally unsatisfactory, unsafe and uneconomical, not only to the consumer but likewise to those involved in merchandising the product. The automotive makers found themselves in the embarrassing position of having to make a complete circle in their recommendations by recommending four-ply tires to correct a steering condition which developed from the use of this ardently supported two-ply tire.

The concern and lack of acceptance by customers resulted in a situation wherein new vehicle customers refused to accept a new car with a two-ply tire of any brand name and simply demanded a safe four-ply tire. These were furnished at an additional cost of from $50 to $75. The result was an insurmountable buildup of two-ply tire stocks within many wholesale and retail tire outlets. Eventually, tire companies refused to take their own tires back in exchange for suitable replacements.

Despite this degree of dissatisfaction, and the resultant hazardous implications, the government failed to intervene and ban the marketing of this product which was totally unsuitable and unsafe. I believe that tires marketed in Canada should be subjected to a vigorous inspection and test in order to meet Canadian road and driving conditions. After all, tires are still the basic foundation of the automobile.

This leads me to another point in respect of the claim of motor manufacturers that the

increased cost of new vehicles is the result of safety features. This is simply nonsense, and the manufacturers should be called upon to substantiate their claim. There is no question but that many safer instruments and devices could be installed at relatively little or no extra cost. For example, I think it would be just as cheap to manufacture a dashboard with a smooth, contoured surface as it is to have the sharp, knife-like edges we see in many models today. I think this could be incorporated without additional cost. I have known many injuries to be sustained as a result of impact against the rear view mirror, some of a minor nature but in many cases of a permanent nature.

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg), much improvement could be made in the construction of the bumper. The function of the bumper has been totally disregarded and it has now become an item of appeal rather than an item for safety.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Another aspect that should be investigated, and to which no reference is made in the bill or the appendix, is a minimum standard for windshield and rear window vision. This matter, naturally, could affect the total design of an automobile and indeed it should. Even today, there are many fastback models produced which have a limited amount of rear window vision and which contain detrimental blind spots. Coincidental with this, I believe it should be mandatory in Canada that all vehicles have adequate defrosting equipment in order that front, rear and side vision may not be obscured in any significant way. Naturally, this standard would probably apply to vehicles marketed in Canada only, but I think it is a matter of major importance. This has been covered adequately by other hon. members.

In looking over the 29 standards set out in the appendix to *Hansard* of Thursday last, I find most items to be very vague. I hope, during the consideration of the bill by the committee, we will be able to find out specifically what is meant by item 113, which is a regulation concerning hood latch systems and regulation 206 in respect of door latches, hinges and locks. These are very vague terms. I think we all realize these are basic necessities in respect of automobiles. I should like to know for the record just what provisions the automobile manufacturers must follow in this regard.

I do not wish to delay this bill unduly and, therefore, shall close by saying I believe the bill is a necessary piece of legislation which I intend to support. I am disappointed, however, by the lack of initiative of the government in prescribing Canadian standards in addition to those set by the United States. I believe such standards are necessary. Some of the Canadian requirements have been pointed out by me and others have been pointed out by other hon. members. I refer to such things as flares and towing devices, which were mentioned by my hon. friend from Pembina.

When one reads the bill one might almost believe it had been written by the motor car companies because without standards the bill does not mean too much. In a general way, all automobile manufacturers now comply with the standards to some degree. Regardless of the safety devices installed, the effect of such devices will depend to a large degree on the driver and passengers. There can be no substitute for caution and concern. One cannot legislate judgment and courtesy on the road.

Probably the greatest single contributor to carnage on the highway today is speed. I submit that if we are really serious about curbing the mass destruction of life and property, perhaps the best and simplest way to achieve it would be to simply build an automobile which travels no more than 50 or 60 miles per hour. Then, it might not be necessary to become involved in a debate which, in many respects, is rather superficial to the basic problem. But I doubt whether such a development will ever take place. Vested interests are involved and these will continue to exist. There will also probably continue to exist a desire and a challenge, on the part of some individuals, to live dangerously. So, we will continue to hear a lot of talk about safety, new innovations and new devices after this bill is passed. We will also continue to hear the tried and proven automobile advertising theme of more power, more torque and more speed. In view of this, there can be no illusions about there being less accidents. I submit therein lies a great part of our problem of highway safety today.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make a few comments.

We are faced with an extremely serious problem, the problem of highway safety which must first be assured through education of those who drive vehicles and surveillance over mechanical safety of vehicles. As a matter of fact, the most advanced car, if in the hands of a careless driver, will always

result in catastrophes such as those we unfortunately see every day, especially on weekends.

It is surprising to realize that in this era of technology and progress, when vehicles can land on the moon, and a great number of mechanical problems, can be resolved with incredible accuracy, the main being living on earth, i.e. man, is forgotten and that truly improved motor vehicles that may be driven safely home yet to be devised.

Cars have been made wider, more beautiful. Sometimes, they have been made smaller, without anything being done to improve them. When you think of the $3,000, $4,000, $5,000 or $6,000 that must be payed for a car, it seems paradoxical that the safety features have been completely disregarded. Too many accidents happen on the highways for them to be all attributed to the drivers' recklessness. It is obvious that car manufacturers do not live up to their responsibilities.

I am therefore in favor of any action aimed at improving motor vehicle safety standards so as to cut down the startling number of accidents on Canadian roads.

Since the price of cars is quite high, it is quite normal for the buyer to expect something safe, something truly useful. This is why I suggest that the previous speeches were to the point. The technical aspect they dealt with must be taken into consideration, so that motor vehicles will really be made to serve the people. We do not get in a car because it likes it, but because it serves us one way or the other. Therefore, a car must be equipped with everything necessary to give us the best possible service. We must therefore think of a whole gamut of small details which are not necesarily the ones that have been thought of.

Safety belts were mentioned. It is common knowledge that practically nobody bothers about them. Sometimes accidents happen precisely because of the wearing of safety belts. There are therefore many problems, of varying importance, and we should not go to the other extreme in adding gadgets to car because this often serves no other purpose than enriching the manufacturer of these gadgets. We should therefore be concerned only with safety devices that are necessary.

I cannot be led to believe that in this century of progress, of sophistication, it is not possible to invent everything required to cut down on highway accidents through improved safety of motor vehicles.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you that I would not have entered the debate on this matter had it not been that I noted throughout this debate that you yourself, Sir, and those who occupy Your Honour's Chair, have allowed the discussion to involve matters such as snowmobiles and protection of aeroplanes. As I have no intention of speaking for more than about four minutes, I know without question that I will be granted the same privilege as that given to other members.

I have noted in reports over the years what it costs Canada to engage in a sea or air search and rescue when a plane goes down. It is my understanding that if a certain instrument, called a beeper, were put in a plane, hundreds of thousands of dollars would be saved in air or sea search and rescue, and also many lives might be saved.

So, I would like to recommend, on this aspect only, what I think will meet with unanimous approval, namely, that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) consider the introduction at an early date of legislation making it mandatory that all planes flying over Canada, especially private planes, be required to have this very inexpensive piece of equipment. At present our law does not require this, but I am certain that for the few hundreds of dollars it costs thousands of dollars would be saved and, in all probability, lives would also be saved. I request that this matter be taken into consideration by the Minister of Transport and that it be made compulsory for this piece of equipment to be included on all planes flying in Canada.

The second point I wish to make concerns snowmobiles. I have been doing a great deal of reading about this piece of equipment. A few years ago it was unknown, but now we have them by the thousand all across Canada. I should like to recommend to the Minister of Transport that the mechanical safety aspect of snowmobiles be included in the bill, apart from the motor vehicle aspect. However, if my reading is correct, and I have no reason to think it is not, a great many accidents are occurring on snowmobiles. I read that in our far north the snowmobile is replacing the dogs and sled. An aeroplane, with two or three passengers, might go down, necessitating air search and rescue. Similarly, a snowmobile might be lost due to an ice break, or for various other reasons, and the same air search and rescue would have to be undertak-

en. I should like to suggest that a beeper, similar to the one which I suggested should be put into planes, be put on snowmobiles or, in other words, that it be mandatory that all snowmobiles be equipped with a beeper.

I see the minister is nodding. May I point out to him that the same expenditure is involved in search and rescue operations for a snowmobile as one undertaken for a plane. So, the point I am trying to make, however ineffectual it may be, is that it should be made mandatory that all planes in Canada or coming to Canada should be equipped with beepers, which cost only about $325 and which could save many lives. I also wish to point out that if they were used on snowmobiles just as many lives could be saved.

I will not abuse my privilege any further, but let me just say again that consideration should be given to equipping planes and snowmobiles with beepers, and that this legistion should be changed accordingly.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I apologize to the House for being late, but I was at a committee meeting elsewhere. However, I should like to have the attention of the minister with regard to a number of points which I should like to make in relation to the bill before us. I think everyone is concerned about making a concerted attack on the whole problem of the annual slaughter on the highways, not only the thousands who are killed on the highways but the scores of thousands who are injured and the millions of dollars of damage to property which results from automobile accidents. As the minister indicated, a section of the legislation deals with the drivers' habits. The provinces have a whole litany of offences dealing with the drivers' conduct. We, ourselves, have recently amended the Criminal Code dealing with the drinking driver. Whether or not this will have a great impact, I do not know. Then, of course, the provincial departments of transport and the departments of public works are concerned with the safety of the highways. Yet we know we are spending millions of dollars annually on rebuilding, on researching, and on the question of highway safety from the point of view of the road service. Now, there remains the last one, and that has to do with the vehicle itself.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I do not care how good a highway you may have, how good a vehicle you may have, how well a driver may have been trained, if he behaves like a damned fool at the wheel all the rest is gone for naught. There is no way in which legislation can deal with his thinking. Within limits, you can constrain him. He can drive only so fast. We have rules of the road, and laws governing such things as dangerous driving, negligence, and so forth. But there are many ways in which the mental attitude of the driver can escape any legislation.

Let us deal with Bill C-137, Mr. Speaker. I think everyone in the House wholeheartedly agrees with its objectives. These are simply an increase in the safe use of the motor vehicle, not exclusively due to the action of the driver but to the safe quality of the vehicle.

My colleague from Grey-Simcoe (Mr. Noble) spoke about his early interest in this matter. I would not want this debate to end without reminding the House, particularly many of the new members on the government side, of the efforts made by the former hon. member for Brome-Missisquoi, Mr. Heward Grafftey, who at times appeared to be a lone knight in this battle. The action now being taken by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) may in large measure result from Mr. Grafftey's insistent prodding on this question. I think we all owe him a great debt of gratitude.

The bill will not guarantee against latent defects showing up in any part of a vehicle. Anything can be designed to standard, can be manufactured to standard, but this is no guarantee against a latent defect appearing in it. Further, the administration of the bill's provisions will be somewhat difficult.

As a classic example, are we going to force automobile manufacturers to design a special model for Canada? We must remember that, according to the terms of the auto pact, decisions are made as to what types of car are manufactured in Canada. The minister must know that what I have in mind here concerns winter driving conditions.

Take the example of a car designed on the fastback principle, which gives quite a low angle to the rear window. In the prairies, where the snow is drier than it is in eastern Canada, there is not much tendency for it to accumulate on such a rear window. However, in Ottawa, Montreal, New York State, and in the interior of British Columbia where the snow is much more moist, the ordinary slipstream of air passing over such a rear window is not sufficient to remove that snow. I have had this experience driving that particular type of vehicle in Ottawa. How will the ministry police such a situation? Can it

say to a manufacturer, "If that type of car is to be sold in particular regions, its design is no use"?

The other day the minister had some difficulty replying to questions about the term, "motor vehicle". He was asked what about a tractor. He replied that in certain cases a tractor might be covered by this bill, for instance if it were licensed to run on a road. But the trouble is that a manufacturer or distributor cannot determine, when he makes a sale, whether a tractor will be used primarily on the highway, or part-time on the highway, or all the time on a farm. I suggest it would be better to amend the bill to say that a motor vehicle means any vehicle except a tractor. The minister should definitely exclude tractors from the provisions of this legislation. The ultimate use of a tractor will be determined by its purchaser, and under the terms of this bill an inspector cannot go into a retail sales outlet and seize a vehicle.

Who will establish the standards to be specified by this legislation? On what basis will they be established? Who will do the research? Instead of setting up a government research bureau, I would prefer that we use an organization such as the Canadian Standards Association, an eminently suitable organization of national repute. Its seal of approval must appear on electrical and electronic apparatus, and on many other kinds of commodities. Why not require that its seal of approval be necessary for automobile components?

Mr. Jamieson: It deals with some of them.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I would prefer to see a body of this kind deal with the actual research and the actual testing of components.

Then, there is the question of the appeal. A difference of opinion may arise between the automobile manufacturer and the government's bureau or the standards association. Who will sit in judgment? There is no use in one side saying yes and the other saying no, with both sides standing firm on their proposals. If we stipulate that the government side will always prevail, what sort of exercise will we have? I do not think that the minister, the government, and the public want that sort of thing.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The section that deals with notice of defects imposes what I say is an absolute liability, an absolute responsibility on the manufacturer or distributor. He cannot claim any omission of notice because under the section it envisages the manufacturer or distributor failing to give notice. He may have done all that is reasonable but the Post Office may have failed to deliver the registered notice. After all, a bag of registered mail containing 50 passports was stolen once and we do not know what other registered mail was missing. Under the system of bulk billing registered mail in the Post Office, it is not possible to ascertain what mail was in a particular bag unless there was a complaint from someone expecting a letter.

Suppose the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) owned a car with a defect and the manufacturer was trying to get in touch with him, would he know that he must receive a notice? If he did not, how could he complain?

I say the section is far too sweeping and imposes an absolute liability. It is worded so that there would be no relief against the situation where notice did not reach the owner, despite all reasonable efforts of the manufacturer or the distributor. Failure to deliver notice constitutes an offence and the penalties imposed for this are extraordinarily high.

Mr. Winch: Not high enough.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) said "not high enough". They are exceptionally high and changes should be made.

Now, I come to the second last point I want to raise, Mr. Speaker, and that is the right of entry of inspectors. I cannot agree that an inspector on his own may enter the premises of a distributor or manufacturer as he is empowered to do under the act, without some authority. Last year there was some discussion brought forward by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) about the powers of inspectors under the act dealing with pesticides. This act gave far more sweeping powers than those accorded the local police or the Royal Canadian Mounted Police regarding search for narcotics. No RCMP officer can enter and search for narcotics unless he has a specific warrant and only a person designated by the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) through the Exchequer Court to possess a warrant has this same power. What is more important, narcotics or vehicle inspection? I think the standards are unbalanced merely for administrative convenience. Administrative inspectors are given far greater power than inspectors under the

Narcotics Act. When this bill comes back from committee, I hope to have a lot more to say about that.

The next thing, Mr. Speaker, is the right of seizure without warrant. There is no appeal under the act against this. Why is there forfeiture of the vehicle to the Crown? There is a provision for a fine and also penal servitude. Why seize the vehicle as well? Under the Excise Act a vehicle can be seized which is used by bootleggers, but in this particular instance why make it forfeit to the Crown?

Mr. Jamieson: Because it is unsafe.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The minister says "because it is unsafe", but what if the defect were to be corrected? Say for instance there was an unsafe tie rod, and a new safer tie rod were installed, what entitlement has the Crown to seize that vehicle?

This is a matter I have continuously objected to in the drafting of statutes. Why in heaven's name do we need a cross-reference to the Fisheries Act in this bill for the provision of steps to be taken under seizure and disposal and all that sort of thing? This is just bad drafting. Perhaps the minister and his colleagues should get together and bring out a new federal seizures act, but let us not keep going back to the Fisheries Act. One of these days, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) is going to amend his legislation unknown to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson). Then he and a lot of others will be left hanging on the coattails of the Minister of Fisheries. Far better to get busy on a new federal seizures act to standardize the procedure under the various acts and know what it is all about. As a lawyer, why I should have to tell a client that I must go to the Fisheries Act to find out how to deal with an automobile is beyond my comprehension.

I hope this bill gets a real going over and that we get some sensible answers to the questions posed on all sides of the House.

I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock the House will now proceed with Private Members' Notices of Motion, namely, public bills.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the House will bear with me for a second, I should like to outline the business to be raised at the time of adjournment: The hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Criminal Code—Proclamation of remainder of amendments respecting breathalyzer; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—Housing—1970 construction target for homes for elderly and those on low incomes; the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Matte)—Post Office—Earnings following postal rates increase.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

POLLUTION

REQUEST FOR RESEARCH ON METHODS OF SOLID-WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should initiate a national reaserch and development program in respect of methods of proper and economic solid-waste disposal, including studies directed to the conservation of natural resources by reducing the amount of waste and unsalvageable materials and by recovery and utilization of potential resources in solid wastes; and provide technical and financial assistance to provincial and municipal governments and multi-governmental agencies in the planning, development, and conduct of solid-waste disposal programs.

• (5:00 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I note that although my motion was filed, if I may use that expression, since that time there has been a notice in the *Citizen* of January 30, about the intentions of the Province of Ontario. The headline of the article reads, "Ontario makes fresh beginning on industrial pollution controls". The body of the article reads in part:

All waste disposal sites and systems (including municipal dumps) will require provincial certificates of approval, and fines of up to $2,000 daily will be possible against violators who dispose of garbage at places and in ways not acceptable to the government.

Hamilton has a problem with regard to the disposal of solid waste emanating from the householder. I will not take up the time of the House in discussing this matter except to say that we have a secondary sewage disposal system utilized for the disposal of solid waste. I hope the federal government realizes that the people of Hamilton are concerned about this matter and are concerned because of the lack of commitment in this area by the federal government.

It can be said that as we enter the 1970's we are burying ourselves in our own waste with as little concern as we showed regarding the pollution of our waters and air. I believe it is time for us to place high on the list of priorities the question of solid-waste disposal. We must now become very concerned about smothering ourselves in the debris of our own making. I am not aware of any comprehensive statistics on the magnitude of solid-waste of all forms generated in Canada. Undoubtedly, there must be some statistics. Nevertheless, it seems to be that because of increased populations and the continuing trend towards urbanization that will be part of the pattern of the 1970's, the problem of waste, its disposal and related problems will become much more pressing than has been the case in the past.

The nature of solid-waste is variable and the problems relating to the disposal of solid-waste involve factors of geography, technology, government and public attitudes. Notwithstanding the variable of geographic location, it has been found that municipal solid-waste can be broken down statistically as follows:

Cardboard	7 per cent
Newspaper	14 per cent
Miscellaneous paper	25 per cent
Plastic, Film	2 per cent
Leather, Moulded Plastic and Rubber	2 per cent
Garbage	12 per cent
Grass and Dirt	10 per cent
Textiles	3 per cent
Wood	7 per cent
Glass, Ceramics and Stone	10 per cent
Metallics	8 per cent

Solid waste from industry is another source of such waste. It is of significant magnitude. Although industry is involved in the waste problem, it plays a significant role in conserving material, thus conserving raw materials, and in the recycling through the industrial process of salvaged material. For example, industrial scrap is useful in the recovery of tons of copper, lead, zinc and other metals.

The paper industry also generates annually millions of tons of waste from the production of articles utilizing paper. Waste is generated from our acceptance of items like paper packaging, paper containers, bottles and jars, plastic containers and caps, metal cans and other miscellaneous packaging materials. This indicates the magnitude of the problem in this area alone. It takes very little imagination for us to realize that society will not stop generating large quantities of this type of waste, all of which in the end has to be discarded. Waste material also results from mining industries and takes the form of waste rock, mill tailings, smelter slag and so on, all accumulated at mine sites. Other areas of concern, of course, are those to do with urban renewal and superhighway construction which is, to say the least, being greatly accelerated. The problem here is this: We must ask ourselves what we are to do with waste materials such as plastic, tile, metal, stones, dirt and masonry. For how long can such materials remain on site or continue to be buried?

The three divisions that must be considered when classifying waste products and their disposal problems are atmospheric, liquid and solid. Although it seems possible, it really is not practical to separate problems involving solid-waste disposal from those involving water and air pollution. For example, air pollution can be aggravated by the burning of solid wastes. Household grinding of garbage eliminates solid waste but increases liquid waste. Solid-waste disposal by means of land fill can produce problems relating to ground water supplies. Therefore, any over-all policy involving the disposal of solid wastes must be developed in association with any policy relating to liquid waste and atmospheric conditions. Accordingly, it is necessary for the federal government to adopt some unified standard. At present it seems to show no interest in this.

I think it would be very unwise for Parliament and the government to debate the Canada water bill in isolation from other factors I have mentioned because, as I said, pollution and solid-waste disposal are interrelated questions. The outpourings of households, municipalities and industry, business and agriculture in the form of waste and discarded materials bring about pollution.

The theme of my remarks is really a plea for better waste management policies and how we are to bring those into effect in order to benefit Canadians as a whole at present and in the future. We must become motivated to deal with this problem now. It matters little whether the ends of our actions are the improvement of health, the economic incentives resulting from salvaging of waste products, long range conservation programs or the removal of aesthetic insults in the form of ugly views and undesirable odours. Although we have been motivated in the past by considerations relating to health hazards, other considerations are steadfastly becoming more important.

We are mainly concerned about the following forms of waste: Organic sewage or waste

which is principally carried by water contained in the units we use for the disposal of our wastes; trash and garbage, by which we mean primarily the material picked up from homes, businesses and other manufacturing establishments, and automobile hulks and demolition materials. Sewage disposal units cost millions of dollars in capital, and we should determine if they offer convenient means for the collecting and transporting of solid wastes that might be collected in the systems. Substantial grants are required in the area of sewage treatment because we must encourage chemists, biochemists, microbiologists and biologists to develop innovations in the technology of sewage treatment. I say this because it seems that professionals in this field have made scant contribution to this area.

The collection of trash and garbage is still, in many instances, carried out in a primitive way and I submit that we need to undertake studies which will examine systems of modernizing the collecting and disposal of such waste. A good many cities have no satisfactory refuse disposal system at the present time and it is not uncommon to see refuse dumped in our rivers and lakes. The complexities resulting from the disposal of waste material from various sources, the salvage aspects relating to waste material, aspects relating to water and air pollution and the logistics of transfer and disposal of wastes, create problems of great magnitude. Visual pollution by automobile hulks is becoming a matter of national concern, and immediate steps ought to be initiated to recycle scrap from old cars to our steel furnaces. In that way, we could clean up this aspect of pollution.

Programs of salvaging and reclaiming can play a very significant role in solid-waste disposal management. The re-use of scrap material can make up for any deficiency in our raw materials. Solid wastes can, therefore, be viewed, in certain instances, as resources. The recovery of these resources has been the motivation behind some salvage operations, particularly in the United States. It is vital therefore that further research be undertaken in order to determine the purposes for which such salvaged waste material can be used.

It will probably be argued, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of solid waste disposal lies in the field of urban affairs, and that the federal government has no jurisdiction for action here. It seems that the federal government is not even interested in this field. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the problem is complex and calls for co-ordination and hard thinking without any jurisdictional nitpicking. As a result of recent United States studies the following has been said. I quote:

> The inescapable conclusion is that it is now clearly necessary to treat the whole urban, suburban and rural complex, instituting a modern community, as a single unit within which waste management problems must be resolved. Full regard must be given to the inter-relationships of all environmental factors, to the total insult of pollutants to man's physical and mental health and well being, to all sources of pollution and to all methods for control.

That statement gives, I suggest, a great deal of credibility to my notice of motion. Hon. members will now appreciate why I call for a national research and development program that will be instrumental in the co-ordinating of programs to do with research, experimenting, the collection of data and so on, as a result of which technical assistance in the form of grants will be made available for the study of this over-all problem.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Technology has solved the problem of getting material into the community. It must now concern itself with bringing forth solutions which will remove waste. The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) in charge of housing requested suggestions from the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) as to what he should do with the $200 million. I suggest this is an area in which he can place some fairly high priority and, perhaps in his wisdom, he would be prepared to give some credence to the motion which I have brought this afternoon.

In closing I wish to read from a report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the Presidents Science Advisory Committee. I believe this matter was studied in 1966. It is still up-to-date. I think it is very important that we should be aware of what it stated in terms of final conclusions. I quote:

> The overall nature of the problem is such therefore that attention should be given to—
>
> (1) The improvement of organization and systemization of the waste material outflow portion of our consuming society.
>
> (2) The improvement of technology dealing with this outflow and with the separate steps of collecting, processing and disposing, and
>
> (3) The adoption of practices and policies that will close the loop between the materials consumption and the waste production parts of our society so that decisions relative to consumption will consider the waste product problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak very briefly in

this debate. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) for raising this subject in the form of a motion and also for outlining so well the problem we are faced with. I do not wish to go over all the figures that were in his speech and I hope other speakers following me will also refrain from doing so.

There is no doubt that the population of the world is increasing at a very rapid rate and that increases in urbanization and sophistication of life are also taking place at a very rapid rate. The problem of solid-waste disposal—the disposal of paper, plastics, bottles, cars, cans—has become perhaps one of the most serious problems facing the modern urban society.

The hon. member's motion is to the effect that more research should be done in this area. From what little I know of the problem, I agree with this. I think all hon. members would agree that federal provincial, or private funds should be allocated for research if it can be shown that research in this area is necessary. The problem of course is that if we devote money to research, this money is not available for use in dealing with the problem itself. Therefore, if research is not necessary and the skills and sophistication of existing technology is sufficient, perhaps the money should be devoted to actual production and operation of the techniques which research has already given us.

I have already stated I do not intend to speak at great length on this point. Perhaps other hon. members who speak on this motion of the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) will discuss it at greater length. I wish to give an example of what I have in mind, which is the East Hamilton solid-waste reduction unit which I presume is close to my hon. friend's riding. This is a large plant costing approximately $6.3 million which is now being put into operation. I understand this plant will compound solid-wastes, produce steam, and that there will be a by-product of reclaimed minerals. According to my information, this is being done in Hamilton at perhaps no cost to the taxpayer once the capital costs are met. This is the type of project where more research is evidently not necessary but where more money is being devoted to actually dealing with the problem with the present level of technology. I am not an expert on this subject, but it appears to me that using our present technology, and without extra research, much more could be done along these lines.

I also wish to mention the program of Firestone Tire Company in dealing with old tires which now litter the countryside, waterways, roads and trash heaps. The company now has a process of reclaiming the chemical ingredients of these tires without the air pollution caused by burning them. Which has been the normal method of dealing with them up to now. This process now exists, and evidently more research is not necessary here. It is capable of being put into effect with present technology.

There is one important aspect which was not dealt with by the hon. member for Hamilton West, namely that we in Canada do not have a problem of the magnitude of other societies with respect to waste disposal. I myself lived for many years in Hong Kong, which is a small island less than 30 miles long and 5 miles at its widest point. One million people live on that island, as does a population of wild deer and other wild animals. I give this as an example of proper land use and an intelligent approach to urbanization which makes it possible for a relatively small area to have wildlife as well as a very substantial and heavy human population. In that city we have an efficient waste disposal plant. Forgive me for using "we". I realize I am speaking possessively, but a number of times I have been referred to as the member for Hong Kong. But to return to my subject, a by-product of this plant is building materials, such as building blocks. The costs of building and operating this plant are not met by the sale of building blocks. There is a certain deficit which has to be made up. Nevertheless, it has been possible to substantially meet the cost of solid-waste disposal by the sale of these by-products. This is the type of operation which Canadians should study.

I would also like to mention another area I know something about, namely Japan. This country has a problem infinitely greater than ours. In many urban areas of Japan the problem is even greater than some United States cities. I noticed in the January 3 edition of the *Financial Post* an article on the Tezuka disposal system of solid wastes. I will not go into all the complexities, but it is, according to the report, a new type of solid-waste disposal system. The research has evidently been done. The Tezuka Kosan Company is willing to sell these units for the disposal of solid wastes f.o.b. Yokohama. They have reached a stage where the research is completed and the units are now into production.

Canada, I suggest, can benefit a great deal by learning from the experience of other countries, such as the U.S., and especially Japan. I suggest if we embark on independent research, much of it would only duplicate research that has already been done elsewhere. If I may make one suggestion in this particular debate, it would be that a portion of the research moneys which have been talked of by the hon. member for Hamilton West should be used for translating foreign technical journals and perhaps even subscribing to these journals and making them widely available in Canada. By so doing, we will avoid a great deal of duplication and waste, not to mention delay in getting on with the job. With that suggestion, Mr. Speaker, I resume my seat.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, for the life of me I could not understand anyone in this House who approached this motion from a realistic point of view, irrespective of his party, opposing the motion or being a party to talking it out. Without doubt this is a motion which should be accepted in principle and agreed to, particularly when we realize the importance of the principle involved. It has been moved in a manner acceptable under the rules of this House, in that it calls for an expression of opinion by the House that the government should initiate a national research and development program to study suitable and economic methods of disposing of solid waste, and so on.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I must admit that upon occasions I am not quite certain as to the interpretation or definition of "solid waste", though I believe I understand the priority assigned to this question by the hon. member who introduced this motion. I also note that he mentioned the subject of sewage, and, of course, whenever there is solid waste in sewage, disposal problems arise. As one who comes from Vancouver, the third largest city in Canada, I have some interest in this question. On the southern boundary of Vancouver, there is the twin delta of the Fraser River whose course begins hundreds of miles to the north. This being so, Vancouver gets everything from the cities, municipalities and industrial establishments as it is discharged into the river as far back as Prince George. So, whether it is solid waste, semi-solid waste or just waste, it all ends in Vancouver where the Fraser hits the Strait of Juan de Fuca.

We in Vancouver and, I think, the citizens of Canada generally, take great pride in the beaches of Vancouver. Yet in the last few years we have been forced on occasions to completely close our beaches because of the effluent, the solid or semi-solid waste which is polluting the area. Vancouver has spent millions of dollars trying to correct the situation through its disposal plant at Iona, yet even today we do not possess too good a record in this regard. There is no question but that the pollution of our rivers, our streams, our oceans is serious enough to call for federal action.

I make these remarks because, in part, they were prompted by the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) when he introduced his motion. Nevertheless, should anyone think that the motion refers strictly to solid waste, then in this case too I believe we should approve the motion of the hon. member for Hamilton West without too much debate. It should certainly not be talked out.

I was most interested in the remarks of the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Anderson), particularly his references to what is being done in Tokyo and in Hong Kong. He told us from his own experience as a resident in those cities that they have moved to deal with this question of the disposal of solid waste. He suggested there was, in fact, no need to spend money on research on this subject since we could learn directly from what they were doing in Hong Kong and Japan. I would agree with that proposition—if we were doing anything about it, if we were learning and taking action on the basis of what he knows from his personal experience in those areas. Basically, there is no great difference between the solid material of Hong Kong, or of Japan and that of Canada. Metropolitan Vancouver now has a population of 900,000; Montreal has a population of well over two million; Toronto, about two million.

So, one does not have to think in terms of Hong Kong or of a city in Japan. We have cities here of comparable population experiencing comparable problems. It is time we moved to deal with them. There has been so much talk and writing about pollution in the last two or three years without anything being done about it that I believe I am not the only member of this House or the only citizen of Canada who is getting heartsick about the fact that all this talk and wishful thinking is accompanied by no action. This motion asks that we carry out certain research projects. If we can get the information from Japan or

Hong Kong, that is fine. But let us then take action. For Heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, do I have to tell you or any other hon. member what it is like outside the City of Vancouver, or any other large city—to show you the debris of the cars, the tires and the cans? The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich says they are dealing with this in Tokyo and Hong Kong. Why, in the name of God, are we not moving in that direction here?

I live in what I maintain is one of the most beautiful cities in the world—Vancouver. Move up the valley, though, and see the acres upon acres of abandoned cars, the tires and the cans. I do not know too much about science but I do read scientific journals and if my reading of them is correct there are methods, developed in other countries, whereby scrap metals can be recovered, tires can be used for other purposes, and cans can be utilized. All I have to say is this: congratulations to Hong Kong and Japan on their progress as outlined by the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich. Congratulations to those who have done research in getting rid of solid waste material.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Unless I am wrong, the point of the motion by the hon. member for Hamilton West is, let us accumulate that knowledge, and for God's sake let us do something about it: with federal initiative, let us co-ordinate this knowledge and work with the provinces and municipalities to remove not only the eyesores but the detriment to the health of the people in our cities and rural areas, because no action has been taken by this authority in respect of solid-waste disposal.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) on this motion. It is a very good one. I am sure it is the precursor of many efforts that will follow from many quarters to focus on a problem that is increasingly recognized as being of major importance.

The hon. member's motion has roughly two arms to it. One calls for research and asks the federal government to initiate research into solid-waste disposal to reduce its volume, and to look into methods of recovery and use of such materials that are beneficial. The second arm of the motion calls for technical and financial assistance to the provinces and to municipal governments—he even goes so far as to include multi-government agencies—for planning, developing and continuing programs.

The hon. member in moving his motion very properly recognizes that this is an urban problem. It is a problem of concentrations of population in relatively small areas. It is a problem of an increasingly affluent society. The beer cans and discarded, used automobiles that litter our highways and provide eyesores are the by-products of a society whose members have two cars in the garage, two television sets in the home and an increasingly high standard of living—a society that places high value on labour services yet neglects the elements of recovery that are essential if we are to reduce this problem to manageable proportions.

Every year in Canada some 400,000 automobiles are scrapped. A disturbingly small proportion of them are scrapped through the established channels through which full recovery of their materials is possible. Approximately 19 million to 20 million tons per year of solid wastes are, as estimated by one authority, being produced in our urban centres. Within the last ten years this amount has increased by 10 per cent in the country of our neighbour to the south, according to our best estimates, and will continue to increase. We are told that roughly 4½ pounds per day of municipal solid waste per person is produced. It is estimated by one authority that in 1980 this will go up to 5½ pounds per person.

In the United States, every person uses per year 250 metal cans, 135 bottles, 338 metal and plastic caps and 6 tubes, including four tubes of toothpaste. These are just a few indicators of the mountains of surplus materials that are being discharged from our increasingly urban communities. The mover of the motion said we are literally burying ourselves in our own wastes. This has been said many times. This is in fact an urban problem. Those of us who have served on municipal councils know how urban it is and how the nature of the problem has changed. A decade ago ashes were an important part of this problem. Now, thanks to the change to heating oils and natural gas, ashes are an almost negligible part of wastes.

We now have an increasing proportion of brush from suburbanites who have their own gardens and have to discharge their own materials because they are forbidden to burn it in their own backyards because it would pollute the air. We have increasing proportions of industrial wastes. We have in Canada, I am sure, the highest proportion of newsprint and cardboard waste per capita.

This is perhaps a doubtful feature of this magnificent resource of our country which has led to its rather reckless use.

Convenient containers, methods of packaging, and trends in public health which insist that everything be covered and nothing be left in such a way that it can be contaminated in the process of distribution, have contributed to the waste disposal problem. The problem has to be viewed in its entirety, and it has to be analyzed at various stages.

The definition of solid waste is fairly arbitrary as between liquid, solid and atmospheric waste. As the mover of the motion pointed out, the one embraces the other; measures to control atmospheric pollution where there are particles involved will often accentuate the solid disposal problem. Liquid and solid wastes are in many cases interchangeable. Let us consider the situation where the woman of the house has a garbage disposal unit which chops the garbage to shreds. It simply converts solid waste to a liquid form of waste, and there is a problem at a different point. The collection of waste, its processing and disposal must be attacked at every stage.

There is also a major secondary materials industry. It is estimated that something like $5 billion to $10 billion worth of waste could be recovered in the United States. The recovery of scrap copper could amount to 80 per cent of the new copper used in the United States. The recovery of lead from secondary materials and scrap is equal to twice the domestic lead production in the United States. The recovery of materials such as paper, rubber, plastic, textiles, even hair and feathers, and in some cases precious metals, has an economic base. A community that has sufficient incentive and interest in that base could build up an industry.

This affluent society of ours increasingly destroys the economic base of the secondary materials industry. How does it do so? It does so by its social attitudes. Anyone engaged in the business of recovering waste is associated with the junk collector. Collection and transfer points are zoned out of existence by municipal authorities. There is no positive encouragement to make such collection points comply with sanitary requirements. There are no research programs initiated to establish a means by which these places could be made acceptable to communities. The approach of our affluent society is just to zone them out of existence.

In our society we are very fortunate that the standard of living and wage rates are as high as they are, and I would not in any way want to change them. However the high cost of living defeats the secondary recovery process because the high cost of labour makes the cost of recovery prohibitive. We have frequently criticized local government because it is completely self-defeating as far as orderly waste recovery programs are concerned. Garbage collection in its rough sense, in broad population usage, tends to be fragmented over different municipalities. This is one of the services that is frequently left, in a two-tier system of municipal government, at the primary level and is not transferred to the regional level.

Regional authorities may have control of waste disposal sites because these are so few, and expensive. The fragmented nature of municipal government, each with its own zoning laws, each with its own by-laws governing the collection and disposal of waste, and each with its own system, makes this a very difficult matter. Municipalities may farm out the job to private contractors. They may have a municipal operation. The effect of such a state of affairs is to make almost impossible an orderly arrangement for the secondary materials industry, with sufficient inducement to engage in planning and investment in capital facilities, collection facilities and transfer points. This is almost entirely due to the fragmented nature of local government in our big city areas.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I served on a municipal council in this city. Every second year we had the problem of how to acquire a satisfactory land-fill site: that was the language used. I am sure hon. members of this House would be astonished to know how many parts of the city of Ottawa have been built up by the sanitary land-fill method. Within my own recollection some of the best parkways along the Rideau River have had five or six feet of sanitary land-fill dumped there. It has been dumped on both sides of the Rideau River parkway and on the Ottawa River parkway.

A major sand re-fill operation took place on the Ottawa River parkway in the Britannia area, in my own constituency. The problem, of course, is very simple: Sites become more difficult to find. Every year the cost of haulage to sites farther and farther removed from the point of origin of the solid waste becomes more prohibitive in an economic sense. More and more communities regard the temporary land-fill operation as a community nuisance that must be stopped at all costs.

The municipality, generally speaking, has two choices. It can incinerate and pollute the air, or it can engage in landfill operations, face the violent objection of residents of the area and run the serious risk of polluting the water and destroying the natural marshes and other features which are part of the environment for a considerable time to come. Last but not least, they must face the fact that the sites that are reasonably available within economic hauling distance are rapidly being exhausted.

The hon. member for Hamiltion West commented favourably, I gather, on the announcement by the government of Ontario that it intends to licence disposal sites and impose penalties on people who do not use proper disposal sites. I believe this is action on the negative side, the penalty side, and is not proper use of the jurisdiction the province has in this area. I do not wish to hide behind the jurisdictional problem. I am one who believes the federal government also should take a great deal of initiative. It is easy to do just what the province of Ontario has done. It is just one small part of the story, that is, placing a prohibition without giving any answers to dealing with the problem. I see the hon. member agrees with me.

Mr. Alexander: I think the hon. member is reading a little more into it than is indicated by my smile.

Mr. Francis: I should be very happy to hear the hon. member's view if he disagrees, because I know the type of problem the municipalities face. They have to face the fact that these sites are not available any more. What can be done? A prohibition can be placed on dumping. Then, where does the garbage and solid waste go? It does not vanish into thin air. It cannot be placed in a stream. Something has to be done.

I am in total agreement with the purpose behind the motion. I believe it is an eminently satisfactory motion, but I wonder if its mover would consider going a little further. This is not exclusively a problem of the federal government, as much as I would like the federal government to have authority over it. I think it is a serious enough matter that when we have a federal-provincial conference on urban problems, it should receive high priority on the agenda. There is no way in which one level of government can cope with this problem. Of all the problems in the whole area of urban affairs, this one has an extremely local content, a regional content and a national content. By the very nature of things I believe the development of a national program would have to be part of a co-operative endeavour at all levels of government.

I should like to say a word or two about the problem of automobiles. Like any other member of this House, when I take a drive on Sunday afternoon out into the country, especially in the winter when the leaves are not there to hide the view, I see the hulks of wrecked automobiles. There is no question that this is an unpleasant sight and that something must be done about it. The National Capital Commission spends in the order of $20,000 each year in hauling away abandoned automobiles from the green belt area. This is just one community and one area. When the owner of an automobile decides it is no longer worth driving, or decides he can no longer drive it, he hauls it out at night, takes off the licence plates, hopes he has succeeded in obliterating the identifying marks, and abandons it. This has become a great problem in areas such as Detroit and New York.

I have read of proposals whereby governments could deal with the problem of abandoned automobiles. I have spoken to people who know something about the automobile business. When I ask what can be done with an old automobile, I am told that first it is stripped. Certain parts of a salvageable nature are removed, such as the battery which has recoverable lead, the tires which have recoverable rubber, and other items. Then the automobile is taken somewhere and burned. By burning, it is reduced to metallic remains; then the burned hulk can be compressed and has an economic salvage value.

Part of the difficulty is what has happened in respect of the steel industry. The steel industry does not need a large volume of scrap material any more. There was a time in the steel industry, about 15 years ago, when scrap metal was a very important item, but because of recent developments the requirements for scrap has been reduced. This has had a most unfortunate effect on the removal of automobiles from our landscape.

The hon. member said that site control is needed. I quite agree. I wonder what other measures might be taken to cope with this problem. I understand the Japanese have developed a good method of recovering automobiles, but in a country like ours the recovery of automobiles is not a simple matter. There must be recovery points, and we have long distances to deal with and

sparse population. We must recognize that a recovery method based on burning would involve pollution of the air. We must have some disposal method whereby we can reduce the extraneous materials which pollute the air.

I believe, also, we must have a method of subsidy in respect of bringing the material into a central point. The tragedy of a solid-waste disposal program is that it has such a precarious economic base because of the attitude toward it, the trends in our society, the cost factor and everything else. It seems to me we cannot reply upon a "do nothing" attitude to develop positive salvage and secondary material recovery industries. The industry will have to receive a good deal of assistance and research. It will have to receive a good deal of help by way of subsidy and help from local authorities who will have to adapt their zoning and regional planning requirements at certain central points to which waste should be attracted and where it can be recovered.

• (5:50 p.m.)

This program will call for a national code of waste removal which, in my opinion, can be developed only by co-operative action at the three levels of government in Canada. I look forward to the day in the near future when, at a conference called to discuss urban affairs, this problem will receive high priority and will lead to the kind of measures which were mentioned in the debate today.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I join hon. members who have taken part in this most important discussion this afternoon in congratulating the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) for his responsible action and for his adeptness in arranging the motion to the top of the Order Paper so that it could be discussed today. I also congratulate him for the subject matter of the motion.

All of us in the society in which we live are becoming increasingly aware of the despoiling of our environment. I think we are all concerned that somehow or other governments, in concert with industry, universities and others, must work together to develop a better quality of life and environment for ourselves and for our heirs.

We who are from the north have also seen the pollution of our environment through thoughtlessness by individuals and companies and because of poor planning. In the small, northern gold mining community of Yellowknife back in the 1940s an underground water supply was developed from Great Slave Lake without regard to the effect of the arsenic run-off from the mines in the spring. Over the years medical officers expressed concern for the health of the inhabitants of the area because of the arsenic run-off which might have affected the water supply.

During the months of April, May and June, due to the arsenic run-off from the two gold mines in the area the supply of water had to be heavily chlorinated and there were warnings to all residents in the community to be careful in the use of snow and ice during this period of the year. As Yellowknife grew to become a larger city, and in view of the fact that it was to become the capital of the Northwest Territories, it was necessary to expand the water system in the community, as a result of which a pipeline was built which cost Yellowknife Bay a great deal of money. The distance covered by the pipeline is about 1¼ miles, and it reaches the Yellowknife River itself. It is from here that the water supply for the community is now available. It is interesting to note that in this particular instance the industry did its share by paying the extra cost of moving the water pipeline to this new area.

Further north, on Great Bear Lake, north of the Arctic Circle one can walk along the shore of the lake, which is 12,000 square miles, and find places where people have stopped and left behind empty beer bottles, empty pork and bean cans, Spam tins and other pieces of garbage. This shows a poor sense of responsibility in keeping the environment clean.

In speaking about this problem the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) made a very pertinent comment, namely, that it is not the exclusive responsibility of the federal government. He said he is looking forward to the meeting of all levels of government so that a concerted attack can be made on the disposal of solid wastes. However, it might be useful to put on the record some of the action the federal government is taking at present.

The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources has undertaken investigations in connection with solid wastes occurring in streams in New Brunswick as a result of base-metal mining activities. The inland waters branch provides facilities to collect water samples from a network of sites and to analyze them for dissolved and suspended materials. The materials that are lost from

the tailings pond system are then studied, and the transportation and fate of these substances in the receiving stream are analysed. This is an experimental program which could be expanded if we learned more about the handling of solid wastes from base-metal mining activities.

There is in the Department of National Health and Welfare an advisory committee in public health engineering, under the chairmanship of Professor P. Jones of the University of Toronto, which is in the process of preparing a report on solid-waste disposal problems in Canada. This report, hopefully, will be available within the next few months. It is to be submitted to the Science Council through this advisory committee. It will attempt to identify the urgency of the problem, with probable emphasis on waste disposal in large urban centres and solid-waste disposal associated with feed lots wherein large herds of animals are concentrated in small areas.

Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation has one program of the value of almost $1 million which has been continued for over three years to develop apparatus for the disposal of wastes within apartment complexes. The apparatus will provide a method for treating all wastes within the complex itself and will handle the solid wastes involved.

The Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce has a program for the advancement of industrial technology. One project, which is valued at $57,000, is in progress to develop a solid-waste compacting machine to replace incineration in large dwelling complexes.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hour appointed for the consideration for private members business having expired, I do now leave the chair until 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY

NATIONAL MARKS AND STANDARDS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Jamieson that Bill C-137,

respecting the use of national safety marks in relation to motor vehicles and to provide for safety standards for certain motor vehicles imported into or exported from Canada or sent or conveyed from one province to another, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) began this debate last week he said that this was one of the most important pieces of legislation with which Parliament would be concerned this session. When I looked at my file, which holds reports covering only a small fraction of the problems concerning automobile safety, I realized the minister had not exaggerated. If anything, he underplayed the seriousness of the problem.

Today I called the National Safety Council in order to get its most recent figures on deaths, injuries and property damage caused by automobile accidents. The most recent figures cover 1967 and 1968. The figures for 1969 are not yet at hand, but I am sure they will not show any drastic reduction. According to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 5,412 people died as a result of automobile accidents in 1967, 165,000 people were injured, and there were over 330,000 claims for property damage. The estimate of property damage in that year as a result of automobile accidents was in the neighbourhood of $650 million. In 1968 there was a slight reduction in the number of deaths caused by automobile accidents. In that year the figure was 5,375, but the number of people injured increased to 172,718. The number of claims for property damage rose to 360,000.

It is because of this kind of situation that finally in 1970, in both Canada and the United States, we are beginning to enact legislation which, if enforced, will cut the toll of deaths, injuries and property damage caused by car accidents. And if we are doing this in 1970 it is because a few individuals in the United States, one or two in Canada, and a few organizations put the spotlight of publicity on defects found in cars over the last 15 or 20 years.

In this situation the role of the automobile companies in Canada has been a disgraceful one, a despicable one. Mr. Speaker, let us face the facts. Automobile companies in Canada are 98 per cent controlled by the automobile companies in the United States, and from the

beginning they have rejected the idea that there was anything basically wrong with their product.

Automobile companies tried to convince the public that automobile accidents were caused by improper driving habits or by defects in roads. Of course, some automobile accidents have resulted from those causes. But the automobile companies also tried to convey the idea that there was nothing wrong with automobiles themselves or, if there was, the companies had done everything possible to correct the defects.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I am sure members of this House know that the person most responsible for publicizing the completely uncaring attitude and negligence of the automobile companies was Ralph Nader in the United States. I am sure that members of this House will know, too, that when Ralph Nader's arguments began to have an impact on the United States public, General Motors, the biggest automobile company in the world, or their lawyers, hired investigators to undertake detailed research into Ralph Nader's private life. What they expected to find, I do not know; and what they expected to do with the information, if they got any, I do not know. Whether the information they were after had anything to do with cars, or whether somebody hoped to find something about him that might be used to detract from his work, I do not know. But I do know that when the information was made public, General Motors had to beat a hasty retreat and apologize.

Mr. Nader did this work in the United States. As the hon. member from Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) mentioned, a former Conservative Member of Parliament, Mr. Heward Grafftey, was also responsible for publicizing the need for very careful examination of the construction of automobiles. He also stressed the need for government inspection so that the defects which caused accidents could be controlled. The hon. member for Edmonton West then proceeded to ignore everything which Mr. Grafftey had suggested, when he argued that this legislation was too tough on the companies. The whole point of what Mr. Nader and Mr. Grafftey were saying to the public was that we had to get a great deal tougher with the automobile companies.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. In regard to the comments made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), I think that any remarks I made this afternoon were not in the sense he indicated, namely, that we were too tough on the companies. What I said was that there were some problems in regard to administration. I would not want those words to go unchallenged because they are a direct misinterpretation, albeit unintentional, of what I said.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spend time debating with the hon. member for Edmonton West what he said or what I interpreted. I will be content to let the record speak for itself. Anybody interested in the subject can draw their own conclusions from the speech made by the hon. member for Edmonton West and my own.

I am glad that the Minister of Transport, on behalf of the government of Canada, is bringing forward the motor vehicle safety bill which will set standards for the first time. I am concerned because the minister in his speech admitted rather candidly that this legislation will bear the United States stamp of approval and that the possibility of Canadian standards varying substantially from those in the United States is virtually nil. This reflects a continuing abdication by this federal government in regard to legislating standards in all areas in accordance with the needs of the Canadian people. Canadian auto safety standards will, in effect, be set in Washington where there has been, and still is, consistent opposition by the automobile industry which has so far frustrated genuine efforts in this field. The United States government has tended to accept standards set by the industry.

I am afraid that in adopting similar standards—the 29 points which will be dealt with by regulation later—we will in effect be adopting the United States standards which have consistently proven to be completely inadequate. Besides that, I presume the safety features required for Canada's climate, such as rear-window defrosters, will not be included because they are not necessary in a large part of the United States; therefore, neither the government nor the auto companies will make them a standard feature of United States automobile manufacturers.

Even if this is true of the United States, it certainly is not true of Canada and we should make it a requirement of new car manufacture that rear-window defrosters are included. I drive a Swedish car, a Volvo, which has

a rear-window defroster, and I can tell the minister that it works very effectively even in the Ottawa winter. A clear rear-window makes it possible for me to be a better and safer driver. I hope this feature will be included in the Canadian legislation. In effect, the legislation is meaningless unless Canadian auto safety standards are specifically spelled out.

Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I said that the United States automobile companies have been conspicuous by their refusal not only to take the lead in promoting safer automobiles but in their opposition to anybody else getting involved in this field. In hearings before a U.S. Senate subcommittee a few years ago headed by Senator Philip Hart, Senator Edward Kennedy was questioning the president of General Motors. He inquired how much profit General Motors had made in the year before the hearings. After some protest it was admitted that in the last fiscal year General Motors had made $1,500 million profit. When Senator Kennedy pressed a question to elicit how much had been spent in research for automobile safety, the president of General Motors had to admit that the figure was less than $5 million. As Senator Kennedy pointed out, that was less than one-twentieth of one per cent of their profit.

When people like Ralph Nader bring to the attention of the public the research findings of engineers and medical scientists at universities such as Cornell, Harvard, California, Minnesota and institutions such as the Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, and John F. Gordon, the president of General Motors, ridicules amateur engineers for trying to take over responsibilities that belong to competent engineers in the industry, it makes one stop and think.

Indeed, the only honest thing Mr. Gordon said was that the responsibility lay with the engineers of the industry but, in fact, the industry had completely abdicated its responsibility. The institutions which I have mentioned, Cornell, Harvard, California and Minnesota, uncovered auto designs which led to 40,000 fatalities per year in the United States at that time. They found that cars were likely to have doors pop open when there was an accident, had cardboard-like roof structures, uprootable seats, flying cushions, flying metal dash-knobs, chisel-like rear-view mirrors, and above all dangerous parts of the steering wheel. These were just a few of the 100-odd design defects found by the research engineers.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The United States Optometric Foundation performed a series of studies, and the projects director, Dr. Merrill J. Allen, reported:

> Not a single car provides a suitable visual environment for daytime driving.

Similarly, a Cornell group established substantial variations in the strength of door-latches among various makes, but all were below minimum adequate safety regulations. The Liberty Mutual Insurance Company in the United States some years ago arranged for the construction of what they called safe survival cars. The company took four standard 1960 Chevrolets, removed the gingerbread, the chrome geegaws and unsafe features, and replaced them with dozens of safety improvements that would have added not more than $10 to the cost of production. Among those improvements were collapsible steering assemblies, automatic fire protection systems, roll bars to strengthen roofs and safety braking devices.

Every one of these safety features has been known to Detroit for years. Detroit engineers have known for years that impacts against steering columns are responsible for a large percentage of serious injury-producing accidents and deaths. But when it was suggested to General Motors that collapsible steering wheel assemblies should be built into General Motors cars, the company said that was not practical. However, one year later when the heat was turned on by the Senate investigating committee, lo and behold, the company installed collapsible steering wheel assemblies in certain cars as an optional feature. Now, a few years later, after considerable pressure by those who are really interested in automobile safety, collapsible steering assemblies are to be made part of an automobile's standard equipment.

It is interesting to note that automobile companies are more concerned about the appearance of cars, because that is important from the point of view of selling them. You change the appearance when you want to introduce a new model. But safety features which protect the lives and well-being of passengers have been made available only very recently as optional features for which the purchaser has to pay more money. It has been demonstrated conclusively that automobile companies have not cared about safety because in their opinion safety features do not sell cars. At hearings in 1965, General

Motors chairman, Frederic Donner, said that the—

—decision to offer an item as optional equipment recognizes what I believe is the basic freedom of the customer to pay the cost of tailoring a car to his own specifications or rejecting whatever he may not want.

In other words, if the customer wants a safety feature, he must pay for it. I have already said that styling will sell a car, but apparently safety features will not. Similarly, faulty tires have been responsible for a substantial percentage of automobile accidents and fatalities. In 1965 John Floberg, secretary and general counsel of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company, made this comment at the end of the hearings before the United States subcommittee:

I submit that the best standard, the time-tested and proved standard and the appropriate free enterprise standard of quality should be the one that has in the case of tires, as in the case of other consumer products, worked most satisfactorily; namely, the discriminating and sophisticated taste of the American consumer.

Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin has introduced several bills covering tire standards. I will refer to them soon. It became obvious during Congressional hearings that the consumer really could not choose because he was never given information on which to base his choice; therefore, he could make no meaningful choice when it came to tires. I wish to refer to some of Senator Nelson's discoveries, because I think we realize that what applies to cars in the United States also applies to cars in Canada; defects in United States cars become apparent in Canadian cars and measures that will make cars safe in the United States are also applicable in Canada. Among several comments that Senator Nelson made on February 23, 1965, are the following, as reported in the Congressional Record. It is significant that only now, almost five years later, are we in this country and in the United States beginning to consider legislation in this field. The report I have in my hand reads in part as follows:

If cars were built so that protection could be provided for the head alone, at least one out of five people who are now dying in auto accidents would be saved.

If cars were built with seat and shoulder belts which would hold people in the car in an accident, thousands of lives would be saved: If a person is thrown from the car, the chance of death is five times as great.

If cars were built with only three basic changes, occupants could probably survive any crash up to 35 miles per hour—and statistics show that 87 per cent of all accidents occur at impact speed of 35 miles per hour or below. The three basic changes are: shoulder harnesses; doors which will stay closed in a crash; and collapsible steering shafts—

The need for changes is obvious. But one factor impedes progress in this area. That factor is the conviction in Detroit that 'safety doesn't sell.' It is the stylist who reigns supreme in the automobile industry, not the safety and engineering experts.

Senator Nelson advocated the following safety features on motor vehicles: collapsible steering wheels, shoulder harness safety-belt anchors, specific types of safety glass, smog removing exhaust systems, standardized transmission controls to avoid confusion, and uniform bumper heights. We used to think that bumpers were designed to protect cars from damage in accidents, but if one looks at a car one will notice that they are becoming fancier and fancier and will only hurt a person or a car coming into contact with them. The automobile companies are making bumpers like that because they are not so much interested in safety as in the look of the car.

In 1966 Senator Nelson began to press for a bill to set tire standards. It would have given the consumer some protection against faulty tires. Disturbing stories came to light in the inquiries he conducted and the evidence submitted. The following was found:

• (8:30 p.m.)

That many new automobiles are being sold with tires which are designed to carry the normal load for which the automobile was designed.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this still applies. It was also found:

That size labels on tires—the only basis a motorist has for determining load capacity—were never meant to indicate the precise size. An 8.00 by 14 tire, which official tables indicate should carry an 1,180-pound load, may actually be smaller than a 7.50 by 14 tire, which is supposed to carry only 1,090 pounds.

That quality labels on tires, such as deluxe, premium, and first-line, have no meaning whatever and "there is no way to tell one tire grade from another."

Senator Nelson reported that he wrote to the presidents of the four major automobile manufacturing firms to ask them directly whether the tires supplied with their new cars were adequate to carry the loads for which the cars were designed. Not one of them replied with an unqualified yes.

American Motors replied that its cars could safely carry a full load, provided—

I think this should be noted.

—the tires were specially inflated.

General Motors stated that the design guide in selecting tires was three passengers, but that its sedans could safely carry six passengers plus 200

pounds of luggage, provided the tires were specially inflated.

Chrysler said simply that its tires were adequate "provided they are properly maintained."

Ford Motor Co. said that it has been customary to make tire selections on the basis of a three-passenger load. But Ford said its sedans could carry six passengers plus luggage if the tires were specially inflated.

This was the testimony they gave Senator Nelson. Consumers who purchased the cars were never told that special measures were required for inflating the tires. In other words, consumers had no way of knowing whether the tires they were purchasing were of adequate quality to give them the protection they needed.

I do not have time to put it on the record this evening, but Senator Nelson was able to document hundreds of cases where cars with new tires which had been used for less than 1,000 or 2,000 miles had been involved in serous accidents because the tires collapsed. Why? It was not because they were necessarily inadequately built, but because the people operating the cars had not been given the information that the tires simply could not carry the load which they expected them to carry. I refer to sedans and station wagons that people use to take their families on camping trips, etc. This was the record in 1965 and 1966, and it has not really changed. In November, 1968, Ralph Nader was able to publicize a partially completed study by the Federal Trade Commission staff in the United States which said:

—U.S. auto dealers and manufacturers have not lived up to guarantees they give on new cars—

The study says that auto industry "quality control . . . has apparently yielded under the pressure to produce more cars."

It said warranties are designed primarily to help sell cars and have not resulted in improved quality or service.

The report further stated:

"The failure of the warranty to provide new car buyers with substantially defect-free cars . . . results from slack quality control at the manufacturer's level, combined with soaring car sales of dealers, shortages of skilled mechanics and inadequate allowance to dealers for pre-delivery inspection."

We know that since Mr. Nader and others began publicizing the defects in cars, the car manufacturers have finally realized that when they discover a number of cars, sometimes hundreds, thousands or tens of thousands, have defects they should not do as they did until a couple of years ago; I refer to their very quietly informing the dealers that there was something wrong with the Buick, Cadillac, Chrysler or Ford. In an almost surreptitious manner the dealer would then get in touch with the purchaser and try to persuade him to bring his car in to be checked, to see if the defect was as serious as the manufacturer thought it was. The manufacturers now make regular public announcements when defects are discovered. This was not done for a long time. They scoffed when Ralph Nader and Heward Grafftey publicized the built-in defects in Canadian and United States cars. Public attention forced the automobile companies to make these announcements.

This is the record of the North American automobile manufacturers. It is a record of refusal to face up to their responsibilities, one of refusing to spend money on research to make automobiles safe. As I mentioned earlier, research has been left to universities and non-profit organizations. Publicity has been carried out by organizations such as the Consumers' Union in the United States. The automobile companies have dragged their feet.

I am worried about two aspects of this bill. I am worried that the standards the minister will be working with, and the regulations which will be drafted to cover the 29 points which he proposes to bring under review by means of this bill, are to a large extent those which have been agreed by the United States auto manufacturers. I submit this is not good enough.

I submit that the government should be prepared to establish a research and testing organization financed by it. I feel this should be undertaken by the government in co-operation with one or more Canadian universities to carry out scientific and objective research and testing of automobiles. We should not leave it, as we have in the past, to the automobile companies. As the record proves very conclusively, they are completely disinterested. They have done as little as possible. I submit that the leopard has not changed its spots; it is the same leopard. They will do no more than they are forced to by the government and by public opinion.

The second major reservation I have about this legislation is, what will happen after it is passed? Who will police the legislation? Who will ensure that the automobile companies live up to the specifications and regulations drafted by the government? I am concerned about the hesitancy of this government and the government of the United States to act. I

am concerned about the desire of this government to pare the budget and reduce the number of civil servants. I am concerned because even though there will be legislation and laws will be passed, there will be little, if any, enforcement of the regulations and therefore little, if any, inducement for the automobile companies to live up to the rules and regulations which will be enacted.

If the minister means business, and if the government wants to protect the Canadian people, it will not be enough to simply pass this law. It will not be enough for the department simply to draft regulations and to get an order in council proclaiming them. A very effective agency, with sufficient staff will be required to police the automobile companies to ensure that they do what up until now they have not been prepared to do, that is, build cars which are safe, cars which the people of Canada can drive with reasonable assurance that they are as safe as can be built. Hopefully, this legislation will become effective so that the automobile companies will be required to manufacture 1971 model cars in such a manner that consumers will know they are safe.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. R. L. Whiting (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to participate in this debate because many of the ramifications of Bill C-137 find a focal point in my constituency of Halton. This bill affects the actual lives of people, and this very month hundreds of Canadian citizens will become victims of accidents involving automobiles.

Transversing Halton are two of the busiest highways in Canada and, indeed, on this continent. I refer to the Queen Elizabeth Way and the Macdonald-Cartier Freeway. Literally tens of thousands of automobiles and other vehicles use these highways each day. Hardly a day passes when someone is not brought into our hospitals because of an accident due to drivers who may be careless or unthinking, or whose vehicles may be mechanically defective. Although this bill cannot and does not attempt to regulate highway traffic, it is nevertheless encouraging to know that the minister, in introducing Bill C-137, indicated that his department is co-operating with the provinces to improve safety standards in connection with highway traffic throughout Canada.

In Halton we have one of Canada's largest automobile and truck manufacturers, Ford of Canada. Their standards of practice and their attitudes toward measures of safety are of vital concern to practically every Canadian. The Canadian automotive companies producing north American-type cars and trucks have for the past two model years been complying voluntarily with United States federal safety standards legislation. This has been done primarily because of the Canada-U.S. automotive trade pact which allows free passage of automotive vehicles and parts across the Canada-U.S. border.

It follows that when cars are being produced in both countries for sale in both countries, it is most efficient and economic to have them identical. This leads up to the desire of all Canadian automotive companies that the standards be identical with those now in force in the United States. Any variation would lead to horrendous problems in the manufacturing area and would, in effect, work against the program as contained in the auto pact. Any deviation would also result in higher manufacturing costs which undoubtedly would be passed on, at least in part, to the consumer.

I think the minister is moving in the right direction at this point by having the first list, as contained in this bill, conform to the American safety standards. However, this should not be another area in which it might be said we are being dictated to by forces outside our country. I believe that we in Canada can show leadership in the field of automotive safety. I would strongly urge the minister and his department to enlist the co-operation of those organizations and individuals who are concerned with the safety of our people when they venture out onto our highways.

We have the people in Canada who, through their observations and experience, have the knowledge to tell us what can be done. We also have the people who know what can be done. This latter group would involve the automobile manufacturers. I understand they are already working with the Department of Transport to develop better standards. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we should use these people to the fullest advantage so that we as Canadians can become leaders in establishing international automotive safety standards.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whiting: However, in all this matter there is something of a paradox. I venture to say that far less individual concern on the part

of the Canadian public will be shown to this bill than to practically any other piece of legislation. If you wish to see the opposite end of the spectrum from the White Paper on Tax Reform, this is it. While there is public concern expressed about motor vehicle safety, there seems to be little personal concern. As an example I would remind hon. members that back in 1956 Ford included a safety package in their cars of that year. What happened? Public apathy was such that there was little interest on the part of purchasers in acquiring a car equipped with this safety package, and as a result it was withdrawn the following year. Does this kind of public apathy exist today?

Let us start with the doctors. They of all people, one would think, should concern themselves with highway safety. Dr. William Ghent, professor of medicine at Queen's University, speaking recently at a seminar held by the Hamilton Road Safety Conference, openly admitted that the medical profession takes less care of itself than any other profession. Only 15 per cent of driving doctors wear their seat-belts. He also went on to say that none of them has regular maintenance done on their cars. If the doctors themselves, men who every day witness the tragic results of highway accidents, are so little concerned with the causes then they, indeed, in my opinion, are a source of cold comfort. Doctors talk a great deal about preventive medicine. Should they not be leaders in preventing accidents?

Mr. James C. Thackery of Montreal, vice-president of the Canadian Safety Counci, said in a speech given recently in Fredericton, New Brunswick:

> We can engineer improvements in our roads and automobiles; we can pass legislation and enforce it; but the only one who can prevent an accident is the driver himself.

He further stated:

> Engineering, legislation enforcement and education must be blended into a balanced program to prevent accidents.

● (8:50 p.m.)

Because of this public apathy the federal government would be well advised to incorporate in their thinking on highway safety a program of education to arouse public opinion and public feeling. In my opinion the federal government should bring to the attention of the Canadian driver a greater respect for the highways and those who use them. This legislation we are considering is a guard for the safety of your life and mine, and indeed for the life of every person who travels our roads. It should be stressed that any safety device incorporated in a vehicle is put there for the benefit of its occupants and is to be used. It is not there as an ornament.

In my opinion public awareness and public co-operation in making Canadian standards effective will remove one of the biggest roadblocks in any drive to cut the death toll on our roads. I do not know what the economic cost of road accidents is in Canada today. I read that in Great Britain it amounts to over £200 million annually. I would think it certainly must equal that amount in Canada. Therefore, any money spent on a program of highway safety would be economically sound.

There is one more point I should like to discuss in connection with this bill, and I would like the minister to consider it in future amendments. I refer to the manner in which the manufacturers are promoting supercars which are sometimes called motorized missiles. According to insurance authorities, these super-powered cars represent 50 per cent larger accident losses than other motor vehicles. They are certainly not conducive to moderate driving; indeed, they are powered well above the needs of the prudent, defensive driver and certainly above the traffic capacity of most streets and roads. While it is my view that many of these cars have a romantic sales appeal which has evolved into a competitive lock-in among the auto manufacturers, I think this romanticism can be maintained, and I appreciate that this is an important factor in modern day selling.

In closing Mr. Speaker may I say the amendment which I should like considered would evolve around a limitation of horsepower for public automobiles as an added safety measure on our highways. In my opinion we do not need faster cars; we need safer cars and safer drivers. The driving public must be educated to realize that the vehicle he drives can be one of two things. In the hands of a responsible person a car can be a highly efficient and most pleasant means of transportation. In a split second it can become a weapon of death and destruction. The final choice still remains with the driver.

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to delay the proceedings very long. In the first instance, I do not like to kick a man when he is down. According to tonight's papers GM and Chrysler are down. They were down drastically in

the last quarter of 1969. These companies and Ford are undergoing pretty stringent lay-offs. As a matter of fact, I am told today that Chrysler of Windsor laid off 2,000 workers.

I should like to make one recommendation before this matter goes to the committee. It has to do with a private members' bill I have on the Order Paper. I think it is No. 96, but it might as well be 960 for all the chance it has of coming forward. I am particularly concerned with the safety features in our so-called muscle cars. A muscle car in the trade is rated as one with a standard domestic chassis and a sports-type body, with about 450 cubic inches of engine under the hood, or a 440 cube hemi. The companies have named these very excitingly; they have called them the Barracuda, the Sting-Ray, the Cobra—or you name it.

An hon. Member: What about the Bearcat?

Mr. McCutcheon: That was another generation. What I object to is that these are standard engineered vehicles equipped with tremendous power plants, with no regard for safety or for the ability of people who buy them to drive them. For example, take a Chevy Biscayne. The engineers tell us that they have 184.3 square inches of braking surface. The engineers have worked out that the braking power to ton ratio is 93.9.

An hon. Member: Tell us about your own product.

Mr. McCutcheon: I will come to that in a moment. Compare this family sedan with a car having a 400 cubic-inch engine. You still have 184.3 square inches of braking surface. Compare that again to a VW 1500, a car that I would not even own; you could not expect me to drive it home. However, it has a braking power to tons ratio of 140, which is about 60 per cent greater than our domestic cars. Let us compare the 93.9 ratio of a Chev Biscayne to a Ford Fairlane, which has 116 and Maverick which has 104.

There is nothing which makes a young man's red corpuscles work better than a drive in a nice, finely-tuned sports car. I have respect for sports cars. I admire them, and I am in good company; the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) likes them too.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Have you other, similar interests?

Mr. McCutcheon: The important point is that these cars being sold on the North American continent are killers. They are standard automobiles souped-up with powerful motors. Is it not a great thing to see one with a set of shackles on the back which lengthen it, and a set of slicks which stick out at least three or four inches wider than the fender. The provinces of this country licence these vehicles, but if you go out on the highway with your truck, and you do not have fender-flaps on it, the OPP or the QPP will pull you over and give you a ticket.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Last year in Essex county one of these muscle cars was involved in an accident. It went out of control and, believe it or not, it went into the second storey of a house. You talk about flying low, Mr. Speaker; that sure was it. We had an inquest in Lambton county when a young man departed this vale of tears. At the inquest it was disclosed that this guy had bought a compact car with a 400 cubic-inch engine in it. The judge, in handing down his decision, said it was obvious there was too much car for this man to control.

As you drive through our villages and towns, more particularly on quiet streets, have you ever seen so many black marks in your life? There are more black marks on some of those pavements than there are on the runways at Malton Airport which are used by jet airliners. On a Sunday in summertime, if you go out for a drive with your wife and you see a crowd, you know you are on a drag strip. Those drag strips should not be the public highways.

These cars I am describing, which are really good only for a drag strip, should not be licensed to travel the highways and byways of the country. Apart from reading today that automobile companies were laying off people, another item caught my eye. It reported that insurance in Canada on muscle cars is about 25 per cent higher than insurance for a standard car. But United States auto insurance firms are ahead of us in this matter; on October 8 last they announced a 50 per cent increase in coverage rates for 1970 super-powered cars. The installation of huge motors in cars, without related engineering covering brakes, suspension, etc., is something which should be watched closely. I believe a formula should be established giving a ratio of weight to horsepower and of weight to braking surface.

Before sitting down may I say there is one other area in which the standing committee

could do a wonderful job, a job that should have been done years ago. It should consider the standardization of traffic acts all across Canada so that one would know what the heck he was doing when he drove into another province. The committee should also make recommendations on standard road signs. In this regard international road signs would be best. For example, in Ottawa one can make a right turn on a red light. In other places that is not allowed, and if it happens a driver is in deep trouble. In the interests of automobile safety I would urge the committee to recommend standardization of traffic acts for the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Randoph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the debate on this bill, and have read a number of the speeches made by hon. members. It is a measure that is of great interest not only to members of this House but to all the citizens of our nation who are well acquainted with motor vehicles and with the hazards associated with those vehicles. Most facets of safety have already been covered by hon. members and it is not my intention to go over all the points again. However, I feel I should briefly outline several points that in my opinion should be considered hand-in-hand with the present regulations and with the provisions outlined in this measure.

I feel that in dealing with the problem of highway safety there must be full co-operation between the federal, provincial and municipal levels of government. Sound, sensible and enforcible safety measures must be enacted and enforced by every level of government. Only in this way can we cut down appreciably the tragic number of motor vehicle accidents which occur every year.

For year there has been need for a national automotive safety code. It is amazing that something more concrete was not done about it prior to 1970. Car safety has now become a No. 1 health problem in Canada. I believe it can be called a health problem. The large number of people who are killed and crippled on our highways makes it a national disgrace. Many accidents could have been avoided, and the intensity of injuries lessened, had a national automotive safety code been established years ago.

• (9:10 p.m.)

As we look back on our laws and regulations it is an amazing and remarkable fact that our government protects our food, protects our water to a degree, especially drinking water, protects other aspects of health; we have building codes to make sure that our housing is up to standard, we have standards for electrical wiring, and a large number of other protective measures are taken to look after our citizens; but for years we have neglected one of the greatest causes of death and injury to Canadians, that is, the modern automobile. I believe that is why the bill before us has given rise to so much interest among hon. members and, I am quite sure, among the general public. Improvements in this field are being made and a measure of government action, both federal and provincial, is being taken. However, we have still a long way to go to cover all the points which we should be covering.

There are two or three aspects of traffic safety which I should like to cover very briefly and point out that in my opinion they must go hand in hand with the various codes which we are trying to establish in this piece of legislation. The three aspects of traffic safety which complement legislation of this type deal first with the drivers of automobiles, second with highway design, and third with the safety features of vehicles which automobile manufacturing firms and governments have neglected for generations.

In so far as training of drivers is concerned, I am not putting all the blame on the deferral government because much of the responsibility is provincial. It is the provinces which have the licensing of automobiles under their jurisdiction. We have driver training programs in schools in various provinces of this nation. In my opinion the training of drivers should be undertaken by schools all across Canada. I have heard people say that this type of training does not necessarily result in a decrease of traffic accidents. This is just not so. Training of drivers must complement legislation of the type we have before us. This is why I urge full co-operation among federal, provincial and municipal governments to ensure that this type of training is made available to the young people of this nation who are the future drivers of vehicles and who, according to statistics, are involved in the greatest number of accidents.

I urge that the federal government approach the provincial governments which have not proceeded with this program. I urge hon. members to help ensure that this type of driver training is undertaken by schools all across Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, so that when our young people get behind

the wheel of a car they know what hazards and dangers they are likely to face on the highway.

Another action which should be taken by the government and which should complement this legislation is research. I am referring now to research in highway design. I think that too much is left to chance at present. I realize that every highway department has a group of very competent engineers who work on highway design; but as we get more powerful vehicles and as the average speed of our cars gradually increases, there is more need than ever for the federal and provincial governments to enter into research of highway design in co-operation with each other. I believe that if this were done, a great number of accidents which presently take place would be eliminated. I suggest that this is a field into which the federal government should enter, and it should support, at least financially, research programs which are desperately needed.

The third point which I wish to make has already been covered by speakers on all sides of the House. It concerns vehicle safety. Other speakers have said, and I say it again, that we are very fond of putting flashy chrome on our cars. The manufacturers of automobiles know that automobile owners everywhere in the world are real suckers for something that looks flashy. They have neglected—there is absolutely no doubt about it, so I will not go into all the details again—many safety features which should be incorporated into motor vehicles before they are allowed on the highways of this nation.

I will give the House one example—the height and quality of bumpers. On many of our vehicles bumpers are placed at different heights. The statistics which are available to individuals who wish to obtain them indicate that a number of injuries and deaths could have been avoided if the height of bumpers had been standardized. Also, the quality of bumpers should be improved because most bumpers would be dented if they hit a package of popcorn.

This is an area in which we need a safety council and a government which will check on the facts and then insist firmly that this type of safety feature be incorporated into vehicles. We can still get good design in a car and a vehicle that will operate efficiently, without losing any of its effectiveness, with many more safety features incorporated into it than we have today.

[Mr. Harding.]

There is one more aspect of vehicle safety which I will mention very briefly. I refer to testing. I believe that motor vehicles should have compulsory testing in Canada. After you have had a motor vehicle for a period of time, you should be forced to have it tested at a proper testing station by competent mechanics. There are motor vehicles being driven around Ottawa and, in fact, in every city in Canada that have no right to be on the highways of this nation. What are we doing about it? The neglect is nationwide for the simple reason that compulsory testing has not been introduced in every province. One or two of the provinces may have this requirement.

I know that two or three years ago we had some interesting information from the city of Vancouver which had introduced compulsory testing of motor vehicles. The number of accidents caused by faulty mechanism was very low compared with the number of accidents in the provinces in which there was not compulsory testing.

I am convinced that the older a vehicle gets, the more chance there is of the vehicle breaking down. That is why we need this type of testing. We are not trying to put the driver of an automobile in a straitjacket by saying that he must do this, that or the other thing; but a driver who is on a public highway should realize that it is his duty, not only to protect himself but to protect other drivers on that highway.

• (9:20 p.m.)

An individual can have an up-to-date automobile in top-notch shape, and yet can have his family wiped out because the vehicle belonging to another driver had not been properly checked for defects. I have no hesitation in urging most strongly that the testing of motor vehicles should be part and parcel of the safety code from one end of Canada to the other.

A previous speaker mentioned the standardization of signs. I should like to say a few words on this subject. Thank goodness it is coming, because signs should be standardized. When I cross the bridge into Quebec, or go to any other province, I should know that I will be driving on highways in exactly the same situation as I would in my native province of British Columbia. This is just common sense, Mr. Speaker. Signs should be standardized throughout the North American continent.

I realize that some of these points have been made before, but I felt I should comment on them and stress what I feel is also needed to make some of the safety codes work. As legislators we must do our best to obtain the type of safety measures which will protect the ever-increasing travelling public in Canada.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson). The House will realize that if the minister speaks at this time he will close the debate.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take a great deal of the time of the House to recap the debate. I simply want to say thank you very much to those hon. members who have supported the principle of the bill as I anticipated they would. There has been, I think, that degree of unanimity which I forecast when introducing the measure a few days ago.

It seems to me the most logical course to take is to give this bill the thoroughgoing questioning in committee that has been predicted in various parts of the House. At that time it will be possible for me and officials of my department to provide hon. members with the explanations that many have been seeking. Let me hasten to add that if it appears, as a result of committee discussion, that there are ways in which this legislation can be improved, I will be more than pleased to consider such revisions.

There are only three or four general comments I should like to make in winding up this debate. It will become evident in committee that the effectiveness of this measure will to large degree depend upon the kind of co-operation we can achieve with the provinces. For this reason I have worked with the appropriate ministers in the provinces from the outset to ensure that companion legislation is introduced at the provincial level so we will have a measure that will go beyond the competence of the federal government in defining what is a safe car, or a reasonably safe car at the time it leaves the factory.

Once it gets into the provinces, replacement parts, new tires and various things of this kind, and the matter of testing, are within provincial jurisdiction. I believe we have established the most effective level of co-operation and an awareness on the part of both levels of government of the need for co-operation. I am sure this will produce the desired result.

From the beginning I have been concerned with what might be described as off-highway vehicles, namely, snowmobiles, and have wondered how we might come up with an effective nationwide set of standards. Under his legislation I am satisfied that we have the competence to introduce safety standards so far as the new vehicle is concerned. We have had discussions with the provinces to see if we cannot arrive at some sort of standards on licensing, because in some instances snowmobiles are permitted to cross highways and in other instances they are not licensed at all. In other cases they are licensed to travel on the shoulder of the highway. While agreeing completely with hon. members who feel there is a need for regulation in this field, I believe we have to get the various jurisdictions to agree on a set of standards and then introduce as many of them as possible into the new vehicle.

I was most impressed with the comments of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) who talked about the need for some kind of homing device and coupled this with reference to the need for a similar mechanism on aircraft. Even knowing your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to drift too far from the subject, but I still do not understand why this is not part of the mechanism of aircraft. I have received submissions from various aviation clubs and the like, and I find myself in complete agreement with the hon. member that this device seems thoroughly logical in terms of aircraft. I have asked if there is good reason why we should not have it, otherwise it would be my intention to bring in this type of legislation.

As far as surface vehicles are concerned, we may have to make some distinctions because there is a difference between a vehicle being used for pleasure in the immediate vicinity of the home and one being employed for commercial or transportation purposes in the north. I undertake to see whether there is any kind of homing device that might be used in this way. There is no doubt that search and rescue is a costly business as far as governments are concerned, but it is tragic that sometimes lives are lost when people are only a few miles from the rescue party because there is no means of locating them.

There were many other interesting and constructive comments during the debate. The only point that I felt was not emphasized as much as I would have expected was my reference to the role of research into causes of accidents. As we have said repeatedly, and

members opposite also commented on it, you can build the safest automobile in the world, but if it hits a child, the child is probably maimed or killed. No matter how safe the automobile is, if it topples over an embankment and rolls 50, 60 or 100 feet, the risk is very great. Apart from making the car as safe as possible, we must try to find the scientific reason for so many accidents happening. Ruling out the impaired driver, there is still a surprisingly large volume of accidents caused by apparently normal people not driving at excessive rates of speed. But there seems to be very little interest in research into this area.

A related question is highway design and its affect on accidents. I believe the research and development section of the Department of Transport can be of considerable help to the provinces in trying to determine, not merely standards of size but to see if we cannot recommend standards on a nationwide basis to reduce many of the problems and make the roads safer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill will help us considerably, but I would ask that members not lay too much emphasis on the 29 standards. They happen to be the ones in existence at the present time, but if anyone comes up with other improvements we will be more than glad to introduce them once they have been tested. I suggest this is only a small part of the problem. If we are to attack the problem as effectively as I believe we can, we must consider the driver, the causes of accidents and also the "ways" system—if we can use that expression—that is, the highway itself.

• (9:30 p.m.)

In any event, I still consider this an historic piece of legislation. I believe if we bring it before the committee shortly we can provide the kinds of answers for which hon. members are looking. I for one look forward to bringing the bill back to the House and completing a progressive move forward for the people of Canada. I thank all hon. members for their help.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

BROADCASTING OF DEBATES BY RADIO AND TELEVISION

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council) moved:

[Mr. Jamieson.]

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, in consultation with Mr. Speaker, be directed to study the question of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its committees, including the legal, procedural, and technical aspects thereof, and the question of arrangements made for reporters for the electronic media in the Parliament Buildings.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I will not take much of the time of the House in speaking on this matter. May I indicate that in the English version of the motion there is typographical error. The printed words on the second line reading, "ratio and television broadcasting", should read "radio and television broadcasting." I think a comparison with the French language version will confirm that this is so.

Perhaps I ought to refer the House, as the most effective way of dealing with this matter, to the debate which took place some ten months ago on March 26, 1969, when the question of having a committee to study the broadcasting of the proceedings of the House was being considered. At that time I said, as reported at page 7164 of *Hansard:*

Thereafter, I expect that the house will want to ask the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to make a preliminary study of the question of working out appropriate procedures for broadcasting in the House. I repeat, however, that I believe we should let the committee complete the work we have given it.

At that time I suggested it would be desirable to let the committee consider procedures of the House as they related to radio broadcasting and television, after the discussion of the general procedures of the House then underway was concluded. The committee had an opportunity of discussing in a general way last spring the question of broadcasting of House procedures by electronic media and, as a result of these discussions, I understand that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has prepared certain information which will be of assistance to the committee this year, assuming that this motion passes.

May I make some brief references to the actual terms of the motion. It says, among other things, that the standing committee be directed to study the question of radio and television broadcasting in the House, including the legal, procedural and technical aspects thereof. It is obvious that there will be technical problems from the point of view of broadcasting from the chamber itself. This is patently not a forum which lends itself readily to the broadcasting medium, and this motion will give an opportunity for the com-

mittee to try and solve some of the technical problems.

In addition, the committee must refer to the practice that has grown up in the House of providing facilities for those who report to the radio and television media and interview members outside the Chamber itself. The committee is therefore being asked to examine the arrangements which might be made for the media so that from a technical standpoint radio will be able to obtain a good signal and television a good picture for the purposes of public broadcasting.

A reference is made to the legal considerations involved. I made a number of references to these considerations in the debate last year. Hitherto, the laws of libel and slander have not applied to proceedings inside the House. The proceedings, in such circumstances, have been guided by the principle of parliamentary privilege and, perhaps more important, by the general traditions of the House and have tended to guard against remarks which might be in the nature of slander. Some changes may have to be introduced in this area so that the reputation of no person may be damaged as a result of remarks inside the House or its Committees, that is, so that as a result of anything said by an hon. member inside, no one may be attacked with impunity before the public media and the country. Therefore, the committee will have to look into the legal aspect and the effect on the country's laws of providing for the proceedings of the House and its committees to be broadcast.

Finally, from the procedural standpoint the committee will have to determine what changes in the procedure of the House will be desirable so that the House may have its proceedings broadcast most effectively and so that hon. members, whether in the front benches or the back benches, will have almost equal opportunities to appear. There is an inevitable bias in our system in favour of those sitting in the front benches on either side of the House. The committee will therefore have to consider how to give hon. members on either side comparable opportunities to be heard on a public broadcast.

As I say, the committee will have to consider the proceedings of the House as they now exist in order to see what changes may have to be instituted if we are to adapt to the new medium, just as I assume the proceedings at Westminster had to be adapted some two centuries ago when Mr. Hansard was first permitted to go into the Commons gallery and take a note of the parliamentary proceedings.

I will delay the House no more, Mr. Speaker. This will be an important step in the history of the Canadian Parlliament. Other parliaments such as that in Westminster have studied this difficult question and pronounced negatively against televising the proceedings of the House. We, in our turn, will have to reach our own decision. I am sure that the committee will bear in mind the observations of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) when he remarked in the debate last March that in this area there is a substantial difference of opinion not so much among parties but among members within parties. On this question I am sure that all hon. members, whether they are members of the committee or not, will have the opportunity to contribute to and involve themselves in the proceedings so that the committee might have the opportunity of hearing their views and arriving at a consensus as to the best method of dealing with this question.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, in responding to this motion moved by the minister I think I can say that I was the one who moved the resolution some ten months ago which was referred to by the minister and which formed the basis of a very useful discussion and debate at that time. In concluding his remarks the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald) referred to the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), who said that not only are there differences among parties but within parties as well. I think this is parallel to the situation that existed in the United Kingdom, where the cleavage was horizontal and ran across party lines. We in this party have a variety of opinions. I think it is proper that this is so. I think it would be very difficult to be otherwise on an issue of this kind, which belongs to the members of the House of Commons. It does not belong to the government. It does not belong to political parties. It is an issue on which for members should be guided by their own conscience, point of view and responsibility and come to a decision. What I have to say will represent my point of view. Other members of my party will have views to offer either in this House or before the committee. I have no doubt that they will vary from the point of view I expressed in the debate ten months ago and which I will again express tonight.

Broadcasting of House of Commons Debates

• (9:40 p.m.)

It is my hope that when the committee is convened and organized it will, for the purpose of this issue, hold public hearings. During the course of the proceedings when we were considering the proposed rules to be brought before the House, the meetings were held in camera. Whether this was wise or not is beside the point; it is now water under the bridge. I strongly recommend that when the committee is convened and organized its meetings be held in public.

I do not envisage any great rush on the part of the public to attend the meetings, but members of the media who are involved, and interested members of this House, may wish to attend. By that time members of the other place may have completed their own close and interesting examination of the media and may wish to attend the meetings to hear what the House of Commons has to say on the question. I hope this will be the case.

I hope after reasonable consideration, when the committee presents its representations to the House the Whips will not be called upon and individual members will be permitted to vote according to their own point of view. I want to make that quite plain. I know there will be problems. There will be a lot of pain and suffering attached to either a permanent or experimental introduction of radio and television into this House and its committees. However, I think the benefits will outweight any drawbacks. Nothing is born without pain and suffering. It may well be that members of this House will have to undergo a certain amount of pain and suffering in this regard.

I feel there are two points which must be considered on this issue. What is paramount is the right of the public of Canada who have elected us and in respect of whom we are trustees. The people of Canada have a right to the fullest, most complete and best information which can be obtained from the proceedings of the Parliament of Canada. Many arguments will be made. Some will be very persuasive and some will be convincing as to why it is not a good thing. I will listen with care to those arguments because I am open to persuasion. I think some of the arguments will be the same as those made the time *Hansard* was introduced into this House several years ago. I think that 20 years after we attempt this timid experiment people will wonder why there was ever any objection to it.

We are not without precedents to observe. Before going on to that however, may I point out some of the problems which will arise. There is, of course, the problem in his House of the two official languages. This will certainly form a technical problem of considerable size. There is the question of cost. We do not know what that will be. We have some idea of the cost of the experiment which took place in the United Kingdom with relation to the House of Lords. There is the question of the relationship between this House and its committees.

If there is to be an experiment and later a permanent proposal to televise the House and committees, obviously there will have to be some rationalization of the proceedings of both the House and its committees. There is, of course, the very difficult legal problem to which the minister referred which in my opinion will involve remedial changes in the statute. Perhaps I may deal with that question for a moment or two.

I have read the report of the Clerk of the House of the United Kingdom. I have also read the statements and some of the documents in connection with the experiment in Australia with relation to radio, and those in connection with New Zealand. In examining the Senate and House of Commons Act in Canada, sections 4 and 7 explain the privileges and immunities of the members to the actual use by the written media of extracts from official documents of the House. The privileges are extended to cover those, but it is a specific restriction to the written extracts. I think we will probably have to follow the same practice with regard to privilege as exists in the United Kingdom.

I will give an example. Perhaps even on an experimental basis the proceedings of this House or its committees may be televised or broadcast by radio. A statement made in this House is of course protected by the traditional rights and privileges of members of the House. If the proceedings are being broadcast live, and a statement is made which could well have a slanderous effect, although it is protected in this House, what would be the position of the member or the network which broadcast the slanderous statement which was received outside the House?

In spite of what was said in New Zealand, this seems to be a legal proposition. It might well be that we will have some trouble. Apart from the question of fair comment, there is some likelihood of being sued for slander. If we are going to do this, I hope the committee

will receive adequate legal advice and will review the proposals made in Australia and the United Kingdom. I hope the committee will consider the excellent and learned article by the Clerk of the United Kingdom House. I hope it will take a hard look at the necessity of amending the Senate and House of Commons Act.

I will now deal with the question of merits. I know the problems, technical and otherwise, which will result. I know it will probably be a long, hard, arduous and difficult process to evolve a system which will be acceptable to all members. I think it would be best if the committee recommended a trial period of radio broadcasting. Australia has almost 25 years' experience in radio broadcasting, and some limited experience in televising. Despite the fact that the arguments advanced in Australia in 1945 and 1946 paralleled the arguments advanced by people in the United Kingdom at the time of the proposal to inaugurate a written record of the proceedings of the House, the Australian people have now come to accept this system—radio broadcasting in particular.

I am not suggesting there is any great national outcry that proceedings of this House of Commons, the other place or the committees of either are essential for entertainment, amusement and the advancement of the knowledge of the people of Canada. What has been happening in the past is that by a gradual process which at times we were not able to perceive, the emphasis on Parliament has been slowly moving out of this chamber and into other places. I am not about to rehash the problems that Your Honour and others have had in connection with the difficulties of the electronic media. Radio and television reporters have attempted to obtain clarification and expansion from members of this House of statements made here and repeated outside.

• (9:50 p.m.)

The trouble is that this practice developed in the course of a year or so to a point at which in the minds of a great many Canadians there was some doubt whether what took place in this chamber, or immediately afterwards outside it, constituted in fact the proceedings of the House of Commons. It is probable that no one was at fault. The practice just grew; it just came about. The Chair finally came to a wise decision. All the decisions which the Chair makes are wise, of course, particularly since there is now no right of appeal against Your Honour's rulings. I did not mean that to be a backhanded compliment. The fact is we were in grave danger of losing the usefulness and advantages of this democratic institution of the House of Commons.

There will still, of course, have to be means by which members of this House can be requested, under suitable arrangements satisfactory to all concerned, to explain and amplify statements made here. I hope we will not then be met with the situation which arose when we attempted to raise in this House questions of privilege, or challenge statements made outside. When we tried to do this we were advised, and quite properly according to the precedents, that we were not able to proceed along those lines. I should like to think that having examined some of the statements made in the House and some of the statements of clarification made outside, the committee would find itself able to examine this question of privilege in relation to the connection between the two.

The other point I should like to make is this. Because of the diversity and size of our country we do not possess what is known as a national press. It is no one's fault. There is, of course, the Canadian Press, and there are a number of writers and commentators covering events on a national basis. But we tend to take a regional approach to events. Much of the press gives greatest prominence to matter which are of the greatest interest to particular cities or regions. This is natural, and it is obviously the case. I suggest this is why an increasing interest has developed in national television and radio coverage; it is because these media have instant access to a national audience, and because what was said or televised outside this chamber had more national significance than the articles which appeared in the press.

This is another reason for considering the advantages of continuing the practice in some form, since they may well outweigh the disadvantages. Indeed, in my view the advantages of tackling this problem along experimental lines do, indeed, outweigh the disadvantages. I hope sufficient hon. members will agree with me in this regard.

I said earlier that I would mention the situation in Australia and in New Zealand. I was particularly interested in a statement by the late Sir Gilbert Campion, the well-known

Clerk of the United Kingdom House, who had this to say on a visit to New Zealand in 1949:

> If one considers only the popular reaction, the experiment of broadcasting debates would seem to have justified itself. People have learned much more about the purposes and proceedings of Parliament. Some are shocked to find that the tone of a democratic assembly is not that of an areopagus or a Roman senate. Many have developed a live interest in the debates and both parties agree that discontinuance is unthinkable.

Another interesting comment was made by an Australian visiting New Zealand who happened to turn the radio onto the wavelength which covered the proceedings broadcast from the New Zealand legislature. His comment was the kind one would expect to hear. He said that the speeches might not have been of the highest quality, and there were probably mistakes in the syntax and in the English, but they had an agreeable element of spontaneity. The interruptions, the arguments and the questions were a spontaneous reflection of the people in the chamber who, in their turn, represented the people of the country as this man summed it up, "This house is the people of New Zealand with all their virtues, all their defects, all their warts."

I realize there will be a long and arduous period of experimentation before us, but in my view we cannot struggle against the fact that this is a medium which no one can escape, and one which offers advantages. Nevertheless, I think we should be most careful that whatever results will have its origin in a logical basis acceptable for a trial period to all of us. I hope the committee will undertake its task with this thought in mind and make its report in an objective way to face a good, freewheeling debate with, hopefully, a free vote at its conclusion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I have on occasion demonstrated an ability to compress a speech into a very few minutes, but I can hardly limit my remarks to 30 seconds. I should like to speak in support of this motion but there are a few comments I wish to make, so I propose that we call it ten o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, before the proceedings on the adjournment motion begin, may I confirm that on Wednesday we shall call as the first item of business the bill to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act, followed by second reading of the National Parks bill, after which we would return to the measure we have just been debating.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

HOUSING—1970 CONSTRUCTION TARGET FOR HOMES FOR ELDERLY AND THOSE ON LOW INCOMES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, right after the Christmas recess I reminded the minister in charge of housing that last year the federal government gave direct assistance under the National Housing Act to the building of some 20,000 dwellings for elderly and low-income people with families. I asked him what the target was for 1970. We were glad to have the suspense ended this afternoon when he answered that funds would be available to construct 35,000 housing units specifically for low-income families. Although this total is greater than last year's, it still falls far short of the need. In Toronto alone I am told there is a waiting list of 15,000 applicants, enough to take up almost half the number of units to be provided for all Canada.

Since the minister answered my question this afternoon, I want to do something rather unusual and ask him further questions so as to get a march on his next statement in the House. The hon. gentleman's statement raised fully as many questions as it answered. I am glad he promised to make a detailed statement soon, and I should like to draw his attention to some of the questions which people are still waiting to hear answered.

• (10.00 p.m.)

The first relates to my question this afternoon. Can the minister assure us that all these 35,000 new, low-income dwellings will have modern facilities for the recreational needs of the tenants of all ages, both inside and outside the housing units? If people with good incomes need space for play and other leisure activities, people with low incomes need this a great deal more. People with good incomes can get away and find the recreation, the space and places for other activities they require. People with low incomes are forced

to stay, and consequently their needs are very much greater. They have fewer advantages and their needs and the needs of the whole community by extension are greater.

My second question: When does the minister propose to announce the new rental scale for public housing which has been hanging fire for so long? To be an improvement over the existing one it needs to be based on net income, not gross income as at present. A single-parent mother, to mention only one type, needs to be able to deduct the cost of child care before the rent is calculated, and to be able to deduct other legitimate expenses. Otherwise there is no use whatsoever in expecting that such families can get off welfare and back into the living and working stream of the community.

A Canadian Welfare Council survey last year found that mothers on welfare across Canada, single-parent mothers with four children, to give one example, spent half their income on rent. That is out of all reason. A rent of that dimension leaves too little for the other needs of the family.

My third question: Is the minister giving consideration to a program of outright grants to enable low income homeowners to improve their older homes? These people simply cannot repay loans and the interest on them. There is no use in the minister saying we already have legislation to cover these people. The grants could be made returnable on the death of the owner and/or the sale of the house, but they must be grants and not loans.

My fourth question: The minister announced that the allocation for student housing is to be $45 million this year compared with $55 million last year. Does he really consider this 20 per cent drop a "modest decline" as he says? Faced with the need to repay student loans, and with the bleak prospect for summer jobs ahead, a good many students will be hard put to it to get the education they need and which Canada needs them to have.

All these people on low income, and many other types, need proper housing now. They need it so that they can support their families in modern homes with the attractions that keep families together. They need it so they can afford to go out and get the training and the jobs that will make them part of the community and will give them self-respect and the right to carry their share of the load. They need it to keep their homes in repair in order to live out their lives in comfort.

I trust that when the minister makes his promised further statement it will be such as to give these people hope based not on promises or on next year but on further proposals for this year such as I have suggested. It is all very well to talk about the war on inflation, but a war on inflation ought not to be carried to such lengths as to become a war on the poor by refusing to extend housing to the required amount. This is carrying the war to the most vulnerable part of the civilian population, those people on low incomes. That is not the place to wage a war on inflation. Let us wage it in those areas where the people can stand it and not in those areas where the people, unless we give them help will become greater burdens on the community. This will only add to our burdens instead of allowing them to carry their own share proudly and effectively.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take issue with the last remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). I think the statement which my colleague the minister in charge of housing made in the House this afternoon is a clear refutation of her charge that we are carrying on a war against inflation with the low-income or poverty groups.

As my colleague indicated, a total of $570 million out of CMHC's capital budget of $854 million has been reserved for the purpose of providing housing for low-income families and elderly persons. These funds will permit the corporation to arrange in 1970 for the construction of 35,000 housing units specifically for low-income families.

As hon. members know, during the 20 years prior to 1969, 82,000 homes for low income families were built in Canada. In 1969, in line with government policy, provision was made for 27,000 units of low-income housing in that year, a number that will be increased to not less than 35,000 units in 1970. The total allocation of capital funds for low-income housing in 1969 and 1970 at 62,000 units therefore represents 75 per cent of the previous 20 years' production, which is a clear indication that this government and the minister have very much in mind the needs of the low-income group. In addition, my colleague also mentioned that the direct lending activities of CMHC under section 40 will be devoted to the needs of families in the lower income bracket.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Referring to the later points raised by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, I may say that my colleague is very much aware of the need for providing recreational facilities in these low income housing areas. He has asked his colleagues for much greater flexibility in managing the budget and his responsibilities during the coming years. I think he will be making statements both on the subject of grants and rentals in weeks to come.

With respect to student housing, a matter raised by the hon. member, I would simply say that if one takes in broad context over recent years the amount of funds devoted to student housing, and relates that to what has been spent in the low-income area, one will find that on balance we are attempting to do now—in the area of low-income housing—that which we have done, not entirely but at least have attempted to do in the area of student housing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Champlain.

I am sorry I did not recognize him sooner, but he was not in his seat.

POST OFFICE—FINANCIAL POSITION FOLLOWING INCREASED RATES

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I thought three questions would be discussed this evening.

Here is the question I put to the Postmaster General: Have his decisions with regard to new postal rates and new working conditions for postal employees finally put the Canadian postal service on a profit-earning basis?

It will be recalled how protests greeted the increase from 5 to 6 cents in the postal rate for first class mail. It will also be recalled how all newspapers and magazines, especially weeklies and monthly publications, protested vehemently for being thus threatened with bankruptcy.

In fact, protests are still being raised. A number of magazines and weeklies which were already in a difficult position though acknowledgely excellent have disappeared or are bound to do so very soon.

[Mr. Kierans.]

Several trades and industries rely, for their publicity, on the efficiency of the postal service. What has happened since the day these decisions were made?

People are complaining. The delivery of second and third class mail is slow. In the urban districts, the fact that services are discontinued from Friday night on is bringing a lot of other services to a standstill.

Last year, I sent to my electors in La Tuque a notice calling them to a meeting. Imagine my surprise on discovering that I had arrived in La Tuque before my notice!

Where are all these changes leading to. Mr. Speaker? Has the volume of mail increased? And the number of money orders, of registered letters and other postal matter?

• (10.10 p.m.)

Should good service everywhere not be the foremost objective? Should some areas be deprived of postal service for a matter of earnings?

I am under the impression that the minister went the wrong way about it, but stubborn as any good Irishman, he may not be willing to admit it.

The minister should inform the House as soon as possible whether his department is moving ahead or losing ground. I know one can always juggle with figures. I do not want to be given just any figures. I wish to be provided with statistics I can compare with those of the 1967-68 financial year.

I am convinced that the Canadian postal service is losing a lot of money and I should like the minister to contradict me. I would be happy if he could.

All newspapers and magazines, all businesses and industries are striving hard to discover new means of distribution other than those of the post office.

I think that the postal service will become less and less economical, and, once more, further rate increases will be suggested.

Therefore, I ask the minister to tell us whether the decisions taken last year have been effective.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speak-

er, postal rates and increases in effect since 1968 were not intended to make ends meet in the Post Office Department nor to provide a surplus.

For the fiscal year 1969-70, the Post Office Department anticipates a deficit of about $75 million. It is obvious that such a deficit would have been a lot higher had the House not passed the postal rate increases suggested by the department.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, February 3, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Fourth report of Standing Committee on Transport and Communications—Mr. Turner (London East).

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

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—CONFLICTING ESTIMATES OF INCREASED REVENUES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether, in view of the fact that one of the basic calculations underlying the white paper on tax reform, namely, the federal government's estimate as to the amount of increased revenues that the white paper proposals would raise, has been challenged by the province of Ontario, the government is reconsidering its estimate, or is the government going to stick to the figure of $630 million as its estimate of the increased revenues which would result from the recommendations in the white paper?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have not looked into it, Mr. Speaker. It was brought to my attention, but the Minister of Finance is in Quebec meeting with the provincial finance ministers. It appears that the computers are not arriving at the same results, but certainly I will be discussing the matter with the minister when he returns.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Prime Minister assure the House that if the studies which the Prime Minister has indicated show that the government has underestimated the revenue yield from the white paper proposals it will immediately reconsider and alter the tax changes and tax increases proposed in the white paper?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Before the Prime Minister says it, I would suggest that the question is hypothetical.

Mr. Stanfield: Then I will ask the Prime Minister a question which is by no means hypothetical. In view of the immense confusion and disagreement that exists as to the amount of new federal revenue which would be produced by the white paper proposals—I am not referring only to the estimate prepared by Ontario but also to estimates made by private individuals—will the government now agree to publish the detailed research and background studies underlying the white paper conclusions, and particularly the estimate of increased revenue resulting from the proposals in the white paper?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the departmental officials and the minister will want to handle this, but obviously the computers in both centres are feeding out different results because the programming is different.

We have a model of the Canadian taxpayer who, incidentally, is a model taxpayer, and when we made our decisions on the white paper we made them in view of the results that we received from the computer. We were not using tax reform as a way to increase taxes surreptitiously. If in looking at the Ontario figures, it is established that in some way their model is better than ours it perhaps will be because the Ontario taxpayer is richer than the average Canadian. Perhaps there is some difference in calculation because of this.

I cannot tell the Leader of the Opposition how we will resolve this matter, but obviously if there is an informed estimate by the Ontario officials we will recheck our own figures.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. How is the model taxpayer feeling about this whole white paper approach?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): He feels you are wasting his time.

Inquiries of the Ministry

POLLUTION

PROJECTED SECOND TRIP OF "MANHATTAN" THROUGH NORTHWEST PASSAGE—IMPOSITION OF REGULATIONS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport regarding the announcement that the *Manhattan* is likely to make a second trip through the Northwest Passage. Has the minister been notified, either by the Humble Oil Company of Texas or the United States government, of this impending trip, and will his department be providing the pilot services and the ice-breaking escort required?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there has been no official request from either the Humble Oil Company or from any United States government agency. Like the hon. member, I only know what I read in the papers. I am assuming that the report is correct and that we will be getting such a request. If so, we will then decide whether we are in a position to comply with it, but at the moment I cannot say.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the minister's intention to impose any regulations upon the *Manhattan*, or upon any other vessel granted the right of innocent passage through the Northwest Passage, having regard to the possibility of pollution in the event of an accident? Have any such regulations been drafted, and will the *Manhattan* be subjected to those regulations?

Mr. Jamieson: Certainly the *Manhattan*, were she to make a second trip, would be subject to any regulations now in effect or to any that may be in effect at that time. I say the latter because, as I have indicated to hon. members, it is our intention to make changes in the Canada Shipping Act with regard to pollution. On the other hand, there may have to be some special regulations with regard to the *Manhattan*, but these would be more of a navigational nature because I understand there is no expectation that it will be carrying any pollutants on an experimental basis at this time.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the widespread concern about possible pollution in the north, can the minister assure the House that such regulations will be put into effect prior to the second trip of the *Manhattan*?

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, so far as the actual vessel, the *Manhattan*, is concerned, (a) we are not sure she will be making this second trip and (b), we are quite certain that if she does the trip will be experimental and she will not be carrying any cargo. In so far as legislation is concerned there will be two areas in which we will be moving, I think in a matter of weeks. One is in respect of pollution measures in the North and the other concerns the more general changes in the Canada Shipping Act having to do with shipping and pollution around our entire coastline.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a supplementary question. Would he obtain a copy of the third report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, send it to the Humble Oil Company and advise them that it substantially represents the views of the great majority of the people of Canada?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the report is already in their hands.

Mr. James E. McGrath (St. John's East): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will Canada be obliged to underwrite the costs of icebreaking services for any subsequent trips by the *Manhattan*?

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

[*Translation*]

TRADE

GLASS—EFFECTS OF IMPORTS ON CANADIAN INDUSTRY

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Is he aware that imports of sheet glass from Poland, Romania, East Germany, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia are likely to cause the closing down of two important plants in Montreal and Toronto?

Mr. Speaker: I think this question could be put on the order paper. The hon. member is asking the minister to tell him if he is aware of certain circumstances. I do not think the question, as worded, is admissible at this time.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, in view of the importance of the question, I should like, if I may, to rephrase it.

Could the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce tell the House whether or not his department was approached with the problem of the possible closing down of two sheet glass manufacturing plants, one in Montreal and the other in Toronto, because of the importance of sheet glass in certain countries such as Poland, Romania, East Germany and Czechoslovakia?

Hon. Jean Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the minister was not aware of this until now. He is now, and he is going to inquire into this matter.

[*English*]

GRAIN

WHEAT—DETERMINATION OF XCAN PRICES—ASSISTANCE TO NEW AGENCY

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Now that the government has decided to give assistance to the Wheat Board by having available a consortium of grain dealers and elevator companies in order to endeavour to recover the 11 per cent of international trade in the export of wheat that Canada has lost, will the minister state whether the prices at which the sales are to be made by these companies will be determined by the Wheat Board? If not, is the government returning to the policy of 1936 when, so far as prices were concerned, the plug was pulled?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the question is not too clear to me. If the right hon. member is referrring to the creation of the new company called XCAN created yesterday by the four co-operatives, we welcome this announcement. We are very pleased with it. I understand that XCAN is going to become an agent of the Wheat Board. We wish them luck and we wish us luck at the same time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I join in wishing them luck but with regard to prices can the minister say whether these will be determined by the Wheat Board rather than by grain dealers and grain storage companies to whom the price of wheat is of no special concern?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, as an agent of the Wheat Board they will have the same rights and privileges as other agents, including the services my department will be giving to them.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is also for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the announcement that the three western wheat pools and the United Grain Growers are jointly setting up an export agency, can the minister inform the House if they will receive any assistance from the government and what will be their relationship with the Canadian Wheat Board?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I understood this was the meaning of the previous question and I would consider that the same answer applies. I understand that the new group will be an agent of the board like any others and will benefit from the same advantages.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What advantages?

MOVEMENT BY RAILWAYS

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a related question for the minister who is answering for the Wheat Board. Are the railways meeting their commitments to move grain at a rate which will fill the terminals at the Lakehead well in advance of the opening of navigation?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this has already been indicated by the minister responsible, again yesterday by the chairman of the Wheat Board and was confirmed to me this morning.

While I am on my feet I might say that I had a telephone call from the Minister of Labour—his smile came through the telephone beautifully—who told me that agreement has been reached between the two parties in Vancouver, subject to ratification by the union members before Thursday.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Mackenzie.

Mr. Gleave: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is rising on a point of order?

Mr. Gleave: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I did not receive an answer to the question I directed to the minister in which I asked if this exporting agency was going to receive any assistance from the Canadian government.

Mr. Speaker: That, of course, is not a point of order, but I shall return to the hon. member in a moment. I understand he has a supplementary. For the moment the Chair recognizes the hon. member for Mackenzie.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TRADE

POSSIBILITY OF BUYING TRACTORS FROM SOVIET UNION

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Since the several Senators who visited the Soviet Union seem to have been authorized by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to promote trade between Canada and the Soviet Union, can the minister enlighten the House and the country about the possibilities of trade agreements between the Soviet Union and Canada and whether Russian tractors may be sold in this country, especially since United States tractor companies are not being too co-operative in reducing their prices?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, negotiations between Canada and the Soviet Union on the renewal of the trade agreement will begin shortly. In these negotiations it is obvious that all subjects of the type the hon. member has raised will be taken into consideration. We shall be talking about the future of Canadian exports to the Soviet Union and about Soviet Union exports to Canada. As the Minister of Agriculture has already indicated if other countries, if the Soviet Union for one, has some good tractors to sell to Canada, I am quite sure Canadian farmers will be very interested.

Mr. Korchinski: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister say whether in their travels the Senators approached the authorities of the Soviet Union about this specific matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think that question ought to be asked in the Senate instead of in the House.

GRAIN

WHEAT—ASSISTANCE TO XCAN

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I again ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether the government is giving any financial assistance to the new exporting agency, XCAN?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I have already said that to my knowledge the new agency would be an agent of the Canadian Wheat Board much like the other 30-odd agents the Wheat Board has. As such it would be entitled to benefit from the good services of the Wheat Board and of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce as well.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I hope this agency will be more successful than others have been.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a further supplementary question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. How do grain stocks in Lakehead terminals at the present time compare with levels at this time last year?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether this question should be asked during the question period.

Mr. Andras: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I implore hon. members to recognize that the two cities of Port Arthur and Fort William, formerly known as the Lakehead, have now been formally amalgamated and the proper name to describe them is Thunder Bay.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Prime Minister. Since there is great uncertainty among scientists regarding the effects of the greatly expanded tests which the United States government is planning to carry out in the near future at Amchitka Island, is the government of Canada planning to ask the United States government to put off these tests until it can satisfy itself that no ill effects will be suffered by the people of the west coast of Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to the answer given yesterday to a similar question by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Perhaps the hon. member will look up *Hansard*.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are we to take it that the government is perfectly willing to have these tests go ahead regardless of their ill effects on the citizens of the west coast of Canada? The Prime Minister nods his head, meaning no doubt that he is perfectly willing that this should be so.

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has his department or any other department of government received from the United States data on the results of the first tests at Amchitka from which we can judge whether or not the second proposed series of tests is desirable or otherwise from the Canadian point of view?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member; I am afraid I was not listening to him. I was listening to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings trying to smuggle a remark into the blues.

Mr. Anderson: Mr. Speaker, may I repeat my question. It was not directed to the Prime Minister but to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has the minister's department or any other department of government received from the United States data on the results of their first tests at Amchitka so that we can judge whether or not the second series of tests will be desirable or otherwise from Canada's standpoint?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of whether these reports were received, but I will be glad to take the member's supplementary question as notice.

IMMIGRATION

DEPORTATION OF JERRY MYRIC MIHM AND FAMILY—REQUEST FOR INTERVENTION

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In his absence last Wednesday I asked the Prime Minister a question arising out of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada that the deportation of Jerry Mihm, his wife and Canadian-born child should be carried out. Will the Prime Minister and the Minister take into consideration the possibility of letting the family stay in Canada in view of the great hardship that will follow their deportation to the United States?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): If I may answer the question, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member that following the announcement of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in this case, counsel for Mr. Mihm filed a formal motion with the Immigration Appeal Board for the reopening of the hearing and an appeal against the order for the deportation of the family. I understand that is under consideration at the present time. I think the hon. member understands that at this stage the matter is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Immigration Appeal Board.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that and I thank the minister for informing the House about the application for reconsideration. Can the minister assure the House that he will watch the progress of this case with great care and do everything possible to prevent Mr. Mihm, his wife and Canadian-born child from having to suffer the hardship of the father being in jail for a lengthy period?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly watch the progress of the case and do anything within my power, but I think it should be made clear that under the law passed by Parliament the minister and the department are powerless at this stage. The outcome depends upon a decision of the board. The matter is now before the board and until a decision as to a rehearing is made I think further comment from me would be inappropriate.

Mr. Lewis: I have a further supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. member has already had two supplementaries on the same question.

Mr. Lewis: One, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps we should go on to another subject. The hon. member for York West.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Don't let us down.

Mr. Hees: Let's see if you really mean all those things you have been saying.

Mr. Givens: I always mean what I say.

HOUSING

LOCATIONS OF NEW URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS

Mr. Philip G. Givens (York West): I wish to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: That is not the guy you are after.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Givens: Is the minister now in a position to reveal the locations of the 12 new urban renewal projects he referred to in his statement last December?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, to quiet the catcalls of the opposition may I say this question was put to me in December by the hon. member for Hamilton West. We offered to the provincial ministers concerned participation in 12 schemes, one in St. John's, Newfoundland, one in Moncton, one in Montreal, two in Quebec city, one in Cornwall, three in Toronto, two in Winnipeg and one in Kamsack. In addition hon. members will recall that there were six schemes under negotiation from August. In some cases the provincial ministers have indicated a desire to reallocate part of these funds to other schemes and we are receptive to such suggestions. These are the 12 schemes to which I referred.

ALLOCATION OF MONEY FOR EXPERIMENTAL PROJECTS AND RENT SUPPLEMENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister contemplate the use of any of the $200 million for new or revised techniques to which he referred to establish federal experimental housing projects?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, that sort of approach will be most welcomed.

Mr. Orlikow: A supplementary question. Is the minister prepared to use any of the $200 million for new approaches for the purpose of rent supplement programs for low-income earners?

Mr. Andras: The whole question of the rent-to-income scale in public housing is now receiving close examination. We now have the final recommendations of all the provinces—the last was received a few weeks ago—and I hope to be in a position to announce shortly to provincial ministers some ideas for an adjustment of the rent-to-income scale.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Can the minister advise the House when the other areas which were under consideration for urban renewal will be reconsidered?

Mr. Andras: I have nothing to add to the statement I made in December in that regard.

[Mr. Hees.]

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON AVAILABILITY OF MORTGAGE MONEY

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): In light of recent reports that inflation and the government's attempt to curb it through a tight money policy have combined to reduce seriously the amount of mortgage money available in Canada through insurance companies, would the minister be prepared to make a statement on motions as soon as he can regarding this very serious situation, with some reference to pension funds and building societies?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): We are encouraging through a specific program of contact the investment of pension funds in the mortgage field—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret I must interrupt the minister but the question was simply whether a statement would be made. A statement cannot be made at this time.

FUNDS FOR PURCHASE OF OLDER HOMES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Having regard to the unexplained absence of *Hansard,* or the non-delivery of *Hansard*—

An hon. Member: It is here.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): —would the minister indicate, in verification of his statement made in the House yesterday, whether any provision has been made for the continuation or addition of funds for the financing of the purchase of older homes, a move which would also be of great assistance in the housing of those in the lower income group?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): I think I answered that question in a reply I gave yesterday. But the answer is yes, we are continuing the program of loans for the purchase and rehabilitation of existing homes.

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether hon. members do not feel we should now pass on to another subject. We have had a number of supplementaries on this question. We might return to the subject after other questions have been dealt with.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

INVITATION TO PRIME MINISTER TO VISIT SIX NATIONS RESERVE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. Will

the Prime Minister accept the invitation extended to him by the Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy to visit the reservation at Brantford and consult with the Indians in connection with treaty rights and other matters which concern the confederacy?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have no exact recollection of such an invitation, Mr. Speaker. I did correspond with the secretary, I believe, of the Six Nations Confederacy, but as I recall it this correspondence had to do with other types of representations and my answer was no.

Mr. Nesbitt: Would the Prime Minister check with his office to ascertain whether the invitation to which I referred in my question was not extended to him this morning or last evening? An invitation was also extended to His Excellency the Governor General.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

ABOLITION OF JOINT PROGRAMS—PAYMENT OF FISCAL EQUIVALENT TO PROVINCES

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Is the government considering terminating cost-sharing programs and transferring the corresponding tax funds to the provinces, as was suggested yesterday in Quebec City?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know who suggested that in Quebec City yesterday but as early as 1966 Mr. Pearson's government, through the then Minister of Finance (Mr. Sharp), put forward a similar proposal which, as you know, was accepted by one province and not by the others.

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—INCREASE IN TRUCKING RATES BY QUEBEC TRANSPORTATION BOARD—INCREASE IN GLASS CONTAINER PRICES

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, last week I undertook to provide an answer to a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition about increases in trucking rates. This situation is a complex one because it involves matters of provincial administration which are handled differently in different provinces. The government will be exploring appropriate ways to go into it in light of these differences in provincial practices and laws and in light of what is disclosed in the information it has requested as to the basis upon which the Quebec board authorized the increases in question.

I should like to take this opportunity to inform the House about something in which I am sure the Leader of the Opposition and all other members will be interested. It concerns the action taken by the government with regard to increases in prices proposed by another industry, that of manufacturing glass containers. Discussions have been held with the major manufacturers of glass containers concerning the importance of avoiding major discretionary price increases while the Prices and Incomes Commission is working to secure the support of the business community for a price restraint program.

Some hon. Members: Order!

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to interrupt the minister. It seems the statement he is making now is of the type which is normally made on motions.

Mr. Gray: I wonder if I could have your indulgence, Mr. Speaker; since I have reached the last couple of words and the House may be wondering what I am leading up to.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair was wondering too. Perhaps, with the consent of the House, the minister might be allowed to complete his statement.

Mr. Gray: As a consequence of these discussions the two largest manufacturers of glass containers in Canada, Consumer Glass and Dominion Glass, have agreed to suspend until March 1 price increases announced last December.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the information about glass, but we shall not allow it to distract us from the trucking problem. Am I correct in assuming from the minister's answer that the government does not propose to take any action at all with regard to the increase in trucking rates?

Mr. Speaker: I have some doubts as to the form of the question. I would think it was somewhat argumentative.

Mr. Stanfield: I am seeking clarification, Mr. Speaker. In my original formulation of the question I asked whether the government proposed to take any initiative with regard to

this matter. I am simply asking the minister now whether the government does intend to take any such initiative.

Mr. Gray: The initiative will depend on the result of our assessment of the information we have sought from the Quebec board as to the basis on which they granted an increase, and on the results of our analysis of the different regulatory practices followed by the provincial governments. These are questions about which we are concerned, and a decision will be reached in the light of the information we receive.

Mr. Stanfield: One further question: is the government fighting inflation in 1970 or in 1980?

INDIAN AFFAIRS

LEASE OF CAUGHNAWAGA LAND AS GARBAGE DUMP—GLENDON COLLEGE REPORT

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I should like to direct a question to my favourite minister, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Has the hon. gentleman received a complaint within the last few days about the process in dealing with the lease of Indian reserve land at Caughnawaga as a garbage dump and, if so, does he intend to conduct an inquiry?

Would the minister also take the opportunity to deal with a question I posed to him last week about a report from Glendon College?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased to answer the hon. member. I do not know anything about the new land rental agreement at Caughnawaga. I have not received any information. I shall investigate and gladly report to the hon. member if need be.

As to the Glendon College report, it was prepared by the students. It deals with the attitude of white people towards the Indians and we are aware of it. The report clearly indicates that some of the attitudes of white people should be changed. We always do our best to help the Canadian people better understand our Indian brothers.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I am familiar with what the report contains. The question I posed to the minister through his Parliamentary Secretary a few days ago was whether the minister would be prepared to make a statement on motions about government action with respect to the findings and recommendations in that report.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary to make a statement on the matter. The government policy as regards the attitude to be adopted by people generally towards Canadian Indians is well known and time and again I have asked people to treat the Indians in a more humane way. It is my intention to continue making such appeals.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*English*]

AIR TRANSPORT

CRASH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—EQUIPMENT OF PLANE

Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence. Was the aircraft that is missing in southern British Columbia and currently the subject of search and rescue operations equipped with a crash position indicator?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some serious doubts as to the form of the question asked by the hon. member. The hon. member is asking for information about a situation which is behind us. Perhaps he might formulate his inquiry in another manner.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could ask a question of the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that approximately 50 aircraft have been missing in a small area in southern British Columbia in the last 10 years, all of which have been the subject of search and rescue operations, what progress is the department making in respect of the proposal to have regulations requiring such aircraft to be equipped with crash position indicators?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): A very good question, Mr. Speaker. I will try to home in on the answer and see whether I can find out for the hon. member in a couple of days.

HARBOURS

GENERAL CARGO FLOW—REQUEST FOR EXAMINATION AND REPORT

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I have given the Min-

ister of Transport written notice of this question which is urgent in respect of at least several Canadian ports. Will the minister ask the National Harbours Board to examine the flow of general cargo, apart from containerized cargoes, through ports operated by the board in light of changes in January and cuts in employment at certain ports? Will he cause the findings and any recommendations to be made available to the House, perhaps on motions?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to do that.

GRAIN

COMPOSITION OF DELEGATION TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board is in London and is reportedly discussing the grading of grain, among other matters, with British importers, will the Minister of Agriculture inform the House whether there are representatives of the Board of Grain Commissioners or the Department of Agriculture with the delegation?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there are members of the Board of Grain Commissioners with this delegation, but I believe there are three or four members of the Canadian Wheat Board.

AIR TRANSPORT

CTC DECISION RESPECTING PRAIRIE SERVICES

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the hon. gentleman's reputation for fairness, will he review the recent decision of the Air Transport Committee respecting class 1 regional air services on the Prairies, particularly with a view to annulling the decision to suspend services into western Manitoba?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware that there was a suspension of service. I will certainly take a look at the situation and if it is a matter which could be the subject of appeal to me presumably somebody will appeal it and I will look at it in that form.

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

MONTREAL—EFFECT OF WORK-TO-RULE ACTION OF G. LAPALME INC. EMPLOYEES

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications.

As a result of the apparent refusal of the department to renew the mail delivery contracts of G. Lapalme Inc., of Montreal, the employees of that company are working to rule.

I would like to know whether the minister has taken the necessary measures to restore order and to ensure satisfactory mail delivery and whether the employees of G. Lapalme Inc. will be hired by other companies which have secured contracts from March 31?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, it is true that G. Lapalme Inc. is contractually bound with the department to collect mail and carry it to relay boxes, but it appears that the slowness is due to the recent contracts awarded for mail transportation in the Montreal area and also for highway services. Unfortunately, the employer, G. Lapalme Inc., did not put in a tender and this has obviously put his employees in a position of insecurity.

As usual, we have called for tenders in all cities of the country and we have since advised the contractor and the unions, four or five months ago—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sorry but I have to interrupt the minister. I believe his answer should be shorter and I ask him to be as brief as possible in answering the specific question of the hon. member.

Mr. Kierans: To give a direct answer to the hon. member for Charlevoix, Mr. Speaker, the Post Office and Communications Department does all it can to settle the situation in Montreal and, naturally, the Lapalme company and its employees are asked to get back to work according to the terms of their contract.

Mr. Asselin: I have a supplementary question for the minister, Mr. Speaker.

Being aware that troubles of this kind occurred last year in Montreal, can the minister assure the House that he will offer his good services to the G. Lapalme Inc., in order that mail delivery will be made regularly in Montreal, even if a strike breaks out—

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that the supplementary question is hypothetical.

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

Already, the employees of G. Lapalme Inc., who are delivering the mail in Montreal, have started to work to rule and if they should continue, the patrons are the ones who will suffer. What I want to know is whether the minister will take whatever measures are necessary to ensure delivery of the mail?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made representations. He must assume that the minister has taken note of them.

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

LOCATION OF NEW FACILITY AT TORONTO

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport. Is he now in a position to name the location of the airport which will be an auxiliary to the Malton airport and, if not, when does he expect to make such an announcement?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I am not in a position yet to name it, primarily because of the hazards or risks of land speculation if there were a premature announcement. We are now examining the possibility of maximum disclosure and I should hope to be able to indicate this within a week or ten days following discussion with the Metro council and the council of the city of Toronto.

GRAIN

REQUEST FOR REPORT ON BOOTLEGGING IN PEACE RIVER AREA OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board I should like to direct this question to the minister answering for him today. Is a progress report available on investigations currently being conducted by inspectors of the Canadian Wheat Board in the Peace River area of British Columbia on the effect bootlegging of grain has on the local economy?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I will try to find out the results of the investigations that were held.

[Mr. Asselin.]

AGRICULTURE

ENLARGING OF BARBER COMMISSION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, in view of the startling charges contained in the Barber report regarding farm machinery prices, will the Minister of Agriculture indicate whether the government plans to enlarge this inquiry to include other major agricultural input costs and specifically agrochemicals of all kinds?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member is asking whether we should have further inquiries, perhaps I should say I think we ought to investigate thoroughly the actions we can take respecting farm equipment, particularly tractors and combines, in view of Dr. Barber's report.

POLLUTION

EFFECT OF CONVERSION TO SMOKELESS AIRPLANE ENGINES

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, in view of the report that Air Canada and Canadian Pacific Airlines are preparing to convert to smokeless engines during the next two years, and that it is possible the new burners could emit even more noxious and damaging fumes, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether his department has done any research on this matter or whether research is under way, and whether the department has full information on the results which would occur from such a change? If no information is available, will this be checked out by the department responsible?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question should be placed on the Order Paper.

PUBLIC SERVICE

FREEDOM OF SENIOR EMPLOYEES TO AIR PERSONAL VIEWS ON POLICY

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, in view of the Prime Minister's answer to me yesterday that it is now government policy to permit senior public servants to make public their personal views on matters of public policy, when does he intend to call a spade a spade and announce his preference and intent to implement a presidential system in this country?

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

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

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: You can groan all you want. I am rising on a serious point of order which I do not do lightly today or on any other day. There may be some aspects of the Prime Minister's conduct in respect of United States takeovers that we cannot debate in this House, but as far as the business of this House and this country is concerned, surely there comes a time when we should start to debate some aspects of this procedure.

We have heard for the first time under this Prime Minister the interesting doctrine that cabinet ministers can express individual viewpoints on matters of government policy until they become government policy. Perhaps no one took exception to that, but it was a new practice. But as a result of the Prime Minister's answer to my question yesterday he is defining for the first time a most fantastic doctrine of parliamentary business.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is making a speech. I fail to see how this is a point of order, but if he has one he should make it as soon as possible.

Mr. Nowlan: I was coming to the summation of my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Perrault: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: I am sure the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour never heard this type of doctrine enunciated in British Columbia when he sat opposite the then Premier of British Columbia. My point of order is that it may be one thing for the Prime Minister to let his cabinet ministers give their viewpoints on public policy but I suggest it becomes quite another matter if senior public servants are to be allowed to give their personal viewpoints on matters under government study.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If that is the hon. member's point of order, I would have to rule that there is no point or order. It is obviously a question of debate. The hon. member may have a good point to make in connection with a debate on that subject, but I have to rule that this is not a point of order on which the Chair should be called to rule at this time. Orders of the day.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, if it is not a point of order, then I think it becomes a question of privilege involving what members of the House, be they on the government side or on the opposition side, have to say either with regard to the third report of the B and B Commission, the white paper on taxation or any other government policy which affects all members, and how we are to conduct ourselves in the House in face of this new doctrine according to which senior federal public servants can say one thing and cabinet ministers can say another. How do we come to grips with any issues in the country when we have this fantastic, academic, theoretical display of viewpoints?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Orders of the day. Is the Prime Minister rising on a point of order?

Mr. Trudeau: I wish to correct an error in *Hansard* which has just been brought to my attention.

Mr. Speaker: This can be done by unanimous consent of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister does not have the consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

An hon. Member: This is in accordance with our parliamentary system.

Mr. Trudeau: That is how you get a presidential system.

An hon. Member: Macdonald has to go.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe there was an agreement among party representatives as to the possibility of limiting speeches in today's debate to 15 minutes, apart from the mover of the motion and the government member replying thereto. If I am correct that this was agreed to, I wonder if it could be made an order for the day.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As I understood it, in addition to the mover of the motion and the government respondent, representatives of each of the two other parties would be allowed more time. Subject to that, other hon. members taking part in the debate would be limited to 15 minutes. We are certainly agreeable to that.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed? If hon. members do not agree they should indicate so. It is

very difficult for the Chair to guess whether there are yeas or nays. Is there unanimous agreement?

[*Translation*]

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

In connection with the point of order raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I wish to ask the President of the Privy Council if the agreement applies only to today's debate or if it will serve as a precedent with regard to the other days allotted for opposition motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): First I should make it clear that the suggestion was not my own, but I am willing to accede to it. I understand that this rule is to apply to this debate only and in the case of further debates it would be subject to a decision as to whether this might be desirable.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered. Orders of the day.

• (3:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—FAILURE TO CO-ORDINATE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND TO REFER ISSUE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East) moved:

That this House condemns the government's failure to co-ordinate its regional development policies under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion with other government activities, and its failure to bring in an appropriate reference to place this issue before the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this motion is brought forward today out of the sense of frustration that we have experienced since this session started; first, our frustration in trying to receive information from the government regarding their regional development policies and regarding the various development programs that are in operation under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and second, our utter frustration over our unsuccessful attempts to have a meeting of the Standing Committee on Regional Development convened.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Notwithstanding the fact that we are now well into the session, and that the members of the Standing Committee on Regional Development, which is supposedly the committee of this House charged with the responsibilities that come under the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), have been appointed since the first day of the session, the government—and we can only believe it is the government that has this responsibility—has failed to convene an organizational meeting of this committee for the purpose of electing a chairman and a vice chairman. As a consequence of that, we have been frustrated in our attempts to bring before Parliament what we feel to be one of the most serious problems facing the country today, namely that of regional development, and also what we believe to be the government's failure to this date to deal with that problem adequately. So, we use this device in the hope that perhaps the minister, whom I am glad to see in his place and whom I hope to see on his feet today, will get the message from what I have to say and from the remarks of other hon. members during the course of this debate.

The aim of regional development is not a new one to this country. As a matter of fact, it is as old as confederation, but certainly since that time we have had a series of new programs. We have had revised programs and replaced programs, all supposedly to be the panacea to deal with the problem of regional development. But, Mr. Speaker, we still have regional disparities in this country. We still have the consequences of regional disparity notwithstanding grandiose attempts by the government and the minister, notwithstanding what has been said by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the promises he made to the country during the course of the last election campaign.

In 1961, we saw the beginning of the ARDA program, a program designed at that time to improve land use in the poorer rural areas of Canada, and hence designed to upgrade the economies of these areas. Then, in 1968 the original ARDA program was replaced by what became known as the FRED program, the Fund for Rural Economic Development, which was to provide money for other purposes as well as land use improvement, which was to provide for long-range planning of rural development, with consultation to take place between the federal and provincial governments. We know what happened to poor FRED. Poor FRED is dead.

In the meantime, the Area Development Incentives Program was begun with a view to encouraging industrial development. Under this program, started with such great promise in 1963, special areas were designated because of their high levels of unemployment, and firms willing to establish in these special areas were given concessions or grants by the government. We all know what happened to ADIA.

These were the national programs, but there were also special programs such as the Atlantic Development Board, which was started in 1962 and which recognized the special needs of the area known as the Atlantic provinces. In its short history, the Atlantic Development Board certainly fulfilled many of its expectations. It did great things in the four Atlantic provinces. It took on the responsibility for the over-all economic development in the region and for the stimulation of new regional programs. It made special aid available to the provinces for highway construction and for power development, all designed to make this traditionally backward area of the country more attractive to industry. Mr. Speaker, we know what happened to the Atlantic Development Board.

By 1968 we had a hodgepodge of government programs, some of them in conflict with the others, all with the general aim of improving the poorer regions of the country, but we had little or no co-ordination between them. For example, ARDA was first administered by the Department of Agriculture and then it went to the Department of Forestry. The Area Development Agency, which was responsible for industrial incentives, was under the Department of Industry. The Atlantic Development Board passed through different hands several times.

The result was administrative chaos. But also the result was one of continuing hardship for the people of the regionally disadvantaged areas who had been led to believe, by the introduction of these programs, that a new day had arrived. The promise of these various programs, which are now supposed to be co-ordinated under the minister, has never been fulfilled, perhaps with the exception of the Atlantic Development Board and it died before it had a chance to implement its program fully.

By the summer of 1969 it was obvious that something would have to be done to bring some order into the whole area. Now, we have the new Department of Regional Economic Expansion, which brings together all of these various programs dealing with regional disparity, and indeed which is charged by Parliament with co-ordinating them.

The minister in charge of this department—this point was made during the course of the debate setting up the department, and it is well to repeat it now—was vested by Parliament with enormous powers, powers that in my view no other minister of the Crown has ever had in peacetime. He was authorized, on his own initiative and on his own authority, to designate areas which he felt were in need of special assistance to improve the economic opportunities of their residents. He could virtually do anything which he felt would improve the economic conditions within these areas. He could make grants to provincial governments. He could make provision whereby provincial services could be expanded. He could make loans. He could even make outright grants to firms planning to locate in the areas. He could secure the co-operation of a special body to undertake development projects in an area. Hon. members who follow me in this debate will be making special reference to what has been taking place in the province of Prince Edward Island since the minister became responsible for regional development.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, the minister was supposed to co-ordinate all the programs of all of the other federal departments which would have some influence on the area of regional development and regional incentives. Those of us who had doubts about the advisability of Parliament granting such vast power to one minister could draw some consolation from the thought that the minister was genuine and enthusiastic in his intent. Consequently, we could expect that the power which Parliament had entrusted to him would be used in a very fast and very dramatic way, and that by virtue of these powers he would be able to deal with some of the glaring examples of regional disparity without going through a great deal of bureaucratic red tape. That is what Parliament intended at that time.

Unhappily for us, and in particular more unhappily for those people who live in the regionally disadvantaged areas, we now have the feeling that all isn't well with the government's regional development efforts.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: All we had to do was look around. I am glad to see the minister applauding my remarks, and I hope he will

shed a little more light on the subject than we have been able to get from him since this session started. We know that all is not well. Conditions in the weaker spots of Canada's economy are not even showing a slow improvement, are not even showing as much improvement as the minister would like us to believe. In one of his official releases last November, the minister boasted that the federal government's regional development program was creating new employment four times as fast as it did in 1968.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I can only say that we must have four times as much unemployment as we did in 1968 if we are to accept that statement because, according to the minister, the grants made so far for 1969 would create 17,938 new jobs. Where are these new jobs that the minister spoke about so glowingly in one of his press releases last fall? The latest unemployment figures from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics show that in the Atlantic provinces, where the minister claims 9,000 new jobs have been created, unemployment rates have not changed from last year. If anything they are worse at this moment. I know they are worse in the province of Newfoundland. In the province of Quebec the minister claims, in the same press release, to have created 5,000 new jobs. For the rest of the country the claims are too insignificant to mention.

When I asked the minister for further information about these new jobs I was informed, and these are the minister's own words, "that some would be created in 1969, some would not appear until 1970 and some would not appear until 1971."

An hon. Member: Some would not appear at all.

Mr. McGrath: And perhaps, as the hon. member suggests, some would not appear at all. To unemployed people in the depressed areas of this country, this does not appear as a very great effort.

What are the achievements for a minister who has been given so much power by Parliament? Nearly 18,000 new jobs have been created over a period of three years. That would not even solve the unemployment situation in the eastern area of Newfoundland. The real problem is not related to what we read in the minister's press releases because these can be examined and scrutinized; the real problem in this country today is that, except for the minister and his deputy, Mr. Kent, nobody in this Parliament and consequently nobody in the country knows what is happening.

Mr. Stanfield: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: I think it is fair to say that the extent of the minister's power under the new legislation is only exceeded by the extent of the secrecy surrounding his activities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: It has only been through the efforts of hon. members on this side of the House that the country knows anything about the new department's operations. It was our party which insisted that an amendment be made to the Regional Development Incentives Act to require the minister to report monthly to Parliament. It is because of this that we now have the information concerning 17 of the 278 grants referred to by the minister in the press release in which the creation of new jobs was glowingly reported. Of the remaining 261 grants made under the Area Development Incentives legislation, Parliament and the country know nothing. Perhaps we may know a little more after we hear from the minister today, if in fact we do hear from him.

We are equally in the dark concerning the signing of federal-provincial agreements under the present legislation. Of course, we hear all kinds of rumours, statements made by provincial premiers, provincial cabinet ministers and provincial politicians. Apparently they have information which Parliament is denied. For example, the Premier of Newfoundland has said, in superlatives that only he can use, that a great one-year plan will be signed by his province and the federal government on April 1 of this year.

An hon. Member: Is he still Premier?

Mr. McGrath: Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that April 1 is an appropriate date for the signing of such an agreement. The premier has also suggested that he is going to sign a great five-year agreement in July of this year. We hear little about that from the minister—as a matter of fact we hear nothing about it from the minister, no official announcement whatsoever; nothing. He will not even reply to questions, either orally or on the Order Paper, so we must be content with reading what provincial politicians have to say in the daily press.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we should refer to the Atlantic Advisory Council, the foster child of

the Atlantic Development Board—one could almost call it the illegitimate child. As a matter of fact if I were in Newfoundland I would say bastard child, but since I am not I can only say the illegitimate child of the Atlantic Development Board. In keeping with this government's policy of not telling Parliament anything, we know nothing about this new council other than the fact that it did meet in Saint John, New Brunswick, with the minister and his deputy. Some mention was made of the fact that the Atlantic Advisory Council was now concerning itself with regional development strategy.

Regional development strategy—what an excuse for inaction, Mr. Speaker! What a lame excuse for inaction in this area where unemployment will reach crisis proportions by March of this year. Surely, the members of that council must be aware that the Atlantic Development Board made the same statement when it was set up in 1962, but it was not given a chance to devise development strategy for the region. Surely, it is not too much to expect that, after almost ten years, there would be some over-all plan for the region. We know there is not, and we know that apart from what is taking place in Prince Edward Island, there is no strategy for the Atlantic provinces.

On January 19 last, the minister and five of his cabinet colleagues met with the Premier of Manitoba to discuss economic development. What official report did we get of this meeting? The report referred to, "General discussions to see how the two governments could best work together in the area." That is all we got; just that simple phrase. The consultations with Indian groups and provincial governments before the introduction of the new Indian policy were also kept secret. This secrecy was never intended by Parliament when the new legislation was passed but it now leaves the minister free to do whatever he wants. It makes him the most powerful man in Canada, the reigning czar of Canada. This concerns us, Mr. Speaker, and since this session started we have been pressing for a meeting of the regional development committee. We hope the minister will shed some light on exactly what is taking place.

We have seen this pattern emerge before. The designation of regions for industrial incentives under the Regional Development Incentives Act was also carried out in complete secrecy, "in consultation with the provinces". I would like to know the definition of the term "province" used in that context. Who else is concerned other than provincial governments? Because of the provincial consultations, the minister said, the government cannot discuss why some areas, such as Cornwall for example, are not designated despite evident and pressing need.

• (3:20 p.m.)

At the same time we know that one provincial government, Alberta, is loudly disputing the federal government's story concerning what went on during the discussions. It seems that we are witnessing a great charade; we are the unwitting participants in this game the minister is playing. The ministers go from one end of the country to the other holding consultations which are so confidential and so secret that we hear nothing about them. The deputy minister, Mr. Kent, is sent to these consultations, but no communiques are issued, no reports are made and the House is not informed. The ministers return to Ottawa and do what they decided to do before they left for these consultations. This is this government's operational definition of participatory democracy. You hold consultations, say nothing about them and then do exactly what you intended to do before you began those consultations. That is the government's version of participatory democracy.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion is going even farther. He, too, is determined to bypass parliamentary scrutiny. Questions on the Order Paper go unanswered; yet the minister is always very concerned to protect the interest of companies which are to receive capital grants. He seems less concerned about protecting the interest of the Canadian taxpayer. That is why we are here.

Most flagrant of all, in the view of some hon. members here, has been the minister's persistent refusal to convene the Standing Committee on Regional Development. This important committee has not met since the beginning of the session. Actually, it has not met since last June. Last spring, the committee set out on a tour of the country to look at the minister's great program in operation. We got only as far as the prairie provinces. The tour was cut short; the rest of it was pre-empted, and quite justly so, because we had to deal with legislation to set up the new department. That should not provide an excuse for preventing the committee fulfilling its obligation to visit other areas of the country, especially eastern Quebec and the Maritime provinces. But, no; the minister does not want the committee to meet, let alone go on the road, because he knows the committee will

discover that absolutely nothing has been happening.

He knows, for example, that if the committee were to go to eastern Quebec, where the unemployment rate is rising steadily, it would discover exactly what has been done—nothing. He knows if the committee were to go to my province, Newfoundland, it would report to Parliament exactly what the minister has been doing about the problems of the area—Nothing.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Is the hon. member quite sure we have done nothing?

Mr. McGrath: He knows that if the committee were to visit Belle Isle, Parliament would soon know that nothing has been done to remedy the ills of this area that have been crying for attention. It is for these reasons that the minister does not want the committee to meet. I can understand why the minister does not want the committee to visit Cape Breton. He does not want problems connected with the Cape Breton Development Corporation, which have been alluded to in parliament by my colleague, the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir) and other hon. members from that area, to be brought to the committee's attention because it will see exactly what has been done about them—nothing.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): The minister does not even know what has been happening in the area.

Mr. McGrath: On four different occasions, we have called on the government to convene a meeting of this committee, and these are all recorded in *Hansard*. On December 1, there was a motion under Standing Order 43 asking that the Standing Committee on Regional Development be convened. On another occasion, there was a motion proposed by my colleague, the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk) under Standing Order 43 to convene this committee in order that it might deal with the closing down of the Newstart program in his constituency. The minister gave a solemn undertaking before the Christmas recess that the committee would be convened. He said it would be convenient to convene a committee meeting in January. We have now reached February 3rd, and the committee still has not met.

No government makes a secret of its successes and I submit that the foregoing facts alluded to, coupled with the very skimpy information we have, is strong evidence that the regional development policies of this government and this minister have been a total failure.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, may I say that I welcome the opportunity that has been afforded us by the motion proposed by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) to deal with this entire subject. The members of this party have been as frustrated as the hon. member for St. John's East has been in trying to obtain information about the government's regional development program. We have been frustrated also because of the failure to convene a meeting of the regional development committee. This failure, I think, reflects on the government.

Just before ending his remarks, the hon. member for St. John's East said that the minister does not want the committee to travel around the country, and to eastern Quebec and the Maritimes in particular, because it will discover how little has been done. I am very happy he alluded to that situation. I, and other members of my party, will mention a number of areas of endeavour that we think should receive immediate priority and consideration from the government. Regional development, since the 1968 federal election, should have been an aspect of government activity meriting high priority. Many people in this country were happy to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) say during his election campaign that as soon as possible economic disparities, regional disparities and economic inequities existing in this country would be removed and corrected. Those people were sadly disappointed because so little has been done. It appears to me that little is being planned for the future in this area.

You know, Mr. Speaker, in the last year and a half we have heard much about problems of Canadian unity, separatism and alienation. There is real talk of separatism. In western Canada, people who feel alienated from the central government in Ottawa are beginning to talk of separating. The main reason for their attitude in my opinion is economic alienation, the alienation of these people from the mainstream of Canadian life. Many of these people are unemployed or working for wages which are insufficient to support the standard they are entitled to in a country as rich as Canada. These people are frustrated. Unless we bring about social and economic changes in many regions of Canada

suffering from inequities and unless all regions of Canada can be equal partners in confederation, no one can say that this country will stay together for the next 100 years.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Our party has long said that present regional inequities in Canada are intolerable and that we must upgrade the living standards of the people of some regions. Since the 1920's, the gap between the "haves" and "have-nots" in Canada has not narrowed. This cannot be tolerated in a country with the riches and know-how we have. We cannot afford to perpetuate the differences of wealth existing in various regions of the country and the situation in which a man's fate or income is determined more on the basis of where he lives than on the basis of his ambition or ability. Often the region in which he lives is a very dominant factor in deciding his opportunities for employment, the kind of education his children will receive and the future of his family. There are many examples of this. What is the result? The result is that the skills of many Canadians are not developed. In many cases, the skills they do have are not used to their fullest potential. These people do not have an opportunity to explore to the fullest what they wish to explore and to do what they wish to do.

Speaking in harsh economic terms, this lack of development is very costly to the country as a whole. According to economic predictions, hundreds of millions of dollars are lost every year because people are not given the opportunities they would like to have in various regions of the country. Underdeveloped regions of Canada are caught in a vicious circle. I am sure many members who speak this afternoon will mention many of these facts. We see that the underdeveloped and depressed regions are suffering from low incomes, unemployment and a low amount of capital to create new jobs. As a result, there is low productivity in these areas. This leads to a lower level of education, poor health and welfare services and a lower standard of living.

There are many ramifications to this problem. This is another reason why we cannot sit back. We must start exploring and initiating new ideas and programs in the whole area of regional economic development. In my own province of Saskatchewan, many of these things are very true. I know that there is a continual migration of young people from the rural areas to the cities, as well as from the poorer areas to the richer areas of Canada. These are the areas in which there are opportunities for people with skills and university educations. This only complicates and worsens conditions in some of the economically depressed areas of Canada.

Last year, the Economic Council of Canada presented its fifth annual review. It dealt with poverty in this country and I think opened the eyes of many people to the fact that there was poverty in Canada and that something had to be done about it. I wish to read a short extract from the report of the Economic Council on the problem of poverty:

> Poverty in Canada is real. Its numbers are not in the thousands, but millions. There is more of it than our society can tolerate, more than our economy can afford, and far more than existing measures and efforts 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.

We must realize the significance of this poverty both in rural and urban Canada. I do not want to suggest that the Department of Regional, Economic Expansion is the only government department that should be fighting poverty. It isn't. Poverty is a many-headed beast. It must be attacked from many different directions. The Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Department of National Health and Welfare also play a part. However, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and its minister are among the key people in the fight against poverty.

In 1967 the Dominion Bureau of Statistics said that approximately 45 per cent of Canadian families with incomes falling beneath the low income lines lived in non-urban areas. This income line was determined by the Economic Council of Canada. We know that the incidence of poverty is much higher in areas such as the Maritimes, eastern Quebec and indeed in the Prairies. It is also much higher among our Indian, Métis and Eskimo population. This is a problem which the committee responsible for this department should discuss here and now. We cannot continue procrastinating. If we do, the problem will become more and more complicated and more difficult to solve.

I have mentioned some areas and groups where the incidence of poverty is very high, but they are not the only areas. It is also very high among the white population in the big cities. The Economic Council of Canada said that perhaps one-third to one-half of the poverty in Canada today exists in the big cities of this country. This has very many serious

complications and ramifications. It is not a simple problem of income distribution. It is not a simple, economic problem. It has many side effects, one of which is a sense of helplessness and alienation for these people from the society in which they live. There is a culture of poverty. It is a never ending circle in which many people are trapped, creating many social and economic problems. I will give an example of this.

In the United States, a commission was set up to study the unrest, violence and alienation in many of the big cities in that country. They said that one of the reasons for this was poverty and that there was a very high correlation between poverty and crime. This is not very surprising because many of these people are put in situations that are vastly different from those of the majority of the people in that country. Some of these people have to resort to crime because of necessity, because they are alienated from the society in which they live or because of bitterness. These are things which we must also face up to in this country and which will have to be faced very soon by this government.

When John F. Kennedy was President of the United States, a commission was established to investigate much of the unrest in the big cities. They found that one reason was that people were leaving the rural areas of the United States, the farms, towns and villages, and moving into the cities. They were unskilled, in a strange atmosphere and became completely lost and alienated in this atmosphere. They were the rural poor and became the urban poor. This is why we must be concerned with these people now living in the rural and urban areas of our country. This is where the Department of Regional Economic Expansion must start to work immediately. Often, it is difficult to readily detect many of the poor people in this country. We must bear in mind that collectively the poor people are quite inarticulate. They are not organized and to a large extent are voiceless. They do not have a Chamber of Commerce, Bar Association or union to speak for them, to outline their conditions and particular circumstances. This is one reason why, for so many years, these problems have been overlooked. Another reason is that we have been too content to file these problems away under different headings in the various departments of government.

The poor people of this country need to have something done for them soon. This government will have to react because the poverty in this country is very great. It is a great problem to the individual. This is my greatest concern because the individual is being condemned to a life of low income, a life that does not give him or his family an opportunity to do what he wishes. He is sometimes victimized by the lack of proper medical attention or care. He does not have the employment or educational opportunities and often finds himself in a way of life where he does not seem to have a sense of purpose or does not seem to know what he should be doing. These are matters that must be studied. These problems must be solved.

Poverty is also very costly to our society. Every year it costs this country hundreds of millions of dollars because the poor people are held back and are not allowed to do what they want to do. I wish to quote a very short paragraph from an article that appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* on November 11, 1969. It reads:

> Poverty may have cost the country as much as $2,284,600,000 in 1961 in loss of output that would otherwise have been achieved if the poor had been properly employed, says an analysis of census figures.

• (3:40 p.m.)

This is just one indication that if we fail to act now, society as a whole will suffer. As I said earlier, this is not my main concern—my concern is principally for the people who live in poverty.

There are one or two other things I might say on this subject, but my time is limited and some of my hon. friends will be bringing out a variety of other points. However, in closing, I do wish to mention one other matter which is of great concern to me and to many hon. members from western Canada in all political parties. When the government announced last summer the areas to be designated under the new Area Development Incentives Act, I was unhappy to note that only a small area of Saskatchewan was included under the plan. We all know about the economic crisis which presently exists in Saskatchewan. Without going into details, let me say that it affects not only farmers but small businessmen and working people alike.

I should like the minister to explain, when he arises to make a statement in the House, why most of Saskatchewan has been excluded, in the main, from the benefits of this legislation. I would suggest to him that because of the present crisis the whole of the province should be designated as a special area, having regard to the economic situation

which confronts almost all of the people in that province. In the circumstances, I ask the minister to seriously consider including all of Saskatchewan as a designated area.

Before I sit down, I wish to move an amendment to the motion which is before us today; I hope it will enable us to bring out a few more points. It is seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and it reads as follows:

That the motion be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and this House further condemns the government for its failure to lessen regional poverty across Canada, and for its failure to create job opportunities so sorely needed at this time."

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Carried.

Mr. Nystrom: With this I should like to conclude, once again urging the government to take this debate seriously and convene a meeting of the committee as soon as possible in order that we may discuss the direction in which the government is moving in the sphere of regional economic problems and the whole question of poverty across this country.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I was in Quebec city yesterday for the meeting of Finance ministers and I learned that a debate would take place today on regional development. Even though it meant altering my schedule, I was most happy to do it, because that debate was to give me the opportunity to rise in the House and deal with an extremely complex problem affecting a great number of Canadians. I also thought that it would at least lead the spokesmen for opposition parties not only to express their views but also to give us food for thought on regional development.

Even though I have clear ideas on a professional and moral basis, I do not doubt that there is a way to improve the tools we have given ourselves. I already notice loopholes in pieces of legislation passed hardly a few months ago. It was rather logical for me to expect, especially from the spokesman for the official opposition, a comprehensive study of the whole philosophy of regional development and not merely meaningless and unproductive generalizations. And such was the substance of the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). I have been trying to remember some meaningful point of his speech, which I unfortunately cannot do, because there is none. It was a general lament about unemployment and the alleged secrecy shrouding the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

It is certainly difficult to eliminate regional disparities in Canada. As the hon. member for St. John's East mentioned, probably as far back as the time of Confederation governments have been trying to wipe them out, but with little success. The only success worth mentioning is that, had we not implemented some of the programs, the gap would perhaps be wider still than it is now. But this is only an assumption, and I do not want to rest my argument on it.

At any rate, it is obvious that we have failed to bridge this gap. Through legislation passed last year, we have tried to give ourselves efficient tools which might enable us to reduce considerably these disparities. While we are attempting to make them disappear, there are things happening at the economic level which affect the implementation of our programs.

In a country as diversified as ours, where there are flagrant contradictions in the field of economics, how is it possible to reach the aims we have set for ourselves? For instance, how do we go about priming the economy in underdeveloped regions while some areas of the country are battling with inflation and others fighting recession? What monetary policy should we adopt? What kind of fiscal policy should we advocate to help certain regions without further aggravating inflation in others? The hon. member for St. John's East could have told us which monetary policy would allow us to reach that goal. It may be that opposition members have excellent ideas which they could share with us.

In our opinion, there are but two possible solutions to our problems: an anti-inflationary policy has to be adopted in an effort to curb the inflationary trend in some regions of the country, and a development policy has to be implemented in the underdeveloped areas.

These are two different policies and we believe it is the only way to reach our objectives. In fact, when inflation pushes prices up in Ontario, Alberta or British Columbia, we realize as well as anyone else that they also climb in St. John's, Moncton, Quebec City and everywhere. If we have to apply a restrictive monetary policy to combat inflation, we notice that such a policy brings adverse consequences on the under-developed areas where a more liberal monetary policy would

be called for. This renders the problem much more acute than it would normally be.

We have developed a new policy which implies a considerable increase of industrial incentives in order to persuade business to establish in less developed areas. What was the result? So far, 544 applications made to the department under the new legislation have been approved by the minister. Comparing the impact of the new legislation with what happened when the Area Development Incentives Act was passed in 1965, we see that the first application made after the law came into force was approved in January 1966. This year, in the same month, close to 80 applications had been approved.

When the legislation was passed in July or August last, the department was ready to operate though, of course, it was necessary to proceed to such adjustments as, for instance, training personnel. Some think that it is easy to find the required personnel in order to promote industrial development or to conclude with provinces agreements relating to regional development. Let those who claim they can train personnel more quickly tell us how they do it. As to ourselves, we had, first of all, to find the necessary personnel and it is what we did.

Moreover, negotiations had to be conducted with the provinces as regards regional development, which brought into play what we call infrastructures.

The hon. member for St. John's East asks us: where are the jobs that have been created? That is a very well-timed question, because in fact, there is more unemployment than before. A very pertinent question indeed! He should have given us the answer himself, because this is not only a group of irresponsible people that we have here. Everyone knows that when the department approves an application for some industrial incentive, two years, on the average, are needed before the firm is established and in a position to hire workers.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: Stop claiming jobs where they don't exist.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Will you listen? I listened to your representations a few minutes ago.

Mr. Forrestall: Stop misleading us, then.

[Mr. Marchand (Langelier).]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. The minister has the floor.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, if they definitely want to hold the debate in that vein, I can fight back, for I have enough experience, but their behaviour gives a good idea of the state of mind I denounced a while ago.

I was simply saying that when we approve an application for industrial incentive, an average of two years usually elapses before the plant becomes operational. Some industries might need one year or a year and a half, others three years, depending on the character of the industry concerned.

In 1969, we approved 359 applications, against 98 in 1968, and this should normally create 22,000 new jobs and not 17,000 as stated by the hon. member for St. John's East, who should revise his figures. However, if the number of jobs he mentioned was for November, I must admit that the hon. member was right.

Who in the opposition is able to create employment at a moment's notice?

Have the opposition members a policy that would enable them to achieve this miracle? If so, why do they keep their secret? It is important! How do they create employment overnight?

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have to remind the minister that he should address himself to the Chair.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but this is what happens when the debate takes a bad turn. Obviously, such things can happen.

The Regional Development Incentives Act has a purpose: to create employment, and we can already see its effects. As a matter of fact, when the hon. member for St. John's East says that nothing has been done, that no new job has been created since the enactment of the legislation, I suggest that he is acting in an irresponsible manner and that he is playing politics as I would not like to do so myself, and as I would not like to see others do it. They can accuse us of not having—

[*English*]

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The minister is imputing motives, and under our rules he is not allowed to do this.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is not my interpretation of what the minister said. I

cannot interpret his statements as imputing motives. He made a statement but did not impute motives, and that is my ruling.

An hon. Member: You are very sensitive.

Mr. MacEwan: Much ado about nothing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, under that legislation, I was authorized to pay some grants to companies willing to settle in underdeveloped areas. I will merely mention that since that legislation was passed, 350 applications have been approved, for investments totalling approximately $639 million. This is what we did in connection with that legislation.

Evidently we have not solved every problem, but what else could we have done under that legislation, except approve a certain number of applications about industrial development? On the other hand, is that figure less than the previous one? Not only it is not, but it is four times higher. In my opinion, next year the growth rate will be much more considerable. I would like to know what hon. members of the opposition are aiming for, in order to see if our activities are really falling short of what the people expect.

As for this first tool at our disposal, we have tried to use it. In that regard, hon. members know how many applications were received and approved and how many jobs will eventually result. I must say "eventually", Mr. Speaker, because that will not happen overnight. I do not see how we could do it by tomorrow morning!

Moreover, with regard to the second part of the legislation which allows us to pay for the infra-structure in the provinces that are unable to establish all the essential services for industrial development, I have this to say: This part of the legislation establishing the department enables me to sign agreements with provinces in order to define priorities, to determine the necessary services and to plan a program for designated areas.

Of course all this leads to discussions. We are to meet the representatives of the provinces. They submitted their projects to us and it is only normal that we discuss them to ensure that they are best for developing the regions concerned. In short, what do we do when we conclude agreements of this nature? The federal government defrays the cost of services for which Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia pay, but some provinces are simply not in a position to set up this basic structure on their own. Therefore we take money from people in Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia and other prosperous provinces and give it to provinces or municipalities that need it.

It is our duty to see to it that the projects submitted are rational and intended to reach the objectives on which we have set our sight. It takes a while to read agreements with the provinces, Mr. Speaker, it cannot be done overnight. Indeed, it supposes several meetings. We have set a target date, next April 1st, to start spending money in that field. I have every reason to believe that we will do so in just about every province in Canada. Agreements are being reached in almost every area. In a few places, there are still a few details to straighten out. But I wonder why the commotion because it took us a few months to sign agreements that are extremely complex and difficult, because we did not report to the House every day or every week on those agreements. How can you negotiate an agreement publicly? We are negotiating agreements dealing with objectives and matters of provincial jurisdiction.

We would like the province to agree before we announce what the agreement is all about. It seems to me there is nothing shocking about the way we proceed and hon. members will get an opportunity to know about all the agreements negotiated with the provinces.

Why such secrecy? Precisely because the agreements deal with matters of provincial jurisdiction. We have no jurisdiction when it comes to sewage systems, roads, education or hospitals. We have to negotiate with the provinces and try to establish priorities in agreement with them.

What is shocking about that? The hon. member for St. John's East would probably want me to say: Well, here is what we suggest, what the province puts forward, what Mr. So-and-so says. Who will venture to imagine that it is possible to negotiate in this way? It is impossible. Once an agreement is reached, nothing prevents hon. members to criticize and to tell us that we went too far or not far enough. This is quite a normal process and I think that we can then arrive at constructive criticism. But simply to suggest to the public that we did not keep them informed about the various stages of our negotiations with the provinces, this is really childish.

I will deal now with the matter of co-ordination of activities. We know that the work which is carried out by the provinces and the

municipalities, by degree of importance, is fairly more significant than that carried out by the federal government itself and that is why there must be some co-ordination within the federal government of course, but most of all between the agencies of the various levels of government, federal, provincial and municipal, and that is our obvious purpose when negotiating agreements.

Our friend, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) has laid a general charge when dealing mainly with the problem of poverty. Poverty is like sin. I, too, am against it. But I believe that we are trying and we shall continue to fight it within our own departmental jurisdiction. Of course we do not deny the fact that poverty exists in Canada but we are trying to fight it and I think that we must continue to exert pressures in order to get rid of it.

This is not a problem particular to Canada; it is also an American problem and one that plagues the western world, it may also be a world evil. It is probably most legitimate to require more efforts on our part in that field but there again, it might be a great, general, and even generous idea but it does not give a specific answer to the current problems.

The overall proposal made by the opposition, betrays their ignorance of the whole matter and also indicates a lack of courage. When you want to come to grips with a policy, you have to identify it and point at is weaknesses and failures. Those responsible for it must be brought back to their senses. All they can do is to use one big word: "coordination". This leads nowhere. It simply gives some hon. member a chance to take the floor for half an hour.

This question is of paramount importance for the future of Canada, and it should be a matter of concern for us. All they can find to say, however, is that there is a lack of coordination, putting the blame on the government.

This is truly what can be called "wasting a little time".

Anyway, I have indicated what we have done to stimulate industry and how far we have progressed in our agreements with the provinces. As the estimates will soon be tabled, hon. members will see the extent of the endeavours planned in the field of regional development. Possibly they will say that it is not enough, but they will realize that it is considerably more than was done previously.

The hon. member claims that it is less than before. According to him, things were not so bad at the time of the Atlantic Development Board but since then the eastern provinces have obtained less. This is wrong. The estimates will give the lie to his statement in enabling members to check the facts. The House of Commons is too dignified a place for such grave and general charges to be made without hon. members first taking the trouble of checking their facts to make sure that they know what they are talking about.

At all events, the estimates will be tabled. Discussions will then be more definite and constructive because hon. members will be aware of the financial extent of our efforts. I do not say that it will be sufficient and that it will settle all problems. I am convinced that were I to be allocated twice as much money to spend, I would find areas where to spend it.

It is to be noted, however, that there is here a substantially increased effort. Once the estimates are tabled, I will be the first one to want the committee to convene to consider them and scrutinize all the information which I am prepared to supply in connection with regional development. I do not object to sittings of the committee. On the contrary. Five or six months after the implementation of the act, one cannot claim—

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Peters: May I ask the minister a question, Mr. Speaker?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I have almost finished my speech.

An hon. Member: Carry on!

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): The department is a new one and has been operating only for a few months. Agreements with the provinces have not all been finalized. Within a few weeks, it will all be settled and I believe it will be normal at that time for the committee to review the agreements and see how we want to proceed, and look into the statistics that the estimates will provide. In this way, the committee will be able to do something constructive, instead of merely making general recommendations about coordination.

[*English*]

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, will the minister now permit a question? I should like to ask him whether he would say a word or two on what action is being taken with regard to

the development of growth centres, which was the only change in the new program as opposed to the old one? What negotiations with the provinces are taking place in this regard, and are any of the proposals that are being made to the government in a particular area being reviewed or extended as a result of the growth centre concept?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had read the act, he would realize that it does not deal with "growth centres". It does deal, however, with "special areas". Thus we have the power irrespective of designated areas, to designate, in agreement with any province, special areas where we can implement measures that we are not allowed to take under the industrial incentives legislation.

The act does not deal with "growth centres". However this may result in centres—

[*English*]

Mr. Peters: This is just semantics.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): It is not only semantics. It is different from that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wishes to know what special areas will become designated areas, I must tell him that I cannot give this information at this time. It is already quite difficult for provincial governments and for us to exert our efforts on certain areas, even though we are aware that several regions are in need. If we are to reach an agreement, we cannot make them public before agreements are entered into with the provinces.

We do not want to play hide-and-seek. But as we cannot make the whole of Canada a special area, we must make a choice, and an extremely hard one for that matter. And the choice is even harder for the provinces.

If we publicize the various proposed projects, it would never be possible to reach a conclusion.

We do not want to play hide-and-seek, but simply to create an atmosphere enabling us to reach specific conclusions.

[*English*]

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): May I ask the minister one question? While I agree with the minister that we need consultation to enter into negotiations and to draw up a full-blown plan, could the minister give us an answer to a question which is causing most of us a great deal of concern, that is the reason the government is not moving now as it has been over the last 20 years in areas which are clearly under federal jurisdiction, such as public works, fishing facilities, postal facilities, airport facilities, and other facilities that are as clearly needed as the nose on your face. Why is it the government has not been moving in these areas? Why is it that austerity has been applied to the slow growth areas just as it has to other areas?

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I think this question can be answered only when we know the details of the agreements which are going to be signed with the provinces.

Mr. Lundrigan: It is a completely federal problem.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): We are putting together all the aspects and establishing the priority, whether it is under federal jurisdiction or provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Lundrigan: And you will do nothing until then.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): We are doing a lot of things, but maybe we are not doing enough.

Mr. Lundrigan: That is the answer.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the minister started off by describing the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) as banal, general and insipid. I would have to say it is a long time since I heard such a banal defence of a program as that given by the minister, but I would not describe the minister's speech as insipid because obviously he tried to make up in heat what he failed to generate by way of light.

I am very concerned about the lack of a program generally with regard to this question of regional economic expansion. We supported the creation of the department. We co-operated in getting the measure through the House, although it was not the way we would have proceeded ourselves. Nevertheless, we wanted to give the government every opportunity to develop a plan of operation. But the fact is that nothing of substance has yet come from the minister or the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Meanwhile a good many regions of the country are

losing ground economically vis-à-vis the rest of the country.

I wish to say to the minister on behalf of myself, the members of my party, and I am sure the country as a whole, that the honeymoon is over for the minister and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) with regard to the question of regional disparities. It is time that the minister really told the country what he and his department are doing, and it is time the government permitted the committee concerned to examine in a reasonable way the program of the government with regard to regional disparities. I do not mean a rushed job when the estimates are before the Committee. It is impossible for the minister and the government to justify their refusal to allow the appropriate committee to examine the minister's program. It throws suspicion on the whole approach of the government.

It is two years since the election, but the department has done so little and the government as a whole has done so little, that they will not permit the committee to examine what has been done. Sure, there have been some grants made in some of the provinces, but nothing very much in others.

The minister pleads that he needs time. He says he could not create jobs tomorrow. Yet he did not attempt to deny that disparity is deepening in the country and is spreading in the country. For example, consider the position of the province of Saskatchewan. Two or three years ago this province became qualified as a have rather than a have-not province and yet the provisions for equalization payments to it were eliminated. Consider the situation in that province today, and the help and positive measures being given and taken by the federal government with regard to it.

Saskatchewan has reached the point where its premier had to beg the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) not to smile when he was discussing its problems. The federal government cannot claim that it has even started any program there. I do not think the minister would even pretend that he had done anything, and we are not aware of any measures undertaken by the Department of Industry or any other department. The government is displaying a cold-blooded, disinterested attitude toward the problems of that province, and it is not much wonder that there is a certain amount of talk about western separatism.

As far as I can see, the minister and the government have written off the whole idea of developing the near north, and are apparently content to leave it flounder as best it can. Parliament has given this minister extraordinary powers so far as his own department is concerned, but the only way these powers have been used so far has been to put a strangle hold on the province of Prince Edward Island.

The federal government claims to be making a contribution of $225 million under the plan agreed with Prince Edward Island, but that is very misleading, Mr. Speaker. There is no such contribution over a period of 15 years so far as new federal money is concerned. A good deal of that amount is made up of bookkeeping transfers, as well as the phasing out and consolidation of existing programs. I would estimate that not more than $60 million at most of this alleged $225 million is new federal money going into Prince Edward Island over a period of 15 years.

There is also the danger that the federal government will not extend new programs as they arise to Prince Edward Island, with the excuse that Prince Edward Island is covered by a plan of its own. We had the announcement last spring that $6 million would be granted for highway projects to the Atlantic provinces, but none of this was to be allotted to Prince Edward Island on the ground that other arrangements had been made under its plan. How realistic is it to expect the province of P.E.I. to put up something like $500 million over a period of 15 years? I hope the plan will produce dynamic growth on that island so that it can meet that commitment, but I am very suspicious of any federal government that would put such a price tag as that on Prince Edward Island's entry into the plan.

I am concerned that the federal government is looking forward, if it is not already doing so, to running P.E.I. like a piece of federal property. I say that no federal plan, department or government should deprive the people of that province of their right to self-government. The plan now in operation for Prince Edward Island is extremely centralized. Every decision is centralized here in Ottawa. Whatever degree of decentralization there used to be under the Atlantic Development Board has been removed, and everything is concentrated here in Ottawa. We have to ask, what are the minister and his colleagues up to?

Certainly, the policies of the federal government are placing very heavy financial pressures on all of the eastern provinces. We must recognize, as the Economic Council has point-

ed out time and time again, the importance of all these provinces being able to render a satisfactory degree of services, particularly growth related services, if they are ever to overcome the problems of economic disparity. Yet three of these five provinces have not yet been able to bring in the medicare plan, a nationwide program, although I believe that two at least are committed to doing so. The federal government must recognize the financial problems in all of these provinces which are suffering economic disparity, yet it seems to me it is exerting constant financial pressure on them and refusing to recognize their financial difficulties in providing services in any effective way. The minister made a great play about asking how one would apply a monetary policy in an effective way. Well, he could at least try. I would like to try. And what about fiscal policy? I say to the minister that the government has not made the slightest effort to adjust its fiscal policy to these areas. The whole effect of its fiscal policy down there has been to cut back and to aggravate the problems of slow growth. It is essential that these provinces be able to provide these services in order to participate in development programs, but as far as I can see the whole tendency, if not the intent, of the present policies of the government is to grind down these provinces.

The tax structure committee forecast the rapidity of the growth and the financial needs of the provinces for basic government services, yet no recognitition has been given to that. As far as I can see, after using an anti-inflation program as an excuse, and perhaps using negotiated plans as the implement, the tendency if not the intent of the federal government seems to be to bring all of these provinces into a condition of financial subserviency to the federal government.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): They were before.

Mr. Stanfield: The minister does not deny it; he says they were, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the province of Quebec would accept that statement nor would some of the other provinces. I am saying that this is a tendency with very, very serious consequences. It is clear that the financial and fiscal policies of the minister's colleagues have set back the work to eliminate economic disparity. I would feel a little sorry for the minister had he not tried to defend himself so vigorously. I think his colleagues have crept from under his feet, and certainly in the past year they have created far more disparity than the minister has eliminated. The country is falling back. The minister speaks about generalities and here is a generality he cannot deny: he has not made a bit of progress and the economic policies of his colleagues and the government as a whole have broadened and deepened economic disparity in the past year. It is the task and responsibility of the minister and his colleagues to get away from these general policies which are depressing all parts of the country and to adopt a positive approach.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if the minister wants to help, let him bring the committee together and give the House a chance to consider what he is doing in detail and to make suggestions. Why is the minister afraid of doing that? I do not know, unless he is afraid of exposing how little has been accomplished. Let him speak to his colleagues, not ask us in this House to tell him how to apply an appropriate fiscal policy. Let the government abandon a fiscal policy which has been applied across the country and which, in spite of all the government says, is deepening our economic difficulties.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, when some hon. members opposite were still in the childhood stage I sat in the gallery of the other place and watched when the terms of union between Newfoundland and Canada were signed. It was a very unhappy incident for me, as I had opposed the idea of Newfoundland entering the Canadian confederation. I suppose most of my motivation at that time was emotional, although a bit of logic did creep into the various arguments. At one stage most of the comments that I made publicly on the subject were based on the standard complaint that I have been hearing for many years from such provinces as New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, the basic argument being that confederation was a bit of an abortion, both geographically and economically, and that Newfoundland would be a dory tied on to the schooner.

I made my decision very early following confederation that if we were to be Canadians, despite my best judgment of those days, then we ought to be good Canadians. Over the last 21 years both in public life and before, I have commented upon and tried to find solutions for and make recommendations about, so-called regional economic disparity. Of course, we did not call it that in the early days. I do not know what word was used but

there was generally a feeling on the part of those living in Newfoundland, and probably those in the Atlantic provinces as well, that in some way or other we were not getting our just dues, as it were, out of the promise of confederation. In 100 years we had not been able to achieve the general objectives, the promises, that seemed to be implicit in the original concept of one nation from sea to sea. I have to say, however, that over that period of 21 years I am satisfied that my own province has probably gone ahead more than it would have under any other arrangement. But I am also compelled to say that most of the progress and gains made were obvious for the simple reason that for such a long period there had been relatively little progress that what we gained seemed like a great deal. I suppose what it amounted to was that half a loaf appeared as good as a full one, and certainly better than no bread at all.

Today, as I strenuously grapple with this problem of regional economic expansion, I am conscious that the basic difficulty is the same as it was 21 years ago. It has been compounded, complicated by developments that have taken place, but the basic problem remains. I do not know the degree to which it is common to all four provinces, but in Newfoundland it seems to be a matter of trying to find sufficient gainful employment for a growing population. One of the miracles of confederation as far as Newfoundland is concerned is that we have managed, despite a decline in one end of the scale, to keep our population moving up slightly. We have not had the massive exodus that many people, including myself, forecast once the immigration barriers between Newfoundland and Canada were removed. Even though we have been able to keep the population static, the fact of the matter is that job opportunities simply are not there.

To hon. members opposite who are critical of this program I would say that, while I share their frustration and concern, I believe that if we were to announce tomorrow more attractive incentives than those the minister has outlined, which must rank with the most attractive in any western country, it still would be very very difficult to find people prepared to introduce the kind of industrial development necessary to take care of those now unemployed. As well as this group, there are others coming along at an ever-increasing rate, that is assuming our population will remain at the level it is now and that we have the normal increase.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

When the minister spoke about the number of jobs the program has generated I have no quarrel with the figures. I can see some evidence already of the effect of the incentives program in Newfoundland. A week ago today, I was present at the opening of a new fishing installation which will give employment to many people. The cost is in the neighbourhood of $2½ million, of which the federal government's contribution was substantially more than one-third; but this is really still only a drop in the bucket.

Perhaps the hon. Leader of the Opposition is right when he says that only if we can get together in terms of a committee discussion will these problems disappear. But I suggest in all honesty that as the former leader of a Conservative government in the province of Nova Scotia, he knows that it is not as simple as that. In fact, we are going to have an extremely difficult job even with incentives, even with growth centres and the like, to provide the kind of employment and the levels of employment which are necessary.

It is because of this complexity and because the history of the last 21 years has shown that many of the programs have not been successful that I do not criticize the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) for what hon. members opposite referred to as his slowness in moving. Rather, I commend him for having the good sense to make sure that this time we have covered as many bases as possible. We do not want to go off in all directions and then find, ten years from now, that we have not achieved very much.

Hon. members from Newfoundland should be the last to suggest that there should be some sort of a precipitate haste in setting up industrial enterprises of any kind. We really must be sure that we have the right answers.

The fisheries, of course, are still pretty basic in terms of our Newfoundland economy. About a year or so ago we had a situation which all of us agreed was desperate. As a result of actions which were taken there has been a remarkable transition. The fact of the matter is that the fresh frozen fish industry is in an extremely buoyant state now and looking better all the time. The danger is, and I only mention this because this is one of our problems, that the incentives program may well attract more people into the fresh frozen fish industry, with the result that we will have a repetition of the depreciated position and sales picture we had a year or so ago. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Mc-

Grath), and other members on his side of the House, can say all they want about regional economic expansion and development programs. Despite what the Leader of the Opposition said about it not being the responsibility of hon. members opposite to make specific suggestions, let us hear something more about this program than criticism.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jamieson: I say, Mr. Speaker, that to suggest right now, for instance, that incentives should be provided in order to increase sales further and to raise the production of the fresh frozen fish industry in eastern Canada would be detrimental, in the long run, to the future of the area. We must examine that problem and look at it extremely carefully. That is what was meant when the minister referred to the need for consultation and thorough planning. I have heard repeatedly, when travelling to Newfoundland and other parts of the Maritime provinces, that the only answer to providing quick relief to economically depressed areas on the coast is "Give us another fish plant".

There is an awful parallel, and it is terribly striking, to what was said a few years ago to our wheat farmers on the prairies. It will be remembered that they were told to grow all the wheat they could because everything looked great. Let us not fall into that pitfall, and there is a great danger here.

There is a second danger when it comes to providing incentives in the fishing industry and that is,—I believe the hon. member who is the spokesman for the official opposition might be inclined to agree—in moving into the herring fishery simply because there is a market and providing fishermen with the means of getting into it. Again we would be, to use a familiar old expression, killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. There is a limit to the amount of job creation that can be performed within the fishing industry of the Atlantic provinces, and this is basic to the whole object of regional economic expansion.

These fisheries problems are related to something else about which hon. members in opposition will have to make up their minds. I do not blame them for their difficulty in doing so, but I say that the issue of centralization, in one form or another, must be decided one way or another. If we are to help people in the fishing industry in the small communities around the coast of Newfoundland, and I am confining myself to that area because it is the one I know best, if we are to provide those people with the kind of future they have a right to expect, if they are to realize the full promise of confederation, as I have called it, then we cannot do it in many of these smaller places without moving the people out. So, the growth centre concept to which the minister has referred and on which, as I happen to know, he and his officials have worked extremely hard in recent months, is a very valid one. But it contains difficulties as well. I can see that when a designation is made hon. gentlemen opposite will look at it and say, "Why is it in this area; why is it not somewhere else?" Inevitably, naturally, understandably and defensively hon. gentlemen are going to say, "But there is not enough in my riding to be of special interest."

What is the alternative? If you are not going to have development areas, if you are not to have growth centres or points round which you can polarize the population and try to provide employment opportunities for them, the answer is that we shall have to continue with what I have called the pastoral syndrome in Newfoundland. I suggest that many people think of that as the easiest way out. It is very easy, when one goes into a community or some backwood area of Newfoundland, to say, "We could not agree more; you are entitled to all the services and to all the improvements that you like."

But surely to goodness, if we are to take any real interest in these people we have to try at least to help them by getting them to move to growth centres and there provide employment for them. I know the stock answer to that is that we have put the cart before the horse and, in some respects, we probably did. Centralization may have moved ahead faster than was wise in some circumstances because, and I agree with those hon. members who have levelled this criticism at us, those who moved in did not have jobs. That is quite true. But I will tell you what they do have. They have better schooling, better access to hospitals and medical services and greater mobility than they ever had before. And if they do not have jobs where they are now, let us also remember that they would not have had jobs if they had remained behind either. So, I say that centralization in some form has to be part of the development program.

A question was asked this afternoon of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion why certain projects have not gone ahead in Newfoundland. To answer this, may I recount a story that took place in my community. I

was involved in it and it took place on the Island of Sagona, on the south coast of that fine riding, Burin-Burgeo. At one point there was a community, and a man coming to the community saw a wharf worth about $75,000 being built. He said, "I can see that you are building a wharf; does that mean you are going to stay?" The answer given to him was, "No, we are moving as soon as we have finished it.".

As the hon. member for St. John's East said, there is a need for co-ordination if we are to ensure that the objectives of the regional economic expansion program and of the growth centres are logical, and if we are to avoid the anomalies to which I have just referred. Consequently we must look twice before proceeding with the construction of useless facilities costing $75,000 or $100,000 or $150,000, because once that money has been spent, it is not available for something else. In the constituency of Burin-Burgeo, there are approximately $2 million worth of marine facilities which are not being used today because, shortly after having been completed, the communities that erected them were moved to more logical places—

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

Mr. Lundrigan: May I direct a question to the minister?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: A question may be asked now only by unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lundrigan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed because the minister has become an Upper Canadian. I do not blame him because he now has a better chance to succeed, since he is not now in Newfoundland.

Mr. Jamieson: With respect, Mr. Speaker, I will permit a question but not an insult.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Peters: I wish the hon. member would withdraw that remark.

Mr. Lundrigan: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I do not want that remark to stay on the record. I indicated that the minister had become an Upper Canadian, and I will withdraw that. The minister spoke about what the Leader of the Opposition had said, and he referred to the remarks of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I ask, why is the government's austerity program being applied to my province? I realize that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), the Governor of the Bank of Canada and other experts argue that this austerity control is good from the standpoint of regional planning. I ask, why have these austerity goals been applied to my province?

[Mr. Jamieson.]

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Jamieson: I will not ask Your Honour's indulgence to continue as long as it would take to answer in full. I deny the fact there has been this cut-back on a general basis. As the hon. minister said, when the committee has the figures and statistics in front of them, it will become evident that in fact there has been an increase in the last year or so in expenditures, at least in the area with which I am most familiar, over what it was 12 months before. In any event, I will be glad to get these figures now for the hon. member and also, if it is permissible for me to do so, to participate in the committee discussion.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, back in the old days before the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) kidnapped the Liberal government and transformed it into his own image, in the days when the present Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and the present Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) were still private citizens in Quebec being ardently wooed by the Liberal hierarchy, these men were commonly referred to as the three wise men. I have not heard this expression used very frequently in recent times. As a matter of fact, recent events have somewhat obliterated this myth. The three wise men have now been supplemented by another trio to which I will refer as the three blind mice. These men, I suggest, are the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) and the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen).

The reason I make this assertion is that I believe these three individuals are blind to Canada's regional difficulties. They are either too obsessed with their positions or too timid to grapple with the problems that confront them. This failure to promote effective action to overcome problems of regional disparity is serious in all parts of the country and very much so in western Canada.

Not only has the government's consistent and obvious disinterest in the west bred a feeling of isolation from the rest of Canada,

but it has aggravated westerners to a point where separatism can no longer be treated as a joke. It has become a very real and much talked about alternative to second-class Canadian citizenship and a policy of alienation. The west today, as it has been since confederation, is in a position of economic inferiority to central Canada. It is still largely dependent upon a few basic industries, agriculture, mining, petroleum and forestry. Some of these are in a grave state of depression, while the others are barely holding their own.

Economic good sense indicates free trade as the best bet for the west, yet this area is still a captive behind the bars of freight rates and tariffs erected in the interest of eastern industry. We have heard many times in this House that the agricultural industry is in a desperate plight. The agricultural population is declining and urbanization is increasing. However, the west lacks the commercial and industrial facilities to handle a relatively painless transition from a basically rural and agricultural society to one that is urban and industrialized.

The inadequate industrial base in the west has accentuated all the familiar problems of rapid urbanization experienced in other metropolitan areas. I refer to poverty, lack of housing and all the social problems and ills which confront other urban centres on the North American continent. I feel this situation should be the prime target for those who profess to be interested in Canada's regional problems. Their solution is a vital national necessity.

The contribution of the west to the nation in the past and the potential contribution in the future demand action by the central government in the national interest. Instead, the west has apparently been written off by this trio to which I have referred. I am forced to conclude from the attitude of this government that it has no priority. We in the west must sink or swim on our own. Is it any wonder there is growing talk of western separatism?

Anyone who listened to the Minister of Agriculture when he addressed the Canadian Federation of Agriculture in Winnipeg a few days ago would have thought the government had everything well in hand. I wish to quote a couple of sentences from his presentation:

> It is our goal in the federal government that we will be able to devise programs that will ease the transition off the farm... We would assist those who wish to retire to be able to do so with dignity.

The minister said much more. He said practically enough to make an angel weep. He went on to say that the Department of Agriculture would not be the only department involved in providing the promised answer to all the ills of the west. He said the Department of Manpower and Immigration would assist with training and relocation grants and that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion would provide programs to create jobs to upgrade those areas which are economically depressed.

The facts are as follows: The Department of Agriculture has not come up with a program of its own to assist the transition of the farmer to the city. The Department of Manpower and Immigration has not come up with anything significant by way of training or relocation programs. The Department of Regional Economic Expansion had not provided one penny of assistance to Saskatchewan, Alberta or British Columbia as of December 31, 1969. This lack of assistance includes the only area of southern or central Alberta that is included as a designated area for regional assistance, the largest portion of that being the home area of the Minister of Agriculture.

By the end of last year, approximately $15½ million had been spent by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in financial assistance to industry as an incentive to establishing in the designated zones. Of this amount, approximately $11 million went to the province of Quebec; $3.1 million to New Brunswick; $1.2 million to Manitoba; $151,000 to Newfoundland and $95,000 to New Brunswick. Not one cent went to Saskatchewan, Alberta or British Columbia to give substance to the empty promises of the Minister of Agriculture.

Let no one in this House doubt the need of the west for a fair share of industrial and commercial enterprise. As of 1966, the last year for which I have been able to find reliable government figures, the west had only a meagre 5¼ per cent of Canada's steel production; 99.5 per cent of Canada's production of crude oil, but only 27.1 per cent of our refining capacity; 14 per cent of Canada's total manufacturing capacity; 17.8 per cent of the total number of manufacturing establishments; 27 per cent of Canada's service businesses and 25 per cent of the retail trade establishments. I could go on ad infinitum.

According to the 1969 edition of Taxation Statistics, in 1967 westerners provided 30 per cent of Canada's personal income tax on only 17.5 per cent of the nation's total of taxable

returns. In the face of such figures, it is difficult for a western Canadian to understand why he is almost totally ignored by Ottawa, except when taxes are levied, and why common sense and common justice do not compel this government to stop making empty promises and start acting.

It is particularly difficult to understand why the west has been excluded from assistance by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. The boundaries of his designated area were set arbitrarily by himself and his officials and from what I can see, with no set of rules or universal criteria. The minister claims the provinces were consulted fully before the lines were drawn, but this is at variance with what is claimed by provincial authorities, particularly the premier of my own province.

There was an exchange of letters last year between myself and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In a letter addressed to me dated October 10 last, the minister said:

> Our conclusion, after consultation with the provincial government, (that is the government of Alberta), was that the program would produce the greatest benefits for the province as a whole if the southern region was designated.

My information is that the minister consulted no one in Alberta except his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, who just happened to represent a riding that coincided roughly with the designated area. In another part of the same letter, the minister stated:

• (4:50 p.m.)

> We are talking about the kind of program that my department can best employ to ease the necessary adjustment process and cushion its effects on the people of the prairies.

At that time he said he was negotiating with the provincial government about instituting such a program. This is as far back as October 10. But no one has heard a word about the program since, or seen any sign of one being initiated. This is the type of windy delusion which comes from the offices of the trio to which I have referred—pronouncements which have led westerners to doubt the integrity of this government and to lose faith in the viability of Canada under such management.

It is more than a co-incidence that the minister has consistently refused to table in this House copies of the letters he claims were exchanged between him and various western premiers on the topic I have just been discussing. Reference to questions 581 and 582 will indicate this clearly.

[Mr. Mazankowski.]

Another glaring example of injustice and a further ground for the build-up of western animosity is to be found in the government's dairy policy. The government now proposes a $10 million cut in funds available under the Canadian dairy policy on the professed ground of aiding its austerity drive. What will happen, in fact, is that the share of western dairy farmers will be reduced in proportion to that of the central region. It is true there is over-production in Canada's dairy industry—but it is not in the west. The over-production happens to be in Quebec, but this fact is ignored. The committee is being asked to develop a national policy, the results of which will simply penalize those regions which have exercised a discretion in the field of supply management, and have not significantly over-produced. There is little use in prolonging this recital of the many shortcomings of the government's regional economic expansion and agriculture policies. They are so blatant that we can all see them.

I turn, now, to the third element in the trio of departments which the Minister of Agriculture claimed would solve the problems of the west. I listened with interest the other day to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration making much of little in his announcement of that department's success in finding jobs for students. As far as I and others are concerned, they were mere empty boasts. Let me cite only one case, that of a graduate student for whom no job can be found. This young man is now being badgered by solicitors for repayment of a student loan. He is Mr. Kenneth R. Powley of Vegreville, Alberta, an architect who graduated in June of 1968 but could find only fleeting employment until January 1969, and none since. He visited the nearest manpower centre seeking assistance, and according to a letter I received from the Minister of Manpower last September, he registered for employment with the manpower centre at Edmonton shortly after his graduation in 1968.

To date, the result has been nil. He is still unemployed, and I have a sheaf of application letters to show that it is not for lack of trying to get a job. He is willing to work in practically any field and at any location. Yet this great department, with its policy of job mobility, has totally failed to assist him. The case of Mr. Powley symbolizes the current condition of the west. He is a victim of federal promises which are without substance or good faith. He is a symbol of the utter and complete failure of the government's promise of regional assistance through a combination

of the three departments most closely concerned. Had he lived elsewhere he might have been more fortunate.

These are some of the feelings of westerners which have been communicated to me in my travels. It is a combination of such inequities with little promise of hope which has created the prevailing hostility toward the federal government and a growing sense of alienation. The result has spurred discussion of separatism, talk of forming a regional power bloc and of possible union with the United States. In the interest of preserving Canada, the reversal of this trend must be considered a basic priority of the government. I firmly believe that if the present callous disregard of the west continues we, as Canadians, will all suffer the consequences.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Deputy Speaker: Before I call on the hon. member for Madawaska-Victoria perhaps I might inform the House of the items to be discussed at the time of the adjournment. They are as follows: the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding)—transport—coal—application by Great Northern and Kootenay Elk railways; the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave)—Criminal Code—proclamation of remainder of amendments respecting breathalyzer; the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski)—Health and Welfare—representations by Diabetic Association respecting cyclamate ban—availability of substitute.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY, S.O. 58—FAILURE TO CO-ORDINATE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND TO REFER ISSUE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

The House resumed consideration of the motion of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath):

That this House condemns the government's failure to co-ordinate its regional development policies under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion with other government activities, and its failure to bring in an appropriate reference to place this issue before the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

and the amendment thereto of Mr. Nystrom.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Madawaska-Victoria): Mr. Speaker, the most important features of the presentation made by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), who sponsored the motion under study this afternoon, are the following: he spoke for approximately half an hour; he spoke in very loud tones; he even sweated quite a bit, but he said absolutely nothing. That is remarkable but also typical, and there is nothing to be done in this desperate case, in my view. I doubt that even St. Jude could be of any help to him.

As the motion presented by the hon. member for St. John's East has no meaning, it is very difficult to address oneself to it in an intelligent manner. It is a skeleton, some sort of noble cause without a defending knight. If the motion had at least some substance, we could comment on it intelligently, but, in the circumstances, this is rather difficult.

Mr. Speaker, the opposition motion presented today reads as follows:

[*English*]

That this House condemns the government's failure to co-ordinate its regional development policies under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion with other government activities, and its failure to bring in an appropriate reference to place this issue before the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

[*Translation*]

I intend first of all to let you know what I think of the advisability of such a motion and I will afterwards comment on the general economic expansion policy of the government.

I have naturally no right to impute motives to the mover, but nevertheless, I can ask myself what he had in mind when he presented that motion. I think it is a weak motion, even from a strictly political point of view. We all know to what extent the hon. member is imbued with political motives. This motion—I cannot help saying it—is not worth a cent.

A motion of censure brought in against the government always contains a great many negative elements. It is normal, they say. But when they stoop to childish and silly things, we can wonder, and rightly so, if money put at the disposal of opposition members for research purposes is not a total loss. I thought that there was still a little unseasoned timber among the opposition members, but I realize that they are all ready to go into action.

I was recently reading over the proceedings of the standing committee on regional development for Tuesday, June 10, 1969. The min-

ister was testifying before the committee, on which sits the hon. member for St. John's East. Bill C-202 had been referred to the committee for study. Obviously, the minister had been called upon to answer questions from members. To my great surprise, no reference was then made by the members of the committee to a need for coordinating the regional development policy and the other regional activities of the federal government, of other governments and of governmental agencies. The hon. member for St. John's East himself said absolutely nothing about the matter. He chose to rail against the minister. On that occasion, he really went too far, as shown by the official report.

As usual, the hon. member took the floor for fifteen minutes but had nothing to say about the bill. Then, he did not speak another word during the other two days this committee held sitting.

The minutes of proceedings show in fact that the hon. member for St. John's East did not attend the other two meetings when the committee studied the bill. Is that an indication of his interest in economic development problems? As I said, I do not want to impute motives to the hon. member and should he have had serious reasons for his absence, they ought to be accepted.

I have noted, however, several remarks made by the hon. member on that occasion. According to him, it is obvious that a great deal of co-operation, of co-ordination and of discussions with the provinces is necessary before conclusions can be reached on such or such an agreement. This was mentioned by the Minister in the House this afternon.

He stated in June last, when he appeared before the committee, that he intended to ask, for example, the advice of the Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation on housing, when the matter would be related to others such as employment.

I know that the minister, before approving an important grant for the establishment of a factory, gets in touch with the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce on marketing, the Minister of Agriculture to check some data, the Manpower Centre to learn about the employment opportunities in the area where the industry wishes to settle. This is obvious, it is the daily routine. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) shows his common sense when proceeding in such a way.

The Atlantic Area Development Board is one of the bodies especially established to advise the minister where co-ordination, plans and programs are concerned. The minister himself made clear what he expected of the Board. To prove it, I shall quote from proceedings No. 14 of the Committee on Regional Development, dated June 10, 1969. Here is what it says:

• (5:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

If there are abuses in that field—

[*Translation*]

He was talking about the field of regional economic development.

I quote further:

[*English*]

—I think we have to rely on that council to point out to the public that something is going wrong; the government is not doing what it should and so forth, the provinces or the federal government.

Then the council should say as was stated:

The majority of those men are surely in the position to resign if they do not agree with what we are doing. It will be the first one to underline what is going wrong.

I suppose this is what the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) undertook to do this afternoon. The minister said a little further one:

You know how those councils operate and you may be sure that if anything goes wrong, seriously wrong, it will be known. This is democracy and I accepted this from the start.

[*Translation*]

What is surprising, Mr. Speaker, is that to date no criticism has been made by the Atlantic Development Board. None of its members has resigned, which does prove that they do not see eye to eye with the member for St. John's East, that they are far more broadminded.

What does the member for St. John's East want when he speaks of co-ordination? Just what is his problem? He indicated at the beginning of his remarks that he was doubly frustrated. That is his problem, Mr. Speaker. For my part, I do not suffer from that disease and I feel very sorry for the hon. member. But I feel powerless to help him, for he refuses to listen to reason.

He read off a litany of agencies, sections and departments which have appeared since the fifties within the federal government. Some of them were active for a while. Others did not live up to expectations, but that is quite

normal. The rapid economic growth of Canada, the problems and difficulties that follow inevitably, dictate from month to month changes in the objectives originally set; of necessity, our programs, set-ups, and solutions must be modified.

The Progressive Conservative party obviously does not like change. The New Democrats, for their part, tell us we do not change rapidly enough, and the members of the Ralliement créditiste say change is good, inasmuch as it suits them.

Mr. Speaker, I followed closely what the member from St. John's East had to say; I resigned myself to it unwillingly because there are far too many exaggerations in what he says for it to deserve much credibility. What surprised me most, is the absence of suggestions, of constructive criticism likely to prompt the government to improve its administration. The member and his party prefer to retire into their shells, when they do not offer the government destructive criticism.

What does the member for St. John's East means by co-ordination? Does he mean complex structures to the extent that we might loose sight of our objectives? As for me, I am satisfied that—projects and policies are co-ordinated between the various departments of the federal government on one hand, and the provinces on the other, in the struggle against regional diaparity. I learned it from the Minister of Economic Development of New Brunswick himself. He has nothing but praise for this co-operation. But if my friend from St. John's East has eyes and sees not, ears and hears not, that is his business.

Mr. Speaker, I would like in the few minutes left to me to deal with some projects that are taking shape in my constituency. One can find there, as I have already told the House, a regional council for the development of north-western New Brunswick. That council is made up of men chiefly and of a few women who have worked voluntarily for five years in order to study the economic development conditions in the Upper St. John Valley. They adjusted the structures of their organization to the purposes they have in mind. My fellow-citizens are not afraid of changes, provided they bring results.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The members and directors of CRANO, namely the Conseil régional d'aménagement du Nord-Ouest, obtained the support of the provincial and federal governments. Moreover, the provincial government has lent them the services of public employees to help them in the administrative work, including economic surveys and statistics.

A black cloud is looming up over the horizon, since the agreement with the province of New Brunswick under ARDA expires on April 1st. CRANO members are wondering whether they will be able to keep on without the federal government's help that was guaranteed them in the past.

I wish to vouch for the work accomplished by that council in our area. I am personally convinced of the necessity of CRANO. I know the results of their work up to now. That organization is most useful. I am aware of the earnestness of those members, as regards the development of north-western New Brunswick. I am also aware of their sincerity and they deserve every possible support, whatever form it may take.

As I said, the first project approved under the new regional economic expansion legislation is located in my constituency of Madawaska-Victoria. In addition to appreciably stimulating our regional economy, this new industry will create 400 new jobs. It will certainly provide a valuable incentive for the potato industry. I would even call it a real stimulus. If we succeed in developing other markets, we shall be able to build other potato processing plants, with the help, again, of the federal and provincial governments.

That plant is located at Grand Sault and construction is now under way in spite of the frost which is six or seven feet deep. This helps to demonstrate, however, that the program of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is yielding tangible results. The plant is steadily coming up and next fall, we hope to employ at least 300 people to start, and possibly 400. This means that the policies of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion are beginning to bear fruit and no doubt we shall, in due time, bear of other wonderful projects.

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

[*English*]

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan): Mr. Speaker, in the short time at my disposal this afternoon, and at the risk of being perhaps parochial, I should like to attempt to place on the record of this House as clearly and as

succinctly as I possibly can the very serious situation which faces the government and the people of my province of Prince Edward Island. I do this in the hope that I may possibly foster a desire on the part of this government to do something immediately to relieve a very distressing problem. Action must be taken to reduce the growing gap between the rich and the poor provinces of Canada. Each region of this country must be accepted as an integral part of Canada and must be developed according to its special needs and according to its potential.

The reduction of the growing gap between the rich and the poor provinces is a national problem, and the major responsibility of solving it must rest with the federal government and no one else. I say that if the so-called just society is ever to be anything more than a flimsy and meaningless promise it must be based on the right of every citizen of this country, first of all, to acquire an adequate income and, second and just as important, to be able to enjoy the same essential public services as are being enjoyed by the people living in the so-called richer provinces. The federal government must be made to realize, as apparently it has not realized yet, that the major burden of financing regional growth in the poorer provinces is its responsibility. Why is it its responsibility? Primarily because money is necessary to do that job and the poorer provinces just do not have the money nor, unfortunately, do they have the opportunities now to raise the necessary money through taxation.

Let me return, if I may, to my own province. Under present conditions, how can the government of Prince Edward Island possibly raise more money through the medium of taxation? The average weekly wage of the worker in our province is $75.97—that is $38.06 a week below the national average. In November of 1969 our unemployment rate was 7.9 per cent of the labour force. At that time that was the highest of any province in Canada. We depend very heavily on agriculture, and yet more than one half of our island farmers gross less than $2,500 a year, before taking out their expenses. The situation is growing worse. For four consecutive years now, the capital investment in the province has been decreasing, and I suggest that we cannot have the base for levying taxes unless we have capital investment. Our business establishments are small—75 per cent of the firms in our province have sales of less than $5,000 a year.

[Mr. McQuaid.]

Perhaps more serious than all of this is the fact that many of our young people who are just entering the productive year of their lives are leaving our province, and for good reason. They are leaving because they cannot find jobs there and wish to take advantage of the opportunities which are offered in the more rapidly growing regions in this country. I suggest that perhaps they cannot be blamed. When our province entered confederation in 1873, our population was 97,000 people. Today, 97 years later, the population is still only 110,000 people. That is an increase of 13,000 people in 97 years. Young people have to move out; there is just nothing there for them to do.

This migration is general all over the maritime provinces. In 1851, 22 per cent of all Canadians resided in the maritime provinces. In 1961, 11 per cent resided there. Unfortunately, these young men and women leave, as I said before, in the most productive years of their lives. We rear and educate them at a cost which is estimated to be $20,000 per child, and just as they reach the age at which they are able to contribute something to our economy they leave for Ontario or some other province in Canada or for a state in the United States where they can earn an adequate wage. Only 55 per cent of our population is in the age group of 15 to 64 years, that is the age when they are likely to be in the labour force and when they can make a valuable contribution to our economy. Our population, therefore, is made up of a disproportionate percentage of the very young and the very old and of course we know that the very young and the very old, instead of contributing to the economy of the province, are more inclined to draw out of it.

There must be a narrowing of the gap in personal income between our region and other regions of Canada, and this must be accomplished through the generation of income within the region. This narrowing of the gap is a national responsibility. The task is to discover how to do it wisely. The minister says the government has been studying that situation, but I very seriously suggest that pouring subsidies into the area is not the full answer. What the government should be striving to give the Atlantic area and the other poorer provinces of Canada is a sound economic base. Our objective must be one of development, not one of welfare.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I was very encouraged when I read the speech the Minister of Regional Economic

Expansion delivered to the annual meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council back in October, 1968. I would like to place part of that speech on the record and then ask the minister what he is doing to follow-up the statements made therein. This is what he is reported to have said in speaking about his own department:

> The new department is being created essentially because regional development is a matter of top priority for the federal government. If the underdevelopment of the Atlantic provinces is not corrected—not by charity or subsidies but by helping them become areas of economic growth—then the unity of the country is almost as surely destroyed as it would be by the French-English confrontation. Our job is to see that economic growth is dispersed widely enough across the country to provide equal access to opportunities of productive employment for Canadians everywhere. This is what I mean by a regional development policy. I mean that the federal government is prepared to take special action where it is needed to bring opportunities up to standard. There has to be a comprehensive structuring of government action to regional needs.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a very weighty statement. It is one with which I entirely agree. But I say to the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that mere words are not enough. Let us get on with the job.

In my own province, we have heard a great deal from the government and from the minister about the famous regional economic development plan. Let me take a look at that plan, Mr. Speaker. The minister says, and I want him to correct me if what I say is not correct, that the plan provides that $728 million will be spent to spark expansion in Prince Edward Island over the next 15 years. Some 95 per cent of the people of Canada think that the federal government is going to pour $728 million of the taxpayers' money into P.E.I. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Two-thirds of that money, $503 million of it, is going to be the responsibility of the province of Prince Edward Island. In other words, P.E.I., with a per capita debt which is now the highest of any province in Canada, is going to have to raise $503 million in order to participate in this plan. That leaves $225 million. Of this amount of $225 million, and correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Minister, $36.6 million is repayable by the provincial government. Some $38.6 million of that $225 million is only a loan, with interest, by the federal government to the provincial government. It is an interest bearing loan. So now, getting down to hard facts, this reduces the share of the federal government to $188.4 million.

But even all of that $188.4 million is not new money. It includes Ottawa's share of joint programs which are already in existence. If these contributions had continued, even at the 1968 rate of $8.5 million a year, in the 15 year period the total amount would have been $127.5 million. So, Mr. Speaker, how much new money are we getting? Instead of the $728 million we are now down to $60.9 million. If these figures are wrong, I want them to be corrected.

How much of that $60.9 million is going to get into the hands of the people? It is estimated that it is going to take 400 people to administer this plan. Put their salaries at $10,000 per year, and I suggest that is low because some of those who are now attempting to administer the plan are getting as high as $15,000 and $16,000 a year, and over the 15 year period you have $60 million gone in salaries. So, what have you got left? You have $90,000 for the people of P.E.I. If these figures are not correct, I hope the minister will correct me immediately.

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, when I, as a member from British Columbia, look at the designated regions map I see there is probably more white area in British Columbia than in any other province. I have to concede, therefore, that this must be one of the prosperous provinces. So, I suppose I speak possibly as someone who is vitally interested in all of Canada but as one coming from an area which is not really considered to require any help. In other words, we know what economic expansion is, but we are not quite too sure about disparity.

I would like, first of all, to congratulate the minister. I have watched this program, and I would suggest that some of my good friends from the Maritimes might be standing so close to the forest that they cannot see the trees. As a British Columbian, I had an opportunity to participate in some development in the Maritimes for a period of five or six years. I know some of the problems with which the people of the Maritimes are confronted. I know some of the problems with which industrialists there are confronted. I know a number of the problems with which the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) is confronted.

I see the definition of the word "disparity" is inequality of rank, station, degree or excellence. I am a little bit concerned about this word. I noticed that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) stated the government

had a stranglehold on P.E.I., and I have just heard a fine speech by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid), in which he referred to one of the poorer provinces that does not have money. He said it is the sole responsibility of the federal government to fix this up, and that there is no provincial responsibility. I wonder does the hon. gentleman really mean this? Does he mean to say it is the sole responsibility of the federal government?

Have you ever been involved in endeavouring to suggest to a fine group of happy people that they were poor, and have them say, "Who, Me? Poor?" The happiest people I have ever known in my life lived in Prince Edward Island. And then somebody said to them, "Tomorrow you shall be producers of food and as producers of food you will somehow or other get rich. What are you going to do about that? We are going to bring you in money." And they answered, "Well, that is fine. There is no complaint there. We will take that. When the fishing season starts, we will be on our boats. If you think we are going to stand in a line and peel potatoes, then we will take a second look at this proposal."

• (5:30 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Nobody fishes in British Columbia?

Mr. Pringle: These people said, "If you feel we should all come to work when we have a blizzard or snowstorm, you might be disappointed." I do not blame the people of Prince Edward Island for this attitude. It is a way of life with them, and it is a great way of life.

The foreman of our field division told me—he may be wrong, of course—that the people of Prince Edward Island never had it so good as during the depression. They had plenty to eat, plenty of coal, and on Saturday night they could row out three miles and pick up a keg of rum.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Pringle: The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that this situation is not the complete responsibility of the government. We may provide, through the taxpayers of the country, the funds to do the job, but it is a joint effort. I would think that members from the Maritimes especially would feel it necessary for everybody to get together.

As I said before, I come from Fraser Valley East which is about the size of Prince Edward Island. It has a population of 70,000 people, whereas the population of Prince Edward Island is 110,000. Fraser Valley East has one Member of Parliament, while Prince Edward Island has four. Fraser Valley East has no Senators, and Prince Edward Island has four. The cost to the federal government to have Prince Edward Island represented in both places is about $132,000. For Fraser Valley East the cost to the government is only $18,000. The per capita cost for Fraser Valley East is 26 cents; I am worth only 26 cents to each of my constituents. I should like the worthy gentlemen from Prince Edward Island to know that they are worth $1.20 per capita.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: I want to make it very clear that this is not a criticism of the provincial government and certainly not of the way of life in that province, but I feel there is a sociological problem involved here. We cannot go in there and say we will give them one-third of the amount of money required to build a plant. A real dandy fish plant was built to the tune of $13 million, but it closed. I do not know why. Perhaps it was a question, not just of the plant but of the engineering of the entire project. I would say that the pro forma arrangements were a little biased, the market projections were a little wrong or the engineering was horrible. The plant was a duplicate of one built in British Columbia.

In dealing with the Prince Edward Island farmers we cannot just go there and tell them how to run their business. They have been farming for many years and are not sure that the information from agronomists about fertilizer is very good. We must go into the distressed areas, talk to the people and find out what they want. We must ask them, "Do you want a plant of this kind? Do you feel that this is the way you want to live? Will this program upset your way of life to the point that you will refuse to function?" In regard to this plant in the east, the unit labour cost was almost double that of the plant in the west.

I prophecy that in the not too distant future things will start to percolate in Prince Edward Island if we can get members of the opposition to adopt a positive approach similar to that advocated by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom). I thought his criticism was objective and that he took a positive approach. I hope that our friends from Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and parts of New Brunswick

would adopt the same positive approach to problems of regional expansion. This will not be achieved by standing up in this House and preaching blue ruin.

Another point which bothered me today was this business of expecting instant employment. We know there are plans on the books and applications approved for plants with an employment potential of 22,000 people. To stand up in this House and ask, "Where are the jobs?"—

An hon. Member: There aren't any.

Mr. Pringle: I was asked that question a couple of times by the hon. member on my left. Let us take the example of a fish plant. Do you go out in the morning, turn a key and have a fish plant? Have you any idea of the amount of planning, programming and engineering required for any industrial plant? When it is built, you cannot start it off at maximum production; it takes three formative years before it gets off the ground. The plant I referred to in Prince Edward Island was built in six months and has taken six years to get into worth-while production. In the first five years it was not even possible to pay the interest on the loan.

An hon. Member: What plant are you talking about?

Mr. Pringle: The plant in Montagne, Prince Edward Island.

An hon. Member: A fish plant?

Mr. Pringle: A fish plant. There is no food plant there.

An hon. Member: You are all mixed up. Fish or fowl; which is it?

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Pringle: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. gentlemen for the kind remarks they are making. I hope we shall be able to realize the benefits that can accrue from the incentives act. Before ending my remarks may I say a word about a matter on which I am in complete agreement with a number of opposition members from one of the Maritime provinces. I do not believe you can build and operate industry in isolated areas. Transportation is one of the most important facets of any industry, because people and goods must be moved into and out of the industry.

Mr. Dinsdale: That includes air transport.

Mr. Pringle: I come from Fraser Valley East, but I recommend most strongly that the government construct the Prince Edward Island causeway.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Pringle: If we build the causeway we shall be in a better position to help the people and industries of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must interrupt the hon. member because his time has expired.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, when the legislation to establish the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was introduced and debated in this House last summer, and when the principal item of legislation proposed by the department during that year—the Regional Development Incentives Act—was brought forward, I think it will be agreed that in all quarters of the House there was general agreement upon the need to develop an adequate regional development program and an adequate program of regional economic expansion.

While there were some points of disagreement on the specific aspects of the government's proposal, and in some cases serious disagreement in areas which members of this party felt could jeopardize the prospects for success of the program, I think there was general agreement upon the principle of developing such a program, and therefore agreement as to the principle of the legislation passed by this House. Thus it can be said, Mr. Speaker, that the government embarked upon this new program with a high degree of good will in all parts of the House and in Canada generally.

However, it seems to me that a good deal of this good will has been dissipated and washed away during the past several months as a result of some of the actions of the government, some of the things it has done and some of the things it has not done. No better example of the type of thing that has been done by the government can be found than the department's news release of last November 19. That news release issued by the department stated, "Regional program creating more new jobs." It went on to say:

> The federal government's regional development program is creating new employment four times as fast as it did in 1968.

Then there was some elaboration on this matter. It was pointed out that from January to mid-November the department has

approved 278 development incentives for firms intending to establish new plants or expand into slow growth regions of Canada. There were further details in the release about the estimated permanent employment which would result. There was also the statement that this activity was a good deal higher than in previous years.

It all sounded very fine, and consequently I asked for more information on this annoucement by the department. I moved a motion for papers in which I asked for a copy of the list of the 278 development incentive grants and for some other information. I was informed on January 28, Wednesday last, by the parliamentary secretary that "the cases referred to are not grants paid out but offers made." He went on to say, as reported at page 2928 of *Hansard*:

> The details requested will be made public in all cases when the project is proceeded with, and before any grant is actually paid. But at the offer stage, confidentiality is essential to the program.

I want to make it clear that I am not blaming the department for bragging a little about getting a larger number of applications than in previous years, even though many of these applications would be from firms which were trying to get in under the deadline of the old legislation because in many cases they would not be able to qualify under the new legislation in view of the change of boundaries. I am not blaming the department for wanting to take a little credit for this. But it is clear from the answer given that these are not firm projects; there is nothing concrete about them.

They are only offers to the extent that the government is carrying out its commitment. They are only offers of grants if a decision is made by the private firm involved to proceed with the development project in question. Thus, it seems to me that the department's news release creates a false impression of what is being done under the aegis of this department.

It seems to me that there are a number of drastic failures and shortcoming in the government's program as it has developed up to the present time. The first major point is that the department has not developed an effective program that can be used as a weapon in the war on poverty. I think all hon. members will recognize that problems of poverty cannot and will not be solved overnight. I believe it must be said that to date we have not seen any evidence that the department is developing any sort of program that can really be described as a attack on the whole problem of poverty. I do not intend to go into this matter in any further detail because the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) dealt with it in his address this afternoon.

The second point I wish to draw to the attention of the House is that the government has failed with its program in this department to counterbalance the impact of its policies of fiscal and monetary restraint in regions which are suffering economic setbacks or which are economically deprived and underdeveloped. Our attention has been drawn to the fact that the government will tolerate a high level of unemployment. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) indicated that he is willing to tolerate a 6 per cent level of unemployment without any difficulty.

This means a 10 per cent rate of unemployment in Quebec, a 12 per cent rate in the Maritime provinces, and for my own province of Saskatchewan a 10 per cent rate of unemployment in the urban centres and communities. Thus, we see that the government's program in the area of regional economic expansion has not been effective and I suggest it will not be effective, within its present framework, in counterbalancing many of the ill-effects of the government's present program and policy of fiscal and monetary restraint.

Third, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there has been political chicanery in the establishment of designated areas under the Regional Development Incentives Act. I have found it rather difficult to obtain answers and adequate information on government policy and approach in dealing with this particular matter. I have asked a good many questions on this subject during the current session of Parliament. One question I asked with respect to seven out of our ten provinces was the following:

> What criteria were used by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion in the selection of designated areas for the province—

The answer provided to each question was, "Weighted measures of rates of economic growth—employment, income and population—and of potential for secondary industry". This is a clear case, so far as I am concerned, of bureaucratic gobbledegook. Thus, we see what wording was used to set out the criteria for the designation of areas under this new legislation. Subsequently, I placed a motion for papers on the Order Paper asking for a copy of all correspondence between the gov-

ernment of Canada and each of the provinces regarding the selection of designated regions under the new Regional Development Incentives Act. The answer I received was that correspondence was exchanged only with the province of Alberta and the government of Alberta, and that with respect to the other provinces there was no correspondence.

• (5:50 p.m.)

This seems to be a pretty strange way of running a government, a business or anything else. There is not a single scrap of correspondence dealing with the matter under consideration—a matter, incidentally, wherein it was a requirement of the legislation that there be consultation between the federal government and the province concerned before the federal government made a decision.

Subsequently, I obtained information regarding the proposals of the government of Alberta. This is information to which I felt I was entitled, and which I received. When I asked for information about the views of the federal government and the views of the other provinces across Canada, I was told that the details of such consultations were confidential. I suggest this is in conflict with the fact that I received information respecting one province. I suggest this sort of secrecy in carrying on the operations of the department in the long run will not stand the department in good stead in bringing these programs to the point of success.

I did obtain information subsequently when I asked for documents which would describe the criteria used by the department in selecting the designated areas across Canada for seven of the provinces. I obtained a table in each case entitled, "Economic growth measures for DBS regions". I examined each of these tables that I had requested for seven of the ten provinces, the other three being the Maritime provinces which were completely designated under this legislation. There was a series of tables. There was no indication given of the correlation among the various columns of figures in the tables. There was a table entitled "Income per capita 1966". This set of figures ranged, for example, in the province of British Columbia between 88 and 127. It is not quite clear to me what the 88 and 127 represent. It seems to be a pretty strange way of running a program, if this is the kind of information they use to establish their criteria.

There is a further set of figures dealing with population, comparing 1966 with 1961. It appears to be some sort of percentage change figure, but again this is not completely clear. The same is true with respect to a comparison of employment between 1968 and 1961, also income per capita comparison in 1964 to 1966 with 1961 to 1963.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there is a composite change index. I found that this composite change index was apparently used as a starting point in establishing the regions across Canada. I have before me a map which I requested and which was supplied to me through the courtesy of the parliamentary secretary to the minister. It sets out the boundaries for these different DBS areas. I then took the figures supplied to me, the composite change index, and I found there were many cases—I could go into them in some detail if I had the time—which indicate that political influence was brought to bear in the final selection of designated areas across Canada. I hope to deal with some of these points on another occasion.

I wish to deal briefly with several other failures of the government in developing this legislation. The government failed to develop the growth centre concept in developing its program. It seems there is even conflict between the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) in their approach to this matter. I suggest, as well, there has been a give-away to the private sector of our economy. This has been carried on in the form of a shotgun approach; the government simply made grants to firms as they applied for them. This was done in quite a haphazard, scattergun manner. This policy involves a failure to develop any sort of an overall-comprehensive program for orderly development. At the same time, it represents a give-away to the private sector of the economy.

I have before me a list of firms for whom grants have been approved over the past several months. In total these firms, most of them in the eastern part of Canada, intend to spend approximately $28.7 million in developing various projects. Of this $28.7 million, approximately $11.5 million will be provided by way of grant through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. This represents a straight give-away of public funds. The only benefit arising out of this expenditure is the hope of the government that there will be some form of stable, permanent economic activity. However, the government holds no equity in these projects once it has

made a grant. This seems to be an inadequacy of the program.

I suggest there has been gross failure by the government in allowing grants to be made to foreign-owned and foreign-controlled firms. There is a good deal of concern about this matter at the present time. Some ministers have expressed concern about it. Nevertheless, when my colleague the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) and myself suggested to the minister, when this legislation was before the committee last summer, that before a grant is given an attempt should be made to ensure Canadian ownership of firms, he said this could not be done; there could not be discrimination against some firms.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Foster).

Mr. Foster: Mr. Speaker, may we call it six o'clock?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the opposition motion seeks to condemn the government for failure to co-ordinate its regional development policies under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion with other government activities, and for failure to make an appropriate reference to place this issue before the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

I suppose the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) who introduced this motion did so with sincerity. Nevertheless, I cannot easily imagine weaker wording for a motion designed to bring the activities of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion under review on an opposition day. Mr. Speaker, the co-ordination of the activities of government departments is precisely what this new department is all about. In April, 1969, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was established for the express purpose of co-ordinating government activities in the field of regional development.

The hon. member for St. John's East dealt in considerable detail with the shortcomings of various programs which have now been incorporated into the responsibility of this department. Surely, if there are shortcomings in the FRED program or the ADA program, for example, and if these shortcomings were related to a lack of co-ordination among government departments, as the motion indicates, the establishment of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion would put an end to these shortcomings, since it would bring all the various programs together.

I believe we should be careful not to underestimate the difficulty of bringing together programs as numerous and as various as the following:

1. The Rural development branch of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry;

2. Agricultural re-development (ARDA);

3. The fund for regional economic development (FRED);

4. The Maritime Marshland Rehabilitation Act (MMRA);

5. The Area Development Agency (ADA);

6. The Atlantic Development Board (ADB);

7. The Canada Newstart Program;

8. The Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act (PFRA);

9. The Cape Breton Development Corporation (Devco);

10. The Atlantic Provinces Power Development Act.

I understand that the administration of these various programs has created the need for a new department with a staff of approximately 1,400 people. Indeed, in the department's annual report we find the final annual reports for these many programs as separate entities—the last occasion upon which they will be so listed.

Let us consider the degree of co-operation which exists among the various government departments. I have here an application for a development incentive grant under the Regional Development Incentives Act. Question No. 7 on this application form is: Will the operation produce wastes which would pollute air, water or soil? It seems clear to me that once the form has been filled out, the application must be directed to the attention of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, should the enterprise be likely to cause pollution to soil or water.

If it were likely to cause air pollution, reference would have to be made to the Depart-

ment of National Health and Welfare. I understand, too, that applications for incentive grants on the part of major industries are appraised by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to ensure as far as possible that these enterprises will be economically viable. Thereafter, assistance is made available as might be necessary in the field of trade or external sales.

It is interesting to note that when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) announced the austerity program last summer involving cutbacks in the operations of many government departments, the Department of Regional Economic Expansion was exempted from these measures because of the need to stimulate economic activity in the slow-growth areas. Though no one likes an austerity program, it may well be that this program, by bringing about a lack of funds for economic development in certain parts of the country, has increased the interest of industry in applying for the incentive grants available only to assist development in the slow-growth regions.

As one who comes from the constituency of Algoma, parts of which have been designated for many years, I welcome this increased interest shown by companies in establishing themselves in slow-growth areas. I am aware that there was a flood of applications for incentive grants during December, 1969. In the 1969 calendar year, 359 offers of incentive grants were made, resulting in 22,100 jobs. This compares with 98 approvals and 5,350 jobs expected for the year 1968. I believe this trend will continue and that the economic disparity which has existed for so long among various areas of Canada will be lessened in the years ahead.

Good co-ordination between federal government policies and departments does not always mean, however, that economic development will take place immediately. It should be remembered that many fields of governmental responsibility for development lie within provincial responsibility, and that unless the provincial government concerned is willing to co-operate with the federal government in its incentive program, little progress can be made.

For example, in my own constituency of Algoma, the town of Blind River has lost its only industry, the McFadden Lumber Company, which employed more than 300 people. The province of Ontario controls the forest limits which provide the wood fibre for this mill. There are about one million acres of merchandisable timber in the area to supply an integrated forest industry. Although the federal government, under the incentives program approved last spring, now offers incentives of up to $12 million for the establishment of a pulp and paper mill in the town, the province has not advertised the availability of these limits on a world basis since 1966.

• (8:10 p.m.)

One would think that with over a million acres of merchandisable timber waiting to be utilized, the provincial government would get moving and advertise the availability of these limits after four years. Just the fact that the federal incentives grants have increased during the past six months from $6 million to $12 million should have stimulated the provincial government to advertise these limits again. Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, this town of 3,500 people waits and hopes that a new forest-based industry will establish there.

With regard to the special areas provided for under the act establishing the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, I realize that there is a strong feeling within the department that these areas should be established only in the Maritimes. The rationale for this policy is that the wealthier provinces, like the province of Ontario, have fiscal resources to provide infrastructure for industrial development. This may be a very well thought-out plan and perhaps the province of Ontario will provide sewer, water and other services necessary to provide the infrastructure for industrial development in the slow-growth areas of northern Ontario, but so far it has not and there is little indication that it will.

In my constituency there are eight incorporated towns, only two of which have complete water and sewage treatment plants. The lack of this infrastructure prevents industry coming to these communities. One small town was offered sewer and water service from the Ontario Water Resources Commission, at a cost of around $400 a household per year for a period of 20 years. In a slow-growth area this kind of fee structure is impossible, and unless it is changed sewer and water service will never be provided.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask that when the special areas are established across Canada this spring, the minister and his departmental officials take another look at their present policy for special areas because I doubt whether the province of Ontario plans

to provide the infrastructure necessary for industry, and in the end industry will not come to the slow-growth areas of northern Ontario without it.

I note that the ARDA agreement between the federal government and the provincial governments is due to expire at the end of March, 1970. The ARDA program on Manitoulin Island in my constituency completely refutes the opposition's motion today about co-ordination among government departments. May I give the House some examples. This winter, under the ARDA program, we have some 60 farmers taking a course called "Business of farming" in the Algoma and Manitoulin areas. This involves co-operation among the Canada Manpower centre, the Ontario Department of Education, the Ontario Department of Agriculture and the ARDA program under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

This program is designed to augment management skills of young farmers interested in the business of farming in the years ahead. At the same time, they are provided with allowances to assist them to arrange for the extra help needed on their farms during their absence for this training program. It gives them an opportunity to receive information about new farming techniques which could lead to the reorganization of their farming enterprises.

The ARDA program has also provided a farm enlargement program for some 60 farmers where a farmer with an economically viable farm is able to lease additional land for up to 25 years before purchasing it. This, at a time when capital is scarce, is of great assistance. Other ARDA projects which have involved cooperation among many government departments include the development of four community pastures. Some of these have involved development on Indian reserves, including one at Wikwemikong Indian reserve, which involved co-operation among the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the local Indian band, and the Ontario Department of Agriculture.

With these few remarks, which cover only a few of the ARDA projects in my constituency, I believe it is apparent that a new agreement should be signed between the two levels of government so that the many worth while projects which have been started and developed over the past five or six years will continue to expand in the future. I believe that the whole outreach of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion must be toward helping people. Certainly the last nine months that this department has been in existence indicates that this is the direction in which it is going.

[Mr. Foster.]

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, when the regional development incentives bill was introduced to the House last June, we on this side welcomed the legislation as something we had been advocating for a good many years and to which we hoped the government would give first priority. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) pointed out at that time that we had been waiting a long time for this legislation, that the government had wasted too much time already in bringing it in, and that he hoped that now it had been introduced in the House it would be passed quickly and the government would move a little faster in bringing help to areas suffering regional disparity.

He also pointed out that because of the failure of the government to do anything for four or five years, a great deal of time had been lost in the Atlantic provinces and it behooved the government to move a little faster to make up for this lost time. He also expressed doubts that there had been any real change in government thinking and he wondered if they would actually move any faster once the legislation had been put through. The doubts that our leader expressed at that time were very real ones, and many people in the region, including myself, are beginning to question the government's good intentions in implementing this legislation.

Leading papers in the area have carried editorials on the subject, and in every case they are beginning to wonder if the government really means to take any immediate action to correct the problems of the region. Like most people in the Maritimes, I was quite happy to hear the minister's remarks in Saint John early in January, that his department was prepared to spend millions and millions of dollars in the Maritimes and that this could be done without adding anything to the inflationary pressures. But our enthusiasm likely will be tempered by native caution. Maritimers will, not unreasonably, await specific results before getting carried away by the minister's words, for his remarks are really nothing new.

We in that part of Canada have been saying for years that while there may be a

cost-push inflation in the rest of Canada, that is certainly not the problem in our area. Inflationary pressures may remain very high in the rest of Canada, but in the Atlantic area people are getting the worst of both worlds. We are already afflicted with high unemployment and low wages, and we are likely to be seriously hurt if the government in Ottawa does not tailor its financial policies to fit situations which exist in the depressed areas of the country.

It is little comfort to us in the Atlantic region to hear the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) remark that he is prepared to take measures which might increase unemployment in the country up to 6 per cent or more. The Prime Minister recognizes that Ontario has been the chief cause of inflation, and he says that he is prepared to take stern measures to reduce these inflationary pressures.

What the Prime Minister does not seem to realize or care about is that we in the Atlantic area cannot wait much longer for this government to do something about unemployment. It is true that in New Brunswick we are hearing all sorts of vague rumours about great new developments to take place, but nobody says when. That will-o-the-wisp, the president of the New Brunswick Development Corporation, is chasing all over the world trying to entice industry to come to New Brunswick and only he knows what promises he is making. I have been told he does not even answer to his own Minister of Economic Growth. Our people are asking why there is this veil of secrecy. Public funds are being spent, and people are entitled to know what promises are being made. How could you expect the people of New Brunswick to have any confidence in a provincial government which could perpetrate the Fundy Chemical Park fiasco on them? Let the minister and his colleagues be frank and tell us what is going on.

The minister has given us some figures. He has told us about 17 grants that have been approved and how they are spread across the country. These figures in themselves suggest that the system of a single grant structure for all the slow-growth regions will not work. If a firm has a chance of receiving a grant in either Nova Scotia or Quebec, it is far more likely to choose Quebec as its location because it is so much closer to the main marketing and productive centres of Canada.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Professor T. N. Brewis in his book published last year and entitled "Regional Development Policies in Canada" noted that this problem of a uniform system of grants had been a problem of the area development incentives program. Under that program the underdeveloped areas of Ontario had been the obvious beneficiaries. There are also other indications that the regional development programs are failing to achieve their aims. The industries which are being attracted to the designated regions do not always come from the overcrowded, industrial centres of this country.

One example was brought to the attention of the House last December by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken). He referred to the Glaverbel Glass Company of Belgium which had sound intentions of locating a plant in Parry Sound but was suddenly attracted away to Quebec city by the regional incentives people. Parry Sound is hardly an area from which an industry should be lured away. Yet this is exactly the result of the programs being pursued by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. No wonder the minister is so anxious to keep quiet about the activities of his department.

So far I have dealt with what might be called incidents of failure in the regional development program. But a far more serious consequence than these incidents has been the gross failure of this government to co-ordinate its other policies with its regional development policies. There are three prime examples of the government's flagrant disregard for regional development in the over-all policies, namely, the proposals of the white paper on taxation, the anti-inflationary policies of the government, and the austerity program in government spending.

The white paper hits hard at small business—despite the protest of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson)—which is the type of business most commonly found in the slow-growth areas. It proposes to remove the special, lower tax rate for small businesses and thus raise their tax bill and reduce their ability to plough earnings back into the business. Owners of small publicly-traded businesses will have difficulty maintaining ownership when faced with a tax bill every five years for the capital gains on the stock they hold in their companies. Farmers, too, will be hit by the new tax proposals. Capital gains taxing of their sales of livestock and equipment, and

the removal of tax concessions previously granted to farm co-operatives, will certainly cut into farm income.

The government also has unfavourable changes in store for the extractive industries. In other words, the tax paper manages to strike at the three staples of the slow growth areas: small business, farming, and extraction. Is this an indication of the government's sincerity about improving regional economies?

Another example is the anti-inflationary measures taken by this government. The Prime Minister says his government will fight inflation even if the national unemployment rate goes as high as 6 per cent. But the unemployment rate in Quebec is already 7 per cent; in the Atlantic provinces it is already 7.4 per cent, while the national rate is 4.8 per cent. If the national rate is allowed to go to 6 per cent, these high unemployment areas will be hit much harder. C. R. McFadden, head of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council, estimates that unemployment in the Maritimes could go as high as 10 per cent. In other words, the government is quite prepared to let the slow-growth areas of the country underwrite the cost of restoring price stability.

The spending of the government under its program of austerity is equally lopsided. With cries of "Economy" and "Let's tighten our belts" the government has cut back spending on the Newstart program and has frozen hiring for the Cape Breton Development Corporation. At the same time, it feels no pangs of conscience about spending $27 million for a new defence headquarters in Ottawa.

In fact, the spending of the Department of Public Works in general is an instructive case. Take, for example, the department's release concerning contracts let during the month of November. In all the areas which the government did not single out in its budget for restraints on capital spending, Public Works awarded contracts with a total value of $2,383,781. In Toronto alone, its contracts were worth nearly three times as much. In Ottawa, its contracts were worth nearly ten times as much, and construction worth $50 million more is planned for Ottawa beginning this summer.

The government is preaching restraint for the weaker areas of the economy while pumping money into the centres of inflation, and this despite the minister's statement in Saint John early last month that the government could spend "millions and millions of dollars in the Maritimes without adding anything to inflationary pressures". Of course, he did not say anything about the rest of the country—I admit that—but it hardly ties in with the government's war against inflation to spend millions of dollars in inflationary areas and not in the depressed areas.

[Mr. Thomas.]

To summarize my main points, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) has created great anxiety in those of us who are interested in regional development by his persistent refusal to remove the secrecy which surrounds the operations of his department. Such secrecy, along with the small bits of information which have managed to leak out about the department's performance, lead us to believe that the program is foundering badly.

No matter how well the department's own programs were doing, they could not possibly compensate for the department's utter failure to fulfil its role in co-ordinating other government programs with regional impact. The fiscal and monetary policies of the present government are such as to wipe out entirely any good which might have been done under the regional development program.

Almost no one disagrees with the aims of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. If the minister would only re-open the channels for discussion of his policies, he might find that he has gained valuable allies for the struggles in which he is obviously engaged with other members of the cabinet.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate. However, I feel that not only do I want to express my appreciation of the views I have heard here—and I will welcome meeting the members of the committee to hear their views—but, more important, I want to correct the impression which may have been left by the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) in figures which he quoted for the Prince Edward Island plan. Either he is not familiar with the financial aspects of that plan or he was speaking in a very jocular manner. None the less, the impression was left that there is very little federal money in that plan. That, of course, is nonsense.

The hon. member said that what there was in the plan was meaningless, because the money would have been there anyway as a result of the standard shared-cost programs. That is not the case, either. He also said that other funds would be spent for personnel, on

salaries for people administering the plan. That is certainly not fair to the P.E.I. plan or to other hon. members who want to understand what is actually happening.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I trust that when the committee meets we will have a more serious and valuable input than that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me run over very briefly the basic outlines of the Prince Edward Island development plan. These facts can be found in a small booklet published by the department last year. The financial aspects are set out on its back pages for all to see. The total development plan is designed to cover a 15-year period. The total investment in that plan by the two levels of government is expected to be $723 million, of which the federal contribution would be in the order of $225 million and the provincial contribution $498 million. But the plan includes all the educational costs of the province of P.E.I. and many other normal provincial expenditures.

I would like to present the members of the House with the costs of the plan broken down in some detail—and only for the first five to seven years, which is the first phase of the plan, after which it is subject to review. The figures for those five to seven years are outlined in the little booklet that I mentioned. This five to seven-year period, known as phase 1, is designed to cover total spending of approximately $243 million, of which the federal share is forecast at $125 million and the provincial share at $118 million; that is to say, in phase 1 the federal spending exceeds the provincial spending. That is part of the design. The federal spending exceeds the provincial spending in order to put some momentum into the development plan at the start That is the time to have the maximum federal contribution. Of those provincial costs of $118 million, education alone comes to $97 million. That is approximately 80 per cent of the provincial spending forecast under the plan. All the rest, so far as the province is concerned, are normal provincial expenditures.

The whole of the extra spending on the Prince Edward Island Development Plan in phase 1 is federal spending of some $125 million. Of this sum, it is true that approximately $6 million would be spent on vocational training programs in any case. However, the rest is not available under any standard shared-cost, federal-provincial programs as they operate in other provinces. I think that is the point which the hon. member for Cardigan failed to recognize. It is true that the federal govenment will be doing some of the same things in other Atlantic provinces, and to some extent also in Quebec and in the prairies. But none of this represents standard programs available in, say, the province of Ontario. It is all extra development spending; it is extra because of the regional disparities recognized in the province of P.E.I.

It is also true that of this $119 millon federal spending, $36 million will be credit. The hon. member drew attention to the credit features. It is credit because it is to be used, for example, for purchasing land. The province recovers this investment. That is the nature of the plan. But the remaining $83 million in the federal portion over the next five to seven years is a pure contribution from the taxpayers of Canada to the development plan.

How is it to be spent? The hon. member said that most of it would be spent on salaries. This is sheer nonsense. I do not know where he got his figures. Of course, some will be spent on salaries because personnel providing services will be involved in the development plan—for example, agricultural extension officers.

Let me list a few of the facts of the spending proposed: tourism, the development of campsites, etc., $4 million; housing, to reduce housing costs, $6 million; highways, $7½ million; industrial financing, $3 million; pollution control, $1 million; fisheries services, $5 million—I stress that this is additional federal spending to put the plan in momentum —agricultural services, $12½ million; health and welfare services, $3 million; and then an additional general development grant, not specified, to help the province cover extra provincial costs, $20.6 million.

All these facts are available in the booklet I have mentioned. I do not think it does a service to this House or to the people of Prince Edward Island to try to reduce all this federal spending to $90,000, or whatever figure the hon. member mentioned. If the hon. member had gone on a little longer, he would have had the province of P.E.I. contributing to the development of some other region of the country through this development plan. It just does not make sense to pursue that line of thought.

It seems to me the hon. member took the same approach as, unfortunately, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) did in saying that nothing substantial is being done. The

facts refute that. Surely the people of the provinces, and indeed all the people of Canada, will not believe that nothing substantial is being done.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogene Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I believe I would not fulfil my duty if I did not take a few minutes to draw the minister's attention to the difficult conditions prevailing in Saint-Hyacinthe and the area, and to ask for his co-operation in order to eliminate them because they worry a great many workers, industrialists and businessmen in my riding who live from their daily work or the operation of their business.

Other reasons also prompt me to take part in this debate as the province of Quebec is now going through a period of severe unemployment which causes misery and concern.

• (8:40 p.m.)

We must think, for example, about the situation existing in the Lower St. Lawrence valley to realize that the minister is surely justified in using all available means in order to speed up the program that he has outlined and to assist as soon as possible these people who are in the most unfortunate circumstances.

In the St. Hyacinthe area, unions describe the conditions as alarming. In the course of the last few months many industries have had to close down due to lack of business, throwing hundreds of workers into the street. Many other industries have had to reduce their work force drastically with the result that in the St. Hyacinthe region alone there are at the present time nearly 4,500 unemployed.

The minister knows that the Central Council of the City of St. Hyacinthe has been justifiably concerned with the difficult situation now prevailing there. Recently the local Union officials invited the minister to meet them in St. Hyacinthe in order to discuss this situation.

I would like to briefly recall to the minister what journalists and labour leaders have had to say about prevailing economic conditions in our region. I had the pleasure of attending the conference held by the minister on January 21. Some 300 persons were present, greatly concerned with the economic situation and with whatever proposals the minister could offer.

The St. Hyacinthe newspaper, *Le Clairon*, briefly reviewed the situation, mentioning that 17 per cent of the St. Hyacinthe labour force is now unemployed.

[Mr. O'Connell.]

That is one of the most affected areas in the province of Quebec, and the people that live there certainly deserve particular attention from the minister. Unfortunately, I did not receive a copy of the brief presented to the minister and containing an in-depth study of the situation. That is why I must trust the newspaper and say that the officials of the CNTU, workers in general and business leaders agree that the minister should, having thoroughly looked into the matter, declare that St. Hyacinthe is if not a designated area, at least a special area. The Quebec government has already taken similar action so that industries interested in settling in St. Hyacinthe may avail themselves of the advantages provided by the provincial government.

As it was clearly suggested to the minister when he visited St. Hyacinthe, it is wrong to consider the town of St. Hyacinthe, as well as the rest of the area at that, as being part of the area of Montreal. The minister will have in mind the great number of arguments proving that the area of St. Hyacinthe is entirely different from that of Montreal.

And I need no other evidence than what the mayor of Saint-Hyacinthe himself said. I hope that the minister will carefully consider the arguments that were submitted to him. He will certainly remember that when he came to Saint-Hyacinthe, the first citizen of the city told him that because the city is not considered as a designated area, it is subject to unfavourable competition from cities like Drummondville, Saint-Jean and Granby.

I know of some firms which would have been interested in coming to Saint-Hyacinthe but because of the disadvantages due to the fact that this city is not considered as a designated area, they went elsewhere, to Granby, Saint-Jean or Drummondville.

It is difficult for the people of Saint-Hyacinthe, who pay their taxes, as well as for those of Granby, Saint-Jean and Drummondville—

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes, but if it is argued that my department's program was fruitless, they could not have existed.

Mr. Ricard: —for the minister's information, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have proof to the contrary.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): You would have to convince my colleague. It seems that the program was fruitless.

An hon. Member: There is nothing to be done.

Mr. Ricard: In any event, I am sure that, because of Bill C-202, several industries did not settle in Saint-Hyacinthe. Our electors are not jealous because those industries settled elsewhere, but a matter of justice is involved and I think that the Minister's former colleagues in the labour movement have made it clear. I would now like to speak on their behalf and request earnestly all the attention to which the city of Saint-Hyacinthe is entitled.

If there is one thing I could reproach the minister with, it is that the Queec point of view has not been sufficiently taken into account, especially in connection with the location of the new international airport. In my opinion, that was a mistake. Indeed, it was quite wrong to dismiss the views of Quebec, since it had several reasons to choose another location. This has surely embittered not only the authorities of the province of Quebec, but many citizens who shared their opinion.

It is also difficult for the workers at the Lauzon shipyards, for exemple, to forget the promises made to them during the last election campaign.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): What promises?

Mr. Ricard: The promises to get contracts in order to give jobs to the workers of the Lauzon shipyards.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): That is wrong.

Mr. Ricard: Today, we realize that those shipyards are in jeopardy, which does not help the workers of that part of the province, who are faced with many difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to take too much of the time of the House, but I urge the minister ro reconsider the case of the Saint-Hyacinthe area and to make it a designated area so that the efforts of the federal and provincial governments will be better co-ordinated with a view to bringing new industries into our region which offers every possibility of providing jobs to those who need them.

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I take this opportunity to discuss the merits of the projects and achievements of the new Department of Regional Economic Expansion and those of the former Department of Forestry and Rural Development.

This opportunity is given to us through the motion introduced by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) to condemn an alleged failure to coordinate policies within the department. The hon. member may be right to some extent but he should not put all the blame on the minister. Rather, he should commend him for his good work, for a job well done up until now, since he has succeeded in putting some order in the various organizations dealing with economic promotion that had been operating for many years in Canada, particularly in the Maritime provinces, under various departments.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Quite possibly and even most probably, there was a lack of co-ordination in the past, because of the situation prevailing in some provinces and of somewhat tense relations between the two levels of government when priorities had to be established.

We must also consider that regional development is a new way of approaching economic expansion. Criteria are not clearly set out, for conditions are far from being identical from one area to the other and each project has to be studied within a local context. Moreover, no development project could fully succeed without unreserved co-operation from the local population and all levels of public administration.

I appreciate the anxiety felt by the hon. members and I do share in it, because, like them, I expect much of that department's ability to provide the assistance required for the recovery of our depressed areas. It must be recognized that the challenge is great and that the work to be done is quite complex. However, nothing is impossible when competent and willing men like those who are now running this department accept the challenge and get to work with vigour and realism.

As for me, I am confident that the results sought will soon be coming and that again our economic situation will improve in the underprivileged regions of our country.

It is easy to criticize in a negative way, as have done some members of the opposition since the beginning of the debate and I might ask the hon. member for St. John's East to tell me what the party, to which he belonged from 1957 to 1963, has done while in power.

The Atlantic Development Board was actually set up under the Diefenbaker administration in 1962, of which the hon. member for Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid) from Prince Edward

Island, who made a speech this afternoon was a member, I think. Unfortunately, this Board had no authority whatever and no budget. It is indeed the Liberal government which, when it came into power in 1963, not only gave powers to this council but also—which was far more important—a budget of $100 million.

But this is a thing of the past; speaking about it or discussing it further will not change anything. Let us turn to the present and the future instead, and worry about what can be done to improve the situation.

A department was created, barely six months ago, to tackle squarely the problems of regional disparities.

Since then, an important bill was adopted, Bill C-202, to provide financial assistance to such industries as will settle or prosper in the designated areas. That act replaces Bill C-129, adopted in the early sixties, which had become—it was soon found out—slightly too restrictive.

Bill C-129, Mr. Speaker, in spite of its weaknesses, gave very good results. According to the report of the department on its activities, as tabled by the minister last Friday, the Regional Development Agency had approved, to March 31, 1969, 1040 applications for capital grants, totalling over $2,600 million and representing 65,000 new jobs.

Obviously, all those plans were probably not carried out, and this, for various reasons beyond the control of the federal government. But it certainly is not fair for the opposition to say that nothing has been done as they have been doing since the beginning of this debate.

Looking at the table which appears on page 19 of that report, I see that the Atlantic provinces, particularly, benefitted the most from this bill. In fact, 301 projects were approved, representing investments of $897 million, and 21,000 new jobs. Quebec follows with 289 projects, amounting to investments of $800 million and 16,000 new jobs. Ontario comes next, with 220 projects, representing only $420 million in capital investments and 16,000 new jobs.

It is therefore obvious from this report, that the Atlantic provinces were the ones that benefitted the most from this act and from many others administered by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion.

I come from the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area, one with a population of about 300,000. If the people from my constituency could benefit as much as those of Prince Edward Island from the act during the next five years, we would be in the seventh heaven, for should this project become a reality, Prince Edward Island will get from the federal government, and only out of this investment project, more than $125 million. The same amount of money should be invested in the four constituencies of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area, where there are 300,000 people. We would be most happy about that. Instead of criticizing a government that would grant such amounts of money, the 300,000 citizens of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area would be most happy and grateful.

But what do we see instead? The government is blamed and pilloried for seemingly not doing enough.

The area I represent also benefitted from that act, in a much lesser way however, which is understandable, as it has but few very large firms. We do have some large ones, but they do not expand very fast. Nevertheless, Alcan was given a development incentive by the department for the building of a new plant in Arvida.

The act was restrictive enough, as I said a while ago, and in many cases, on account of requirements from the inspectors and from the act, the amounts spent to qualify for an incentive almost cancelled out the benefits thus obtained, especially for projects involving less than $75,000.

Another weakness which I have been able to notice in Bill C-129 is the time gap between when the applications are made and when the subsidy is paid, which has been so long in some cases that the business has been obliged to pay to the bank rather large amounts in interest on a temporary financing of the subsidy it was going to receive.

I hope that such problems will not arise again in practice, and I think that Bill C-202, in the case at least of small projects, has rectified this situation.

My area is among the designated areas and during the last few years, the federal government paid for an extensive study of the conditions and the economic potential of our area. That study has been carried out by a highly qualified expert, Mr. Pierre-Yves Pépin of Montreal, and recently a very interesting report on the matter has been presented.

Nearly a year ago, a mission of economic planning was appointed by the provincial government in order to carry out a study of

the whole area and a plan is starting to take shape which no doubt will soon be submitted to the federal and provincial authorities for approval and implementation.

The Department of Regional Economic Expansion will certainly be asked for its support and I am confident that the present minister will listen with sympathy to that request so that the beautiful Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area, which he knows well, can have once again a strong economy which will keep there thousands of young people educated today at very great expenses and whom unfortunately we see now move out of the area every day.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. C. A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, I would not want to miss this opportunity to say a few words on the motion introduced today and which reads as follows:

That this House condemns the Government's failure to coordinate its Regional Development policies under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion with other government activities, and its failure to bring in an appropriate reference to place this issue before the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

I would also like to make a few remarks on the amendment which adds, and I quote:

and this House further condemns the government for its failure to lessen regional poverty across Canada, and for its failure to create job opportunities so sorely needed at this time.

Have we actually the right to blame the government? Surely if we study all the aspects of the problem, we can certainly do so, because, in everything, there is always some good and some bad, and men are not more perfect than the laws that they enact.

The new department had in mind, I think, a comprehensive project, and it urges all groups: provincial governments, municipalities, companies, industrialists, to come and co-operate with a view to reducing unemployment across Canada.

If the government is to be blamed in some instances, we also have to examine our own conscience, since that question is of the utmost interest to us. We must ask ourselves whether we have done our duty and have informed the population on the aims of the department.

The minister, in the introduction to the report of his department for the year 1968-69, stated the following, and I quote:

The first phase in the establishment of the new department was dealing with the re-grouping under the authority of a single minister of all the federal organizations and programs devoted to regional development and social progress. The oldest of those programs dated back to 1935, but most of them had been initiated since 1960; each was designed to settle what was originally considered distinct and isolated cases—

As a matter of fact, a few years ago, when the famous ARDA program was introduced, I had the opportunity to rise in the House and to congratulate the then Minister of Forestry. I drew to his attention in particular the fact that, thanks to the ARDA program, many blueberry operations had been set up in my region. We got grants totalling more than $3 million to that effect. I then told the minister that he was making a big mistake by setting up those blueberry operations.

Six or seven years later, it turned out that I had been right. The blueberry fields have become public places where pickers are fighting for the blueberries. Once everything had been levelled down, I told him: You should not have caused all those trees to be chopped down, because you should know that blueberries grow in the woods with trees a necessary protection.

Well, what is being done now? Just a return to what I recommended six or seven years ago. I quote from a November 1969 newspaper:

Parcels of land will be distributed to the pickers.

So the blueberry fields which had almost been regionalized are going to be returned to the owners.

I believed it was a mistake at the time and I had censored the government for thus venturing into areas it was not too familiar with. I had precisely told the minister that he knew nothing about blueberry operations. This was no fault of his, but he should have heeded my advice.

Today, because of these failures, blueberry production has considerably decreased. However the new arrangements should result in correcting these mistakes.

This organization has been established recently, as I said a moment ago. Its aim is to centralize all efforts in an attempt to solve the problem as a whole.

If we really want to solve it, co-operation is essential on the part of the provinces, companies and industrialists.

The Quebec government has certainly understood the aims of this department, since in September 1969 a newspaper stated that it intended to invest $50 million in the program for financial assistance to primary industries.

Reading this article, I understood immediately that the province of Quebec was aware of the part it had to play, since it allocated funds for joint programs which the Department of Regional Economic Expansion will help to put into effect in each of the regions.

As far as my riding is concerned, much work has been done. In fact, we have benefitted from the planning mission as well as from the REC which is doing an excellent job in determining means to promote industry, agriculture and tourism.

We have obtained an excellent report of some 450 pages which is full of valuable information. On reading that report, some deficiencies are discovered, even in my area. Indeed, some authorities, such as reeves, have violently criticized it. In my opinion, it has given too much importance to the Upper Saguenay area in comparison with others, namely the Lake St. John and Roberval areas.

Apparently, all the industry has been centered in the Upper Saguenay, while the Lake St. John area becomes an experimental farm. In fact, it is considered as being mainly a farming district, while the best farm lands happen to be in the Roberval area where the future of forestry operations looks very promising.

• (9:10 p.m.)

It will probably be necessary to retimber the present lands in order to start a forest development.

If one of our distinguished citizens, a reeve, expressed straightforwardly his opinions on that matter, he was sometimes right. If it had been arranged to have the study made by people of the area, I think the results would have been different.

Anyway I do not wish to destroy everything that has been done because there has been some progress. What has been achieved is surely not useless since it has already given rise to discussions and certainly it has helped the minister realize that the people of the Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean area are not only awakening but want to study the problems and get out of the present dead-lock.

We have already seen some results in our area, since we have received a grant for one of our most prosperous industries, one that manufactures machinery used in forestry, such as motor chain-saws and, in my opinion, this is quite an achievement. We hope this assistance will be continued, in order that other similar industries will contribute to the recovery of our economy which is not based entirely on the forest industry because the people there also go in for farming. We also hope that in this field we will be able some day to note some progress.

We have also a very interesting project in St.-Félicien and there is no need for me to cross the t's, as the Minister knows what I am alluding to. Besides, I contacted him on that subject and I am sure that the Minister will do what he can so that the studies about St.-Félicien be carried out as soon as possible, because the region needs it. This industry would create 2,000 or 2,500 jobs. I think that it is a constructive project and I feel sure that the Minister is very much interested in it.

Besides, I received the other day from the city of Roberval—the Minister must have got one too—a copy of the memorandum which it submitted to the economic mission—

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

[*English*]

Mr. J. B. Morison (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was talking to the leader of the House, my hon. friend from Rosedale (Mr. Macdonald), and he expressed concern about some of the comments which had been made in connection with the tardiness of the regional development committee in convening again after the fall recess.

As the chairman of that committee, and in an effort to be fair and objective, I feel that with all due respect to members of the House, and in answer to their complaints that they have been left in the dark about what the committee and the department have been doing, I should review what the committee has done over the past 18 months.

As many members know, this was a new committee, one made up of people here for the first time and who were not familiar with committee procedure. The committee encountered a further handicap in that it was immediately presented with the estimates of two government departments which were being phased out. In studying these estimates and listening to hon. members such as the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) and the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir), we probably heard more about coal mines and found out more on the subject of coal and steel than we ever realized we did not know. As we pro-

gressed through the Maritimes and into the west we picked up an idea of just what the government had been trying to establish through the fragmented departmental programs and the ARDA development plan. We had a taste of what might be accomplished by the new department which was being instituted.

Having made progress through the estimates, we decided at the steering committee meetings that we would go to the west and investigate on site the FRED, ARDA and Newstart programs. These were, of course, older programs and it was easier to judge how they were accomplishing the ends which the departments had sought to achieve. Nevertheless, the committee kept in mind the eloquent plea from Bell Island. It decided, and fully intended, to go to Newfoundland and the Maritimes to look into the problems of transportation which we knew existed there. However, we decided to go west first.

I recall, as we got to Prince Albert, our first stop, the sense of frustration which I felt. It is curious that the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville (Mr. Nystrom) should have opened his remarks by talking about frustration. Members of the opposition refer to their frustration when they look across to the government benches. I will always remember the frustration I experienced, because I understood what those kids must have felt when they got to the airport, having driven 80 or 100 miles to see that bright young member of the committee, the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville, and found that after all he was not with us. I sensed their frustration and I, too, was frustrated. I knew that this young member's mind was probably filled with his marriage and his forthcoming nuptials, and that he just could not be with us. I am sure he, too, was frustrated—not with his marriage, of course, but with his inability to be present at that time.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Here we have different frustrations and they probably all revert back basically to the people. You cannot think of government; you must think of the people. This was true of our committee work. I was impressed, and I know members of the committee were, with Newstart. The people, particularly those from Newfoundland, had never seen anything like it. As a matter of fact, they had never had a program like this on the island. We found that ARDA programs had worked wonders.

After returning to Ottawa with the experience we gained in the west, we knew what we intended to do. We were prepared to go to the east, study the existing programs there and make recommendations as to how they could be improved. The hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) generously suggested, when we got back and were confronted with the bill to establish the Regional Development Incentives Act, that we did not have much choice. If we postponed the committee study of this bill and decided to go east, the whole program would have been put off for six or nine months because of the summer break; we probably would not be having this debate tonight because we would just be considering the first stage of the measure.

The committee in its enthusiasm for this measure, and with its tremendous responsibility—I cannot praise the members too highly—studied the bill and returned it to this House in time to pass it by the end of June in order that the new department could commence with the program hon. members have been discussing tonight. Following this we adjourned for the summer.

There was some discussion about going to Newfoundland and the Maritimes even at that time. I would have been very happy to go there even though it might have been too early for tuna fishing. I still think it would have been a good trip. But hon. members were tired, they had worked hard during the spring, and the consensus was that it would be better if we waited until the fall.

Had we gone to the east in the summer, a double load would have fallen upon the shoulders of hon. members. Had we gone there and presented ourselves as the great white hope, if you will, or the seviour to the people suffering regional disparity, we might have raised their hopes for no real reason, because we were going just to look. We were not prepared immediately to say we intended to enter into constructive programs. In any event, it was decided to put off that trip.

During the summer numerous letters were exchanged, there were telephone calls and there was a meeting. Often the 264 members of this chamber have a hard time reaching agreement. I realize that the "famous five" who were attempting to plan the Newfoundland trip were probably experiencing difficulty in reaching agreement on priority and the areas the committee should visit. I have no direct knowledge of this, but knowing their enthusiasm, and with my interest in their

problems, I am sure if there had been a meeting of minds we would have done something before October or November.

I do not wish to ingratiate myself with the minister, and certainly I am not the type to ingratiate myself with the government. However, I take complete responsibility for the committee not being reconvened in December. The House Leader spoke to me about this matter. In fact, he advised the committees branch that we should reconvene. Perhaps I did not have the authority, but after talking to the members of the committee I decided there was no real purpose in reconvening and that nothing of significance could be accomplished if we did reconvene in December.

The members of this committee are young and enthusiastic. They are not the type of committee members who want to sit in committee just for the sake of doing something. There were other committees sitting in December which demanded much of hon. members' time. On that basis, I advised the House Leaders that we would be better advised to wait until we had the first full year's estimates of the department before the committee for study.

Let me say without any malice, and not as a snide remark, that opposition members have the advantage of the research people which this government has provided. They are a great deal better off than we, for this reason. If they have had any spare time during the time the House has been sitting, I hope they have used their research people to prepare themselves for the committee's study of the estimates. I hope when this study commences they will present many constructive ideas. Let them tear the estimates apart, without knocking them just for the sake of knocking them.

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

Mr. Morison: I am certainly no expert on research and development, but having been the chairman of this committee I have a warmth and fondness for research and development. Because we initiated this matter, I like to think of it as our baby.

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

Mr. Morison: As I listened to opposition spokesmen today, all I can say is: Wait until the baby can walk and talk before you beat it over the head.

[Mr. Morison.]

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member took it upon himself to accept full responsibility for not reconvening the committee. What right did he have to take that responsibility upon himself, since he was no longer the chairman of the committee?

An hon. Member: Think fast.

Mr. Morison: I do not think I really have to think too fast on that question. Mr. McGrath—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Morison: The hon. member for St. John's East—I am sorry. That was probably a Freudian slip. I have known the hon. member for St. John's East for a pleasant six or seven months. I have become a little informal with him at times, and therefore I made that Freudian slip. Whether I was the chairman or not, having been the chairman with a fair knowledge of how members of the committee were thinking, and being the logical person to discuss the problems of the committee, I gave this advice to the House leader and I take full responsibility.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that the government which was elected in 1968 intended that the Department of Regional Development should be the keystone in the so-called just society. This afternoon the latest report from the department came into my hands. I notice that the second paragraph on page 1 confirms this viewpoint. It says, with reference to the establishment of this department:

> The announcement stemmed from the Prime Minister's previously declared policy of making regional development a matter of top priority for the government.

• (9:30 p.m.)

I think it will be equally obvious from the worth-while debate that has taken place today that, while the government might have intended to make the Department of Regional Economic Development the cornerstone of the implementation of the just society, it has fallen far short of the mark with respect to implementation. Notwithstanding the large amount of propaganda, as demonstrated by the many press releases that have been issued, this program unfortunately has not yet got off the ground. In fact, I would think the amount of attention that has been paid in speeches and press releases to this subject has aggravated a situation which is inherent in the Canadian body politic, that is, the prob-

lem of creating economic equality and equity from sea to sea by raising beyond the level of realization what might be called the revolution of rising expectations.

It is not entirely the fault of the department that this unhappy situation has occurred, because it was preceded by the so-called war on poverty which began three or four years ago. In view of the sound and fury which ushered in the commencement of the war on poverty, everyone anticipated that Utopia would be just around the corner. Unfortunately, and unhappily for the good of national unity, this has not occurred.

I want to speak briefly this evening on a subject that has been drawing increasing attention from the press, namely, the growing protest that is emerging in western Canada. It has reached such a crescendo that the former premier of Alberta, Hon. Ernest Manning, says that there is a greater feeling of isolation on the prairies now than at any time in his 35 years of public life. It is interesting to note that this period of time includes the great depression.

I was encouraged to note, also, that the Toronto *Star,* which has the largest circulation of any daily in Canada, has become aware of this growing feeling of disenchantment and recently assigned five of its top writers to examine the situation. They came up with the conclusion that the west is hopping mad. This is accentuated by the fact that the west is long-suffering; it is "slow to anger" as the Bible says.

I am sure that the person who could confirm the situation to the minister is the deputy minister who, when he was editor of the Winnipeg *Free Press,* helped to overthrow the last complacent Liberal government with his editorial policy. The government was out of touch with the west at that time and the Winnipeg *Free Press* back in the 1950s constantly harped on this theme. I recall the minister's deputy making very significant speeches on the necessity of implementing a new national policy and referring with great enthusiasm to John A. Macdonald's original national policy.

The reason this debate is so important today is that it has enabled us for a few moments to focus on the fundamental problems that are causing this feeling of alienation and isolation in the west, that is, the economic problems that are peculiar to that part of Canada. I need not recite them in any detail. They have been with us almost since confederation. I am referring to the tariff through which the west subsidizes industry in central Canada to the tune of about 25 per cent, and inequitable freight rates which are being aggravated by the fact that transportation facilities, which are the lifeblood of confederation in the more remote parts of Canada, are being phased out purely according to whether they are operating in the black or in the red.

This is a new interpretation of national policy. The national government has always seized its responsibilities in this regard. Indeed, this was fundamental to the original national development policy of providing adequate transportation, not only for economic reasons but for sociological reasons. So we are batting our heads against the wall, not only because of the persistent and inequitable freight rates but because of the phasing out of transportation facilities which is occurring at an alarming rate.

The essence of the current problem is the plight of the wheat growers who are in the hands of a government agency, the Wheat Board, and the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who heads the campaign for the just society, according to the statements on the subject, is not even aware that the Wheat Board is a government agency which has prime responsibility in coping with this very difficult economic situation.

Now, to the old economic problems that I could recite at length tonight have been added new ones. Instead of concentrating on a fundamental, national economic policy the government is concentrating on symbolic and cultural matters. The white paper has exacerbated the problem because it is aimed directly at the small businesses and at the farmers who are clustered in great profusion in western Canada.

The statement has been made that the opposition has been entirely negative in the course of this debate. I want to be positive. I want to interpret for the minister why, to quote the Toronto *Star,* the prairies are "hopping mad" at this time. I hoped some government backbenchers would speak in this debate. They speak outside the House, but unfortunately they do not get the ear of the government or of the minister in this respect. I know the minister wants to be loved. Everybody wants to be loved. But he has a golden opportunity to become the hero of confederation during these critical economic days, because economic policy is more important

than any other in binding this nation from sea to sea.

I think everybody who understands the problems of Canadian confederation will agree with that. Under this new department the minister has that opportunity. Solving regional economic disparity is not an easy task because our climatic and geographic conditions aggravate the problem. For years Ottawa stayed clear of its obligation in this regard and we did not advance very much on the original national policy that first brought Canada together. Nothing happened really until the late 1950s.

Much can be done through policy decisions of this government. The minister said during the course of his speech that some areas are affected by deflation and others inflation. I wish he would communicate this information to his colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), because one of the reasons for the misunderstanding concerning the government's approach to regional disparity is the unequal application of the austerity program.

• (9:40 p.m.)

The austerity program has slowed down or cancelled programs that were actually on the drawing board. This applies particularly to some projects under the Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Act, and I would say this situation is more apparent in western Canada than in any other operation that the federal government might carry out. It offsets all the propaganda and the press reports about increasing job opportunities.

As a result of the growing problems in the west, the Premier of Manitoba visited Ottawa not long ago to bring some of these difficulties to the attention of the minister and a few of his colleagues. I would point out that the provinces actually were ahead of Ottawa in coming to grips with special regional, economic incentives which have become necessary in our post-World War II economy. Manitoba introduced a dynamic program in the late 1950s. In close co-operation with Ottawa it introduced power development programs such as the Shellmouth Dam project which has been in progress all this time and will be completed this year, the erection of vocational schools, the Winnipeg floodway, and so forth.

Following his talks in Ottawa, the Premier of Manitoba was interviewed by the Winnipeg *Free Press*. In a red headline, almost as large as those that used to be created by the deputy minister, it stated, "Schreyer Unsatisfied with Talks", with a subheading "Federal Piecemeal Approach Disappoints Manitoba Premier." This is why the west is hopping mad. The premier said that no matter how hard Manitoba pressed its counterparts in the federal cabinet, it could get no clear picture of the federal funds that would be available to Manitoba through the Department of Economic Regional Expansion.

To use a quotation I picked up just this evening from the Ottawa *Journal*, Mr. Speaker, I say that the government has been sounding the bugle long enough concerning the success of its programs. Now it must teach the bugler to play "Charge!" and get to the essence of the problems. If no funds are available from Ottawa, no programs will be implemented at the provincial level.

Even though this motion is not coming to a vote, I hope that everything said in the chamber today will not be lost on the minister. Our approach is positive. We have tried to bring to his attention some of the difficulties in various parts of Canada. I hope he has listened to what members have said about the growing disenchantment of the west, and that he will seize his responsibilities as leader of this new department and see that the new national development program, which the Winnipeg *Free Press* used to talk about, will be implemented in fact as well as in propaganda.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few words after hearing some members of the opposition. This motion is to say the least untimely under the circumstances.

I think that the government is the least to blame when it comes to restructuring all its activities in order to stop economic disparities.

Some members of the opposition want, as a matter of fact, a little childishly, to force the government to solve within less than a year problems which have always existed. In my opinion they just want, as the previous speaker said, to give rise to hate among the people instead of appealing to their reason.

If we upbraid the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for inaction and question the implications of the legislation, namely those of Bill C-202, passed on June 27, 1969, that is barely six months ago, this in no way settles the economic problems of this country, nor suppresses the regional economic disparities. Above all, this shows a lack of

understanding of the means of action at the government's disposal.

Regional disparities exist and they would tend to increase at the expense of the future well-being of our citizens in the absence of governmental intervention. Then, how should we behave? There will never be efficient governmental action without concurrent initiative on the part of private citizens and private enterprise.

Unless we create basic structures designed to urge the private citizens or private enterprise to act, and unless some economic controls are imposed, only initiative and incentives will generate action.

Bill C-202 which was passed by the House last June deals with industrial incentives required for developing depressed regions. Within a very short period and thanks to their initiative, the people will manage to eliminate these regional disparities.

I represent an economically underprivileged region. Before introducing Bill C-202, the department acted with wisdom and clear-sightedness by selecting the disadvantaged regions; earlier, this was rather like a straitjacket which effectively prevented the government from acting.

What is more desirable yet is coordination. It already exists within the department, but it must also exist within provincial government and municipalities. The latter claim that they do not have the necessary financial means to honorably discharge their duties, but they have however the first say insofar as the development of the territory is concerned. Because of the very large number of municipalities, such action deteriorates and is often lacking in co-ordination and planning.

But at the provincial level, industrial incentives work together with economic wealth, thus creating a force which goes against solutions likely to eliminate regional disparities.

If we are able to take advantage of natural means of action, namely natural resources, the implementation of Bill C-202 and the action of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), with the help of personal initiative and co-ordination at all government levels, will bring, I submit, concrete results.

In spite of what certain members may think, we are at the present time faced with the serious problem of unemployment. We hope that the legislations passed by this government will enable us to solve partly the problem of unemployment, as well as the one not less serious, concerning regional disparities.

Instead of blaming the government which is setting itself to a mammoth task, I suggest it would be better to bring forward constructive suggestions.

I shall conclude my remarks by saying that the measures adopted by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and by the agencies it has set up, are quite efficient, and that the government will attain its objectives.

• (9:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I feel I have been "had" without the benefit of osculation. I am particularly interested in this bill because it affects the part of Canada that I come from, where not too much is being done. The minister would deserve a great deal more credit if he would agree to set up a committee to make reports, instead of leaving that to his parliamentary secretary. One of the problems of his department is that he has always left things to somebody else. He has a background of national attachment in his former occupation. I had a long period of international attachment, and now I have become a strong nationalist and he a strong provincialist.

All afternoon I have heard complaints from the maritimers; but if anything has been done anywhere, that is the place. I would like to hear some maritimers ask the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to put money into the heavy water plant which was to bring so many benefits to the province of Nova Scotia. Surely they cannot afford to tie up $100 million in this project. It was built on federal advice, and it is up to the federal government to salvage it. The people of the Maritimes cannot afford to lose their investment in the project. The minister should look into the whole matter before they lose any more money.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the minister the documents of the mid-Canada corridor concept put out by Acres Research. I am well aware of the merits of this document as well as its weaknesses. As a socialist I have no intention of turning over all of the mid-Canada corridor for private enterprise to exploit, but they have indicated the resources that are available, the massive expenditure involved and the rewards of such develop-

ment. This will never happen under this minister, for the simple reason that the provinces will not allow the federal government to have full control of the area unless the federal government states how much it is willing to spend.

It seems that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) has considered this kind of project in relation to northern development because he has been interested in the development of a concept where business and government get together and evolve the total concept of a given area. The time has come for us to look forward. Shared-cost programs have failed and the people will not again become excited about ARDA, FRED or any similar projects.

If the federal government has a role, it is to look at the total concept of what can be done and set about doing it in an orderly fashion. As long as the federal government is willing to put up the money, the provinces will not throw any roadblocks in the way. I am sick and tired of all this bickering back and forth about what areas are to be designated. The federal government has to make the decision. The provinces are willing to let them put up the money, but they want the say in how the projects are run.

This program is not bringing new industry into my area, where resources are plentiful. We have put out money for a sawmill to be built or expanded, for a plywood factory or some other factory that was proposed for the area. I have no quarrel with the priority given to this program by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), but let us look at it on a national basis. I have listened with great patience all afternoon to complaints about projects in individual areas. Surely, in the national Parliament we are interested in a national concept. We know that the area of Canada which is not developed is the mid-Canada corridor, and we know that industry from the Golden Horseshoe will not go into that area unless it is provided with great incentives. Such incentives need not necessarily be monetary; they may have relation to the total concept of what can be done in the area. It is here that the government should be giving leadership to industry.

I hope that before the committee meets the minister will state what is to be done about the one project that has cost the Maritimes more money than any other and which will go down the drain unless the federal government gives assistance. I hope he suggests that certain things be done in conjunction with Atomic Energy so that at least that problem will be solved to the satisfaction of all Canadians.

The concept of regional development, Mr. Speaker, is national, not provincial and not parochial. I suggest we get on with the national concept of regional development.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It being ten o'clock, it is my duty to inform the House that by virtue of section 11 of Standing Order 58, these proceedings are deemed to be terminated. A motion to adjourn the House is under consideration. The motion is that this House do now adjourn.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

TRANSPORT—COAL—APPLICATION BY GREAT NORTHERN AND KOOTENAY ELK RAILWAYS

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, on December 3 I directed the following question to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), as recorded at page 1554 of *Hansard:*

> Has the Canadian Transport Commission received an application from the Great Northern Railway Company and the Kootenay Elk Railway Company for permission to build lines into the United States and back into Canada at the Pacific coast for the purpose of carrying coal to the Pacific coast via the United States?

This question is of vital importance to the economy of British Columbia and to Canada in general. I welcome the opportunity to raise it at this time so that further information and facts on the situation can be placed on the record. Perhaps the minister will give the House tonight some information on both these applications and the hearings which I understand are now under way.

Since raising my question in the House there have been several articles in the various news media from information supplied by Crows Nest Industries Limited, one of the applicants interested in building a rail link to the United States and shipping Canadian coal via United States railway lines. This company is trying to tell the Canadian public that CPR lacks the carrying capacity to meet the

demands of the Japanese steel industry for Canadian coal. It indicates that the freight rates asked by CPR are higher than the company can afford to pay.

Last year a similar controversy took place when the Kaiser Coal Company advocated the shipping of Canadian coal via the Great Northern Railway to Roberts Bank. At that time I thought this matter had been settled. The CPR apparently negotiated an acceptable freight rate of $3.50 per long ton of coal for a 15-year period. I understand that since that time it has added another contract for two million tons annually at the same rate.

However, the charge that CPR lines cannot handle the coal which will be mined in East Kootenay is a disturbing one and, in my opinion, is not based on any factual evidence which Crows Nest Industries Limited can produce. I am opposed to the shipment of Canadian resources over United States railway lines if we can possibly ship the material via an all-Canadian route. Any time we use our transportation systems in Canada, we are providing more jobs for Canadians and we are also adding, as in the case of this huge coal contract, many millions of dollars annually to the Canadian economy.

There are other advantages to shipping by an all-Canadian route which might not be readily discernible to the general Canadian public. One advantage is the employment which the supplying of the equipment gives to Canadians in many parts of our country. For example, the coal cars are built in the Hawker-Siddeley plant in Nova Scotia; steel for these cars comes from Hamilton; the locomotives are built in Montreal; the steel rails come from Algoma Steel at Sault Ste. Marie; the wooden ties for the track come from various parts of Canada; workmen on trains come from our own railway unions. Their money, plus the freight rates, accrues to individuals and companies within Canada. It is worth millions of dollars to our economy.

Here is an estimate of the Canadian labour income which results from coal traffic moved on Canadian lines. From the Kootenay area of B.C. to the West Coast, for each one million long tons of coal moved annually there is a return of about $1.2 million annually. This means an annual outlay of labour income from the present five million tons of coal being moved of about $6 million. This labour income represents wages, salaries and related railway employee benefits. There is little enough return to the Canadian economy through the development of this resource. We cannot afford to lose the jobs and the purchasing power involved by shipping coal by way of the United States.

At present the CPR has two contracts for hauling coal. One contract is for 15 years at three million tons per year. The second contract is for three years at two million tons per year. During the period in which it will be hauling five million tons per year they plan to use two trains per day with 88 cars in each. On April 1, 1972, the Fording Coal Company plans to ship another three million tons per year in addition to the figures I have given. This will require another 105-car train.

I am surprised that Crow's Nest Industries Limited has applied to build a connecting link with the Great Northern Railway in the United States. To my knowledge, this company does not yet have a buyer for any of its coal. This fact alone should void its present application. In my opinion, its charge that CPR does not have the carrying capacity to handle all the coal in the Fernie area is also unfounded. From information I have been able to obtain it would appear that CPR has ordered 578 cars, 37 diesel locomotives and 5 robot cars which will be sufficient to handle the contracts they now hold. Other equipment can be added as required. I understand the main CPR line from Calgary to Vancouver averages 7 trains per day in each direction. Sometimes there is a peak of ten trains per day, if there is a rush on wheat, potash and coal at the same time.

In 1968 a centralized traffic control system on this line was completed. It can now handle a minimum of one train an hour in each direction. Taking the present peak of 10 trains per day, it means that another 14 trains, minimum, per day could travel this route. I am informed that the present 3 million tons yearly contract requires only one train per day which consists of 105 cars. This is based on 345 days per year. A 20-day period in the year should cover any line interruptions or breakdown at the mine or shipping port. Trains can be made longer if needed and can go to a maximum of 115 cars. These longer trains would still fit the siding capacities and the facilities at both ends, because the loading and unloading has been designed to handle 150 cars if needed, together with the motor power. This additional available capacity of 10 cars per train would add a further safety factor as far as delays and interruptions are concerned.

In addition, we have an alternate route over the Kettle Valley line which serves my own constituency. There are also several interchanges where Canadian Pacific Railway trains can transfer to Canadian National Railways' tracks in the event of trouble. There is even an interchange near Grand Forks, British Columbia, where trains could transfer to the Great Northern if a real and lengthy emergency occurred.

The picture is clear to me, Mr. Speaker. I feel that CPR has the equipment or can obtain it. It has the line capacity. It has Canadian workmen using mostly Canadian-produced equipment. If CPR is anywhere near competitive in freight rates, and apparently it is, there should be no hesitation in the Canadian government insisting that these Canadian resources should be hauled to Canadian ports via an all-Canadian route.

Mr. Gerard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) on his plea to have coal transported through his province by Canadian railway companies rather than United States companies. Surely the hon. member wishes me to reply to the question he asked on December 3. I will attempt to inform him what has occurred since that time.

The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows with respect to the status of applications received in the matter of the Kootenay & Elk Railway Company. The Railway Transport Committee of the commission received on November 28, 1969, the following applications:

1. Application under section 255 and other applicable sections of the Railway Act to join the proposed line of the Kootenay & Elk Company with the line of Great Northern Railway Company at or near the border between British Columbia and the state of Montana, near Rooseville West.

2. An application under section 255 of the Railway Act to cross the railway of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company near Hosmer in British Columbia, with the proposed line of Kootenay & Elk Railway.

3. An application under the Crowsnest Pass Agreement, chapter 5 of the Statutes of Canada, 1896-97, for running rights over the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company between Natal and Elko in the province of British Columbia.

Applications two and three are said to be alternative applications and the applicant states that if its application for running rights under the Crowsnest Pass Agreement is granted, the application to cross the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's line north of Hosmer will be withdrawn. The three applications were served on the Minister of Commercial Transport for the province of British Columbia, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the Attorney General of Canada and the Attorney General for the province of British Columbia.

Since November 28, two interventions have been received, one from the regional district of Kootenay Boundary and the other from the corporation of the city of Grand Forks, both of which have been circulated to the parties of record. It should also be pointed out that solicitors for Kootenay & Elk Railway Company have since asked for an early hearing on the question of whether the Canadian Transport Commission has the power to make the order sought.

I am informed that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was given notice to file an answer to the applications within 30 days. The CPR applied for and were granted an extension of the time to answer. Before the expiration of this time, CPR filed with the Canadian Transport Commission a motion for an order seeking particulars on the applications, and for a stay in the proceedings until they had an opportunity to study such information. This is now being considered by the commission.

HEALTH AND WELFARE—REPRESENTATIONS BY DIABETIC ASSOCIATION RESPECTING CYCLAMATE BAN—AVAILABILITY OF SUBSTITUTE

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my purpose in bringing forth this matter this evening was prompted by the questions I posed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) a few days ago concerning the recently announced ban on cyclamates and the resultant hardships created as a result in the dietary planning of those afflicted with diabetes.

• (10:10 p.m.)

The questions, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 2969, were as follows:

In view of the recent ban on cyclamates and subsequent representations made to the minister by the Canadian Diabetic Association indicating that as a result severe hardship has been imposed upon those inflicted with diabetes, is any consideration being given to making available a substitute in order that diabetics may acquire some relief?

To which the minister answered: "Yes, Mr. Speaker." The exchange continued:

In the meantime, is the minister giving any consideration to permitting the use of controlled amounts of cyclamates by those afflicted with diabetes?

Mr. Munro: Depending on what is meant by controlled, yes, Mr. Speaker.

I had hoped to extract more detail than that, Mr. Speaker; frankly, I found the minister's answer somewhat vague. I trust that tonight the House and the country will be given an opportunity to learn exactly what steps are being taken to overcome the confusion which presently faces doctors and patients who are finding difficulty controlling their diets following the ban.

I realize that the minister is not able to be present this evening, but I am sure his parliamentary secretary, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Haidasz), himself a medical practitioner, can provide us with some of the details.

According to a newsletter issued on October 21 by the department, dietetic canned fruit containing cyclamates is to be banned on September 1, 1970. I am told that wholesalers in many areas have informed retailers, distributors and hospitals that they will no longer be able to supply these canned fruits after February 1. I am advised that this raises a difficult problem for diabetics in formulating a proper diet, particularly in areas where fresh fruits are not always readily available.

I am not a medical man, so, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from a letter which I received from a medical doctor who has some misgivings about the way in which the question of cyclamates is at present being handled. He writes:

I have found that statements made concerning cyclamates have been very confusing to the many diabetic patients that I have to see. The one thing which I think might help would be the issuing of some statement as to the amount of cyclamates which could safely be taken each day. I am also wondering if it would be possible to have the amount of cyclamates present in the various diabetic foods stated clearly on the food labels. I think if this information were available it might not be necessary to take these foods off the market; I believe that such action is likely to impose real hardship on the many diabetics who attempt to keep good control of their disease.

The letter goes on to say:

I also wonder whether the labels on the diet foods for diabetics could be printed so they would show the food exchange value. All diabetics understand how to use these food exchanges which are listed in the meal planning booklet put out by the Canadian Diabetic Association.

Again referring to the newsletter of October 21, issued by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the following is stated:

—we have no scientific evidence at this point to indicate that cyclamates have caused cancer or any other harmful effects in humans.

The newsletter also states that while there was evidence of cancer in rats, it was prevalent after extremely high dosage, 50 times higher than that accepted as that being safe for adults as prescribed by the World Health Organization. The newsletter goes on to say on behalf of the minister:

Let me repeat and emphasize the fact that there is no evidence that cyclamates have caused cancer or any other disease in humans.

The newsletter states further:

Four days ago, however, new evidence appeared that cyclamates produced tumours when fed to rats at very high levels for long periods of time.

Further on it says that no tumours developed in rats given cyclamates at doses equivalent on a body-weight basis to that of 200 bottles of soft drinks per day throughout the lifetime of a 150-pound man. The newsletter continues:

It is obvious, therefore, that the danger to humans from cyclamates is undoubtedly very small.

I am sure most Canadians have no objection to the banning of cyclamates if sufficient evidence can be produced that the product is potentially capable of producing harmful side-effects. However, if harmful effects have not occurred until exorbitant amounts are consumed and this seems to be backed by many members of the medical profession they would be acceptable.

Perhaps if a standard could be issued dealing with safe amounts of cyclamates or the tolerant factor, indicating the amount which could be consumed without causing harmful effects, this would go a long way in assisting those who must practice dietary control. It is also my understanding that the United States has modified the ban on cyclamates and permits the sale of foods containing cyclamates, but it will maintain its ban in respect of beverages. I think this fact does have significance, and I hope the minister will undertake to take steps so that diabetics in Canada may once again look forward to leading normal lives.

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, on October 21, 1969, the

Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) made a statement on the restricted use of cyclamates in Canada after having decided it was a course of action that afforded the greatest protection to the health of the Canadian public.

The minister is also well aware of the problems of diabetics in Canada. Officers of the Food and Drugs Directorate have had discussions with the Dietetic Counselling Commission of the Canadian Diabetic Association on the subject of cyclamates. They have also discussed the matter in some detail with representatives of the various industry groups concerned.

As a result of these latter discussions we know that it is possible to produce dietetic beverages, spreads and foods, without the use of cyclamates. This is accomplished by modifying the formulas and the use of permitted flavours along with a sweetening agent known as saccharin. The use of these new foods should permit diabetics to have a suitable variety of diet without running the risk of using cyclamates.

I would also remind the hon. member that my minister has never at any time questioned the need of diabetics for sweetening preparations for home use. These products will continue to be available under special labelling, the details of which have not yet been fully determined. It is anticipated, however, that their labels would carry a warning to the effect that they should be used only on the advice of a physician. With these measures being taken, my minister believes that Canadian diabetics should have no cause for concern over the ban of cyclamates in special dietary foods.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, February 4, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

OIL

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FURTHER GOVERNMENT INVESTMENT IN PANARCTIC OILS LIMITED

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce today another major step in the development of Canada's north.

Members of the House will recall the announcement made on December 12, 1967, of the government's decision to enter into a unique partnership with 20 oil and mining companies to carry out a joint oil exploration and drilling program in Canada's Arctic islands through the creation of a new Canadian company, Panarctic Oils Ltd.

To finance the first stage of Panarctic's exploration program, costing $20 million, the federal government put up $9 million for a 45 per cent equity, and private capital $11 million for a 55 per cent equity.

Both government and industry recognized, at the time Panarctic was formed, that the program contemplated would require additional funds in the future. Each participant was given the right to extend his equity interest pro rata when the time came to increase the initial investment to $30 million or more.

Last fall Panarctic gave notice of its need to raise an additional $10 million and will give notice this spring of a need to raise a further $20 million to finance the next phase of its exploration activities in the Arctic islands.

The government recently reviewed the extent of its future involvement in Panarctic and whether it should retain its whole 45 per cent equity interest by investing in the next stage of the company's enlarged exploration and drilling program. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the federal government will invest an additional $13.5 million in Panarctic Oils Ltd.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Chrétien: The government will be issued further preference and common shares in respect of its subscription, and this will maintain for the people of Canada its 45 per cent equity interest in Panarctic. This will bring the federal government's total investment in this daring and imaginative venture to $22.5 million.

Should Panarctic's program be further extended and additional capital be required above the present $50 million, the government retains the option of extending its interest pro rata. In addition, the agreement with Panarctic empowers the government to control the transfer of shares and, therefore, the degree of Canadian ownership and control in the company.

Maintenance of the government's 45 per cent equity in Panarctic will ensure for the people of Canada a direct interest in what promises to become Canada's largest oil company and a highly profitable business venture. And it will continue to provide for the original government objectives, namely, stimulation of oil and gas exploration in Canada's Arctic islands, maintenance of Canadian ownership and the control of the oil and gas rights over a very large sector of this potentially very rich oil basin, creation of employment opportunities for northern residents as well as other Canadians, and the development of Canadian technology suitable to northern terrain and climate.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Since Panarctic was formed the international oil industry has focused its eyes on the Arctic following the discovery of oil at Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, 200 miles west of the Yukon border. The recent oil discovery at Atkinson Point, 40 miles northeast of Tuktoyaktuk in the Northwest Territories, has further accelerated interest in the Canadian north.

Exploration activity has increased remarkably in Canada's north since the start of Panarctic's operations. In early 1968, less than 190 million acres were held under oil and gas exploratory permit north of the 60th parallel. Today, more than 440 million acres are held under exploratory permit in this region. Expenditures on oil exploration in Canada's north were less than $25 million in 1967, rose

to $45 million in 1969 and are expected to increase rapidly to an annual expenditure of $75 million by 1975.

The Arctic Islands, Mr. Speaker, are believed by many to be the most attractive oil basin in the world remaining to be explored. However, until major oil discoveries are made, Panarctic remains a high risk venture. The government has accepted this risk which clearly demonstrates its faith and commitment to northern development, as well as its determination to ensure active Canadian participation in the development of this last vast resource in Canada's last frontier—the Arctic Islands. The government's investment which I have the pleasure in announcing today is truly an investment in the bright and rich future of Canada's north.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words in response to the statement of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. When the government first announced its intention to participate in this venture in 1967 the Hon. Alvin Hamilton, speaking on behalf of this party, endorsed it as a useful way in which the government of Canada could assist in the development of the north. We supported the proposal at that time, and I see no reason why we should take any different position now. It is a vehicle for northern development through which the Canadian people can participate to some extent in the profitable aspects of any development that takes place.

I think the minister might have been a little more cautious in referring to this enterprise as prospectively Canada's biggest oil company. This sounds a little like puffing and I think we should see our chickens before we start to count them. However, Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister's optimism is justified and I certainly wish the minister well. I am glad that the poor tired Minister of Finance is able to find this money, no doubt with great sacrifice to himself, in order to provide this additional support to the venture.

May I just say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development might interest himself a little in the pollution or preferably the antipollution practices followed by this company, because the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development drew to the attention of the House one or two rather unfortunate aspects of its work in the far north. I hope there will not be any more of this sort of thing but on the contrary that this company, of which the government of Canada is a major shareholder, will set an example to all other companies operating in our northern environment.

In addition to its participation in this venture, I hope the government of Canada will recognize fully its responsibility in improving transportation in the north. One of the difficulties in northern development is the high cost of such development, and one of the reasons for the high cost, although not the sole one, is the high cost of transportation which does not appear to be highly organized in any respect. I take this occasion to remind the minister and the government as a whole of their obligation to improve transportation in the north. We are not going to see the sort of development we want to see in the north until there is adequate transportation there. There is no indication as yet that this government has fully recognized its responsibilities in this regard.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, every Canadian is necessarily and unavoidably interested in the kind of development which is reported in our Arctic area. I want, on behalf of my party, to put on record some of our fears about the way this is being done and some basic objections to the way it is being done. We do not object to Panarctic being a consortium involving a large number of private corporations, but we do not see any reason at all why the government of Canada, and through it the people of Canada, should not have majority control in Panarctic instead of having only 45 per cent control and 2 out of 12 directors on the board. I cannot understand the logic of that and the result has already begun to show, as I will indicate in a moment.

I am not at all certain that the exploration for oil in the Arctic is the best way to develop the north, that oil reserves are the greatest need for the people of Canada or, indeed, the people of the world in view of other oil reserves that are now available. I am not certain that the $20 million-odd spent by the government could not have been spent in some other way to assist the people living in the north. But if we are to spend this money, then surely we ought to be in total control of the operation, instead of only partial control.

The minister reminds us that the government has authority to authorize or to refuse to authorize the transfer of shares between various companies. That is true, Mr. Speaker. Despite that, as the minister well knows and as is shown in a background paper which I have read, Canadian ownership of the enter-

prise is now down to 70 per cent, whereas at the beginning it was somewhere around 90 per cent in Panarctic. Already the slide away from Canadian ownership to foreign ownership has begun. Furthermore, when you look at the background paper you will find that Panarctic is engaging in a method of farming out some of its operations in parts of its lands. A sentence in the background paper says, "In this respect Panarctic recently farmed out 945,000 acres of its various farm-outs jointly to Triad Oil Co., Ltd., and B.P. Oil Ltd.". I am sure the minister knows that Triad Oil Company Limited is a subsidiary of B.P. Oil Company Limited. Clearly, these lands are being farmed out to one corporation. The background paper then goes on to say, "These companies will jointly complete exploratory projects estimated to cost about $8 million and earn 50 per cent of Panarctic's interest in these lands."

There is a definite promise that Canadian ownership will be further eroded by this farming-out process that Panarctic conducts. It is that to which we, Mr. Speaker, of the New Democratic Party object. We see no reason why this natural resource should be handed over to foreign controlled companies, to a consortium of private corporations that are inter-related, that have members on each other's boards of directors, that own each other's shares and that have one single objective, to derive as much corporate profit and power as is possible. We see no reason why the Canadian government should not have invested in this corporation at least enough to give it 51 per cent control, in order that all the corporation's operations may be carried on in the public interest.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Let me make another point, Mr. Speaker. I will not be long because I know what the general rule is with regard to these statements. If I recall correctly, Mr. Speaker, the minister made the statement that the government is concerned with the creation of employment opportunities for the people in the north. It is significant and important to note that despite the concern of the government, only two or three native people are now being employed in the whole of the Panarctic operation. This is according to information which I have received. If an operation is going to be carried on in the north, particularly one that is not labour-incentive but capital-incentive, with only two or three native people employed, the concern of the government for the employment of northerners does not impress me very much.

Finally, I wish to emphasize the point made by the Leader of the Opposition on the problem of pollution. I summarize by saying that every time our country has had an opportunity to exploit and explore the great and rich natural resources of this country, we have leaped to give them away to the private corporations in this country and we have just as readily leaped to give them away to private corporations owned elsewhere. This, in our opinion, is a sell-out of the interests of the Canadian people and we wish to protest against it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, we can only rejoice at the progress and growth which this investment by the Canadian government is likely to spur. Still, we wonder about the wisdom of a decision to invest an additional $13.5 million in an undertaking which the minister describes as very risky.

The government ventured to invest $22.5 million in Panarctic Oils Limited, a decision which did not fail to surprise the people in certain areas of Quebec where mining and even oil resources are plentiful, because they realize that the paralysis which delays the development of these resources happens to result from a shortage of funds.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the question is: Should we spend millions of dollars to help a company whose economic viability is questionable, at a time when we are in the midst of an austerity program, as the Prime Minister never fails to remind us?

Let there be no mistake about it. If his department has millions to put in risk ventures, the minister should inform us accordingly, and we will be able to suggest to him some very good investments.

Mr. Speaker, we would like to know more about the terms and conditions of that agreement so that the population may assess its value.

[*English*]

LABOUR RELATIONS

TABLING OF SMITH REPORT ON LABOUR UNREST AT QUEBEC PORTS

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to table in a few moments, in English and in French, what is known as the Smith report, a report of an

inquiry into the abnormal causes of labour unrest at the ports of Montreal, Trois Rivieres and Quebec.

I wish to take this opportunity to make a brief statement and point out the terms of reference of this commission which, briefly stated, are as follows: to investigate conditions, conduct and matters not part of normal trade union activities, giving rise to labour unrest. These included such subject matters as pilferage, theft, and corruption. The terms of reference also included employer and business practices not part of or dealt with in collective bargaining but giving rise to labour unrest. These included methods of dealing with cargo at the ports, the methods of exercising discipline and the methods of maintaining a standard of good conduct. The full terms of reference may be found in the report which I am about to table.

The commission commenced its work in the autumn of 1968, after Mr. Justice Smith retired from the Court of Queen's Bench of Quebec. The commission presented to me, as Minister of Labour, its report in October of 1969 and since then the report has been translated, duplicated for distribution and is now being tabled.

On behalf of the government, I would like to thank the commissioner for the efforts he has made to deal with the problems he encountered during this lengthy and difficult inquiry. The inquiry grew out of the settlement of the stoppage of work in 1966 which tied up the St. Lawrence River ports for 38 days. It is encouraging to note that since the settlement of 1966, and more particularly since the recent three year contract signed in April of last year, there has been a marked improvement in labour relations in the port of Montreal. This year there has been no time lost through illegal work stoppage, and the collective agreement is being respected to a much greater degree than in previous years due, in no small part, to the work of Judge Alan Gold of Montreal, who acts as mediator and arbitrator of day-to-day problems in the port.

That there has been shown a greater responsibility on the part of the various union locals involved, as well as a serious effort on the part of management this year to deal with the unions through their newly formed Maritime Employers Association, should also be noted. Last week, the Canadian Importers Association indicated that the number of cases of pilferage reported had been reduced from 400 to 7, indicating that certain measures introduced in recent years by the National Harbours Board are proving effective.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

I am also pleased to note that many of the recommendations of the report have already been implemented. Nevertheless, it would be unfair of me to leave the impression that labour-management regulations at the ports of Montreal, Trois Rivières and Quebec do not leave much to be desired. The survival of these three important ports depends to a great degree on their ability to compete with similar ports in the United States, and a greater joint effort will have to be made in the future if these ports are to achieve their full potential.

A reading of the report will disclose that the Commissioner has been very critical of labour, management and port administration. The report is a very sobering document to which careful attention will have to be paid. While the government will take no action on any of the recommendations until all parties concerned have had an opportunity to give consideration to them and have made known their views with regard to them, it is my intention to implement as soon as possible those recommendations which the government thinks will improve industrial relations at the three ports, regardless of what temporary disruptive effects this may have on certain groups of employers or unions.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to see that the minister has finally agreed to table in the House the Smith report which has been so long awaited not only by members of the House but also by all Canadians. I regret, however, that this report, which was submitted to the minister on October 2, should reach us three months later.

It should, I believe, be pointed out how difficult it is for opposition members, to submit their party's point of view about motions and reports the ministers table here, particularly when they are as bulky as the document that has just been tabled.

I therefore invite the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government house leader to give consideration to the feasibility of giving at least 24 hours' notice to opposition members before tabling reports or papers in the House. Members would then be able to go through the reports so as to criticize them in a positive and objective way.

This being said, I think that the government will want to examine the said report, in order to improve the administration of the nation's business. I can comment on some recommendations only in a very general way, but I feel that the Smith report does not show, at least at first sight, anomalies or facts which were not already known by those who closely followed the events which occurred in the above-mentioned ports.

I hope that the Smith report will not be a source of conflict or disagreement between the employees of the ports concerned, the unions, the owners and the users of those three main ports.

In addition, according to public opinion, the report would tend to emphasize among the general difficulties three specific conditions existing especially in the ports of Montreal, Quebec City and Trois Rivières, while the government would have been wiser, in my opinion, to make comparative study of all Canadian ports and to relate them to port operations throughout the world, in the United States as well as in Europe. This would enable us to make a true evaluation of the port operations that are mentioned in the Smith report and of those occurring elsewhere. My reason for saying this is that some recommendations contained in the report are such that they question the honesty and efficiency of some workers, at those ports.

Since I represent a riding directly affected by those operations, I am in a position to say that most workers are conscientious and honest, although as it happens in all fields, there may be some questionable things going on.

I hope that the report will not be such as to aggravate or revive the difficulties that have already endangered relations between management and labour.

As I have stated, we cannot make a thorough examination of each of the recommendations on such short notice. For that reason, I take the liberty of pointing out that the report does not appear to give any thought to having, within a committee, a board of directors, or a local or national harbours board, representatives of the riverside municipalities that are directly affected by port operations.

I suggest that this is a glaring omission which the department should remedy.

I hope that the minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) will undertake to take action in order to assure the Canadian people that port operations will not be troubled again by local difficulties and that following their immediate and efficient action, ports will enjoy an economic activity beneficial to Canada as a whole.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Labour announces that a report he is tabling is a sobering document that is fair warning not to enter into an elaborate comment upon it until one has had an opportunity to study it. In the few minutes I have had to look at the report, I have come to agree with the position taken by the minister that it makes some far-reaching proposals which affect the three parties involved, namely labour, management and the port administration. I notice the minister has given the assurance—and I welcome it—that before any recommendations are implemented an opportunity will be given to these three parties to study the report and make their comments and their recommendations thereon. But I am glad to note the minister has recognized there has been an improvement in matters at the three ports as a result of the excellent work of Judge Alan Gold, as well as the fact that the union has taken a great deal of responsibility with respect to the things that take place at the ports, and the efforts of management in its dealings with labour.

We are glad to have the report tabled. As the minister says, it is a document which requires study. We welcome in particular the minister's statement that the three parties concerned will be able to make their recommendations to him before action is taken.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, as mentioned by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), the ports of Montreal, Trois Rivières and Quebec were strikebound for 58 days in 1966. At that time, the government decided to institute a commission to study the problems that were leading to labour unrest in those ports as well as those which had nothing to do with regular union activities but which had caused discontent among workers. In fact, the latter had been involved in looting, theft and corruption.

It is undeniable that thieves operated in the ports of Montreal, Quebec and Trois Rivières as is the case about everywhere. However, as the hon. member for Sainte-

Marie (Mr. Valade) was saying, the great majority of the employees in these ports are honest family men who work with courage and objectiveness.

This commission was therefore set up and went to work in 1968. In February 1970 the report is laid before us.

The minister stated a while ago and I quote:

> It would be unfair of me to leave the impression that labour-management regulations at the ports of Montreal, Trois Rivières and Quebec do not leave much to be desired. The survival of these three important ports depends to a great degree on their ability to compete with similar ports in the United States.

It is not a question of competing with Vancouver and San Francisco but with U.S. ports on the Pacific coast. The minister added and I quote:

> A greater joint effort will have to be made in the future if these ports are to achieve their full potential.

It is evident that if it costs two or three times as much to use the ports of Montreal, Trois Rivières and Quebec than that of Halifax or those on the U.S. coast, we will lose a lot. That is why, I think, the minister honestly appealed to employers and employees, particularly the unions, to behave objectively, to open their eyes and their ears, to approach the problem in a constructive way, in order to help the ports of Montreal, Trois Rivières and Quebec, to win them patrons and to develop their facilities to the maximum.

In my opinion, the Smith report will help the parties concerned to better understand their responsibilities. Even if they assert their rights, they should not forget that they also have duties to discharge.

We have rights in every field. However, we also have duties that urgently need to be fulfilled. In this respect, trade unions, labour, management and the department are all considering together what has to be done to improve the situation, to prevent costly strikes in the future and to stabilize the economy in this particular field, which will enable workers and their families to foresee better days.

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—REPORT ON PROGRESS IN PLANNING FOR EXPANDED FACILITIES

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been anxious to advise the House of the progress being made in connection with the Department of Transport's over-all planning for expanded airport facilities to serve Toronto and the surrounding regions. From the outset we have been anxious to consult to the maximum extent possible with all of the parties who have a legitimate interest in this important project. I am referring to the province of Ontario, the municipalities in the area in question, and certain business and industrial interests.

• (2:40 p.m.)

When the decision was made late in 1968 to seek alternative solutions to the original plan which was to expand the existing Malton airport a committee was established jointly with the government of Ontario, and this committee has been working most co-operatively ever since. From time to time we have sought means through which the other interested groups to whom I have referred could be made aware of the progress being made.

Hon. members will appreciate that this is not an easy task. At the outset, close to 60 different locations were involved as possible sites for the proposed airport. These regions are represented by more than 90 different municipalities. It can be seen, therefore, that worth-while consultation with such a very large group was not practical. This is especially true in view of the fact that the great majority of the locations were not in fact particularly desirable from a site standpoint and were therefore eliminated when the first of the long list of criteria was applied to them. As a result of this elimination process, it has now been determined that all but four or five of the sites considered originally are not usable. I want to emphasize that this does not mean that any or all of the sites still being considered will prove to be adequate. Much more investigation must be done on each of them before a final selection can be made.

Some indication of the complexity of the process of investigation can be obtained from the fact that such questions must be considered as passenger origin and destination studies, aviation technology, safety, ground transportation systems, noise capability, pollution, ecology, topography, economics and essential services such as water, sewage, power, etc. It is also essential that we take into account Ontario's long-range regional development plans and the effects of the proposed airport development on these. It can be seen, therefore, that a great deal of further study is necessary on the various potential sites still being examined.

Hon. members will appreciate that because of the risk of land speculation it is extremely important that there be no premature disclosure of the specific areas now under consideration. I appreciate that this necessity for secrecy is in conflict to some extent with our already expressed desire to consult as fully as possible with those other parties that have a very great and legitimate interest in this project. I feel, nevertheless, that there cannot be additional disclosure at this time. This view, I may say, is shared by the government of Ontario.

In the case of the so-called waterfront site the same considerations are not present, and therefore it has been possible for us to hold lengthy and detailed discussions with the city of Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto and the Toronto Harbour Commission. I can tell the House also for the reasons I have mentioned that while there will undoubtedly be some type of airport development along the waterfront at some time in the future it is now our judgment that this site is not appropriate for a full scale international airport. Rather, the downtown location is more likely to be developed as a facility limited to the accommodation of intercity and short-distance air traffic. I may say, too, that in so far as our planning for the waterfront location is concerned the various civic authorities to whom I have referred have representation on our technical subcommittees.

I anticipate that by fall of this year the necessary further investigations will have been completed, thus permitting the formulation of an airport system master plan for the Toronto and surrounding regions. At the earliest possible moment between now and then and as soon as it appears appropriate to do so, I am sure that the government of Ontario will agree with us to provide the fullest possible information to all interested parties. We are now exploring with the province the best approach to take in order to have a mutually advantageous exchange of information and views with the political, industrial and business communities.

If the House so wishes, Mr. Speaker, and presumably an opportunity will present itself when the main estimates are discussed, I will be pleased to appear before the Standing Committee on Transportation and Communications to elaborate on the contents of this statement.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, this matter was just brought to my attention but that is not really too important in any event because what was stated, of course, was a disclosure of the thoughts that all of us have in mind in regard to international airports. I believe the minister indicated in his closing words that he would be prepared to go into further detail in respect of the generalities and the nothingness in his statement.

One of the most important points in the minister's statement is the fact that there has been consultation. This is extremely important for the simple reason that we are now involved in considering amendments to our constitution. We have set up a joint committee on the constitution. It is extremely important that this continual dialogue or consultation, as the case may be, be regarded as of prime importance and always be a factor in the making of decisions. In other words, what I think is extremely important here is that the government has not acted arbitrarily.

I note there are four or five sites now being considered. I can appreciate the embarrassing position of the minister as a result of not being able to disclose these sites. The minister is now seeking information, through the province, from political and business interests as to the best way to approach this subject. It is most important, however, to obtain somehow a consensus of the views of the residents because it is they who may experience a great deal of frustration in terms of noise, land values and traffic.

I am pleased also that the minister is still interested in the waterfront, though not in terms of an international airport. But there should be a continuing dialogue with Toronto, Metropolitan Toronto, and also Hamilton harbour officials. This is the age of supersonic and jumbo jets. The minister should proceed with all due haste so Canada can play its role in this most important means of transportation, and so that he can make a further statement and, if at all possible, put his entire plans before the House by the fall.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, as one of the representatives of the metropolitan area of Toronto I welcome the core of the minister's announcement. The core, as I found it, was that airport development along the waterfront in the east end of Toronto will not be for a large-scale international facility. This is no longer contemplated. The site should have been a non-starter from the word go. It is perfectly obvious to anyone

who knows the area that such a venture should have been rejected as unthinkable from the beginning, and probably would have been if the local people had been consulted. The noise pollution and the immense traffic problems that would have been created seriously would have depreciated the value of an attractive residential area which has been the home of many thousands of Canadians for more than 50 years.

The minister's statement refers to the civic authorities being represented on technical committees dealing with the proposed airport. The large urban areas and municipalities have responsibility for populations larger than some provinces. They must be made effective planning partners at all stages of dealing with developments of this sort. If there are constitutional difficulties that must be overcome it may be impossible or impractical, as the minister's statement indicates, to deal with all municipalities concerned. But there is no reason why, in the consultation between the federal and provincially elected and politically responsible officials, members and representatives of the major municipalities affected should not be consulted.

I suggest to the minister that technical consultation is not enough. What is involved goes far beyond the question of airports; it concerns all the great problems of urban development facing us today.

The minister spoke of the danger of land speculation. I hope he will consult his colleague the Minister of Justice, who I believe will be able to inform him that under the Expropriation Act any effort to speculate in respect of expropriated land will probably be fruitless. If he will speak to the Minister of Finance and get an adequate capital gains tax we will not have to worry about such speculation at all.

I welcome the core of the announcement which will be received with relief by many of my constituents and other people in the city of Toronto. I hope that the process of consultation will continue and improve as time goes on.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, we are always glad to listen to a statement made in the House about any kind of improvement. The statement made a few moments ago by the Minister of Transport

[Mr. Brewin.]

is one of those. Indeed, we can expect that there will be speculation, that consultations will take place and that the best possible site will be selected in order to improve Toronto's airport. On page 3 of the statement, I read these words, and I quote:

[*English*]

We are now exploring with the province the best approach to take in order to have a mutually advantageous exchange of information and views with the political, industrial, and business communities.

[*Translation*]

To my mind, the minister should have proceeded the same way with the government of the province of Quebec before selecting the St. Scholastique site. The Quebec government was consulted only after the decision had been taken and not before. Today we are told that discussions are taking place at the federal and provincial levels.

As regards the Montreal airport, the decision has already been taken. However, if there had been previous consultation with the provincial government, the Chambers of Commerce and intermediate bodies, that would have been fairer, more honest and sensible.

The statement further says, and I quote:

[*English*]

We are now exploring with the province—

Not without the province but with the province.

—the best approach to take in order to have a mutually advantageous exchange of information and views with the political, industrial and business communities.

And in this way to take a decision which will be shared by the province with Ottawa.

[*Translation*]

In my opinion, the same procedure should have been applied with respect to the St. Scholastique airport.

In any event, we are happy to see the government bring about some improvements in Ontario, in connection with the Toronto airport, and we congratulate the minister for consulting the organizations concerned, in short the population of that province, in order to find the most suitable site for the airport so as to control noise, air and water pollution, to the entire satisfaction of the population.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AUTOMOBILE PRICE INCREASES

Question No. 27—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. Is the Government of Canada aware of the recently announced price increases for Canadian automobiles as indicated by Canada's auto manufacturers?

2. Did the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs maintain that if there were increases this year of Canadian automobiles, he would undertake an investigation by the Combines Investigation Branch or other types of inquiries by the Prices and Incomes Commission?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. Yes.

2. No.

SHIPMENTS OF CERTAIN GRAINS FROM PEACE RIVER

Question No. 323—**Mr. Borrie:**

How many bushels of wheat, oats and barley have been shipped from Peace River, B.C. to the Canadian Wheat Board and the feed market?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): During the crop year 1968-69: 2,472,000 bushels of wheat, 173,000 bushels of oats, and 462,000 bushels of barley were delivered to the Canadian Wheat Board at points in the Peace River area of British Columbia. In addition, shipments of grain in the crop year 1968-69 from stations in the Peace River area of British Columbia to the feed market in that province were: wheat 2,236,000 bushels, oats 1,938,000 bushels and barley 4,920,000 bushels.

INFORMATION AND PUBLIC RELATIONS, PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Question No. 365—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

1. From the date of the establishment of the Prices and Incomes Commission to the end of October, 1969, what are the names of the individuals who have worked for the Commission on information and public relations matters?

2. In each individual case, what has been the length of working service, and the amount of remuneration?

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 and 2 (a) Mr. R. A. Ralfe, 11 working days, $653.84. (b) Desroches, Jasmin et Associés Inc., seven working days, $1,650 for professional services and $97.30 for expenses. (c) Girard, Bruce and Associates Ltd., two working days, $400 for professional services and $15 for expenses. (d) Hopkins, Hedlin Limited, 16 working days, $4,090 for professional services and $508.59 for expenses. (e) National Film Board (During this period the National Film Board began the preparation of three film clips, in both English and French, for the Commission. However, work has not yet been completed on these film clips and, therefore, an invoice for this work has not yet been submitted.)

In addition, individual members of the staff of the Prices and Incomes Commission have devoted part of their time to information activities.

PROPOSED CPR TRAIN SERVICE WITHDRAWALS—EMPLOYEE LAY-OFFS

Question No. 447—**Mr. Orlikow:**

How many employees will be laid off by the Canadian Pacific Railway in each region if it is permitted to discontinue the train operations it has proposed to the Canadian Transportation Commission?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Information not available.

RAILWAY PASSENGER SERVICE ABANDONMENT APPLICATIONS—LOSS OF EMPLOYMENT

Question No. 492—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. For each of the 18 applications filed with the Canadian Transport Commission covering all of Canadian Pacific Railways passenger services and discontinuation of these services, what would be the estimated loss in employment for CPR employees involved in these operations?

2. For each of the 13 applications filed with the Canadian Transport Commission covering some of Canadian National Railways passenger services and the discontinuation of these services, what would be the estimated loss in employment for CNR employees involved in these operations?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. The subject matter being one with respect to which a private company has sole responsibility, the information is not available.

2. The Management of Canadian National Railways advise as follows: The filing of applications for discontinuance of uneconomic passenger train services is a procedure which the Railways must follow under provisions of the National Transportation Act of 1967 to obtain decision from the Canadian Transport Commission as to the individual services that may be terminated and those which must be continued. It is only after a decision is made by the CTC that it will be feasible to trace

through the seniority rights of the employees engaged in these services and estimate the number, if any, who will suffer loss in employment. Of those affected, many will find work in their own craft (engine and train crews), some will be transferred to other employment and others will be absorbed by normal attrition.

ADVERTISING ON USE OF BREATHALYZERS

Question No. 507—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Did the Government of Canada appeal to a wide sector of private industry to finance a $1,334,000 advertising campaign on the use of breathalyzers to test drinking drivers?

2. When did meetings on the above subject take place?

3. What firms were invited to attend these meetings?

4. What individuals representing these firms attended these meetings, and in each case, what was the response to the government appeal for financing this advertising campaign?

5. Is the Government of Canada now planning any advertising campaign on the use of breathalyzers to test drinking drivers, and, if so, what are the estimated expenditures?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. October 27, 1969.

3. The automotive industry, gas companies, tire manufacturers, insurance companies, distilleries, breweries and the wine industry.

4. The responses ranged from negative to excellent. Propriety does not permit the release of each reaction in response to the offer of participation in this public education program.

5. A public education campaign on the Criminal Code amendments is presently being conducted by the Departments of Justice and Transport at a cost of approximately $50,000.

OPERATION OF RAIN-MAKING DEVICES, QUEBEC

Question No. 548—**Mr. Godin:**

1. How many rain-making devices are in operation at present in (a) the Province of Quebec (b) in the Constituency of Portneuf?

2. Is there another name for such equipment?

3. Which company manufactured such equipment?

4. Did the federal government contribute to the installation of such equipment and, if so, to what extent?

5. Is the maintenance of such equipment the responsibility of a government department or of private industry?

6. Does the government regulate the operation of these devices?

[Mr. Loiselle.]

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. As no information is normally filed with the Federal Government when a rain-making device is placed in operation, it is not known how many, if any, are in operation in these areas.

2. and 3. Not known.

4. No.

5. Private industry.

6. No.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR WORKING POOR AND WELFARE CASES

Question No. 592—**Mr. Southam:**

Is it the intention of the government to increase the number of job opportunities as a key element in the program to assist Canada's working poor and hard-core welfare cases?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Yes, in so far as the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is concerned.

The Department of Manpower and Immigration increases the number of job opportunities open to Canada's working poor and hard-core welfare cases primarily by making such persons more competitive in the labour market. In this way, their earning power is increased and their vulnerability to unemployment and underemployment is reduced.

The programs of the Department of Manpower and Immigration increase their productive skills, their employability, their knowledge of jobs and their mobility. The Canada Manpower Centres assist their placement in the labour force market or if unable to place them, refer them to training so that they can be better equipped to fill available employment opportunities. If employment is not available in their local community, it assists their movement to communities where employment is available to them. The Department is also supporting community agencies in experimental projects designed to assist poverty groups not normally reached by manpower services.

Using the Economic Council of Canada's definitions of poverty, the proportion of poor persons for whom the Department provides training is twice as high as the proportion of poor people to the population as a whole. In 1968-69, over $100 million was spent in the provision of training for such poor persons. The proportion of poor people, particularly with larger families is also higher among those helped under the Mobility Program, and almost all of the physically or mentally disabled per-

sons prepared for jobs through the Federal-Provincial Rehabilitation Program were poor and without employment. These programs continue to reach more persons each year and in 1969-70, the Department of Manpower and Immigration spent over $396 million in the manpower field alone to help people including a very substantial proportion on welfare or in poverty to find productive and worth while work.

STATUTE REVISION COMMISSION

Question No. 660—**Mr. Fortin:**

1. In what year was the Statute Revision Commission established?

2. Who are the members of the Commission?

3. When will the revision of the Statutes be completed?

4. Who will publish the revised Statutes?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): In so far as the Department of Justice is concerned: 1. The Statute Revision Commission was established on May 4, 1965.

2. The present members of the Commission are: the Hon. John N. Turner, Q.C., Minister of Justice; Mr. D. S. Maxwell, Q.C., Deputy Minister of Justice; Mr. R. Bedard, C.R., Associate Deputy Minister of Justice; Mr. D. S. Thorson, Q.C., Associate Deputy Minister of Justice; Mr. Jean Miquelon, C.R., President, Crown Assets Disposal Corporation; Mr. J. W. Ryan, Q.C., Director, Legislation Section, Department of Justice.

3. Except for matters affected by legislation enacted by this Session of Parliament, the manuscript of the revised statutes is completed and at the printers. Proofreading of page proofs from the printers is in progress. Because of technical difficulties encountered in 1969, the printing of the revision is behind schedule; publication is not foreseen now until the fall of 1970 although it is anticipated that the text of the revision will be available before then.

4. The Revised Statutes will be published by the Queen's Printer as required for the purposes of section 12 of the Statutes of Canada, 1964-65, c. 48.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BERMATEX INCORPORATED

Question No. 676—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to Bermatex Incorporated of Ste. Genevieve, Quebec and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. What is the total estimated capital 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 Bermatex Incorporated?

4. To what extent is Bermatex Incorporated non-resident or foreign-owned or controlled?

5. What is the name and country of the known non-resident ownership of 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 Industry, Trade and Commerce 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, 4 and 5. Information requested regarding Bermatex Incorporated is not known.

Ownership of corporations in Canada is determined under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act; such information is not available for corporations not required to report under the Act, and the company mentioned here is one of them.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BONAVISTA COLD STORAGE LIMITED

Question No. 677—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to Bonavista Cold Storage Limited of St. John's and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. What is the total estimated capital 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 Bonavista Cold Storage Limited?

4. To what extent is Bonavista Cold Storage Limited 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 Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce 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 executive officers of Bonavista Cold Storage Company Limited are as at January 31, 1968: H. A. Russell, President; P. P. Russell, General Manager, R. A. Russell, Director; J. W. Mahon, Director;

J. P. Pike, Director; A. G. Swyers, Director; R. Young, Director.

4. Four per cent non-resident owned.

5. Unknown.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BROOKFIELD ICE CREAM LIMITED

Question No. 678—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to Brookfield Ice Cream Limited of St. John's and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. What is the total estimated capital 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 Brookfield Ice Cream Limited?

4. To what extent is Brookfield Ice Cream Limited 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 Departments of Regional Economic Expansion and Industry, Trade and Commerce 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 executive officers of Brookfield Ice Cream Limited are, as at January 31, 1968: H. R. Luscombe, President; A. G. Luscombe, Executive Vice-President; C. G. MacLennan, Vice-President; G. Butler, Director; H. M. Maddick, Director; H. A. Pike, Director; O. L. Vardy, Director.

4. None.

5. None.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BOULANGERIE RÉGIONALE DES ÎLES INCORPORATED

Question No. 679—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to "Boulangerie Régionale des Îles Incorporated, Îles de la Madeleine, Québec" and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. What is the total estimated capital 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 "Boulangerie Régionale des Îles Incorporated"?

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 Departments of Regional Economic Expansion and Industry, Trade and Commerce 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, 4 and 5. Information requested regarding Boulangerie Régionale des Îles Incorporated is not known.

Ownership of corporations in Canada is determined under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act; such information is not available for corporations not required to report under the Act, and the company mentioned here is one of them.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO GLAVERBEL VERRERIE LIMITÉE

Question No. 680—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to "Glaverbel Verrerie Limitée" 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 "Glaverbel Verrerie Limitée"?

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 Departments of Regional Economic Expansion and Industry, Trade and Commerce 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, 4 and 5. Information requested regarding Glaverbel Verrerie Limitée is not known.

Ownership of corporations in Canada is determined under the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act; such information is not available for corporations not required to report under the Act, and the company mentioned here is one of them.

INCENTIVE GRANT TO BURLINGTON INDUSTRIES (CANADA) LIMITED

Question No. 681—**Mr. Burton:**

1. Has the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, under the Regional Incentives Act, authorized or provided an incentive grant to Burlington Industries (Canada) Limited, Lachine, Quebec and, if so, what is the amount of the grant?

2. What is the total estimated capital 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 Burlington Industries?

4. To what extent is Burlington Industries 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 Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce 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 executive officers of Burlington Industries (Canada) Ltd. are as at July 27, 1968: A. B. Grossman, President and Director; C. R. Snively, Vice-President and Director; W. J. Mullins, Vice-President and Director; G. B. Bonney, Vice-President and Director; E. F. Davidge, Vice-President and Director; W. E. Greer, Jr., Director; S. G. Dixon, Director; L. Warren, Director.

4. 94.6 per cent non-resident owned.

5. Burlington Industries Inc., United States.

AIRCRAFT OPERATING LICENCES ISSUED TO U.S. RESIDENTS

Question No. 734—**Mr. Penner:**

1. How many 9-4 licences, permitting operation into points in Ontario, have been issued by the Air Transport Committee to residents of the United States in 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969?

2. What restrictions, if any, are imposed upon these licensees while operating in Canada?

3. What assurance does the Air Transport Committee have that these licensees are not violating the fish and games laws of Ontario?

4. What penalties are imposed for violation of Canadian laws by these licensees?

5. How many of these licensees have been penalized in any way during the past four years?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Canadian Transport Commission advises as follows: 1. 1966, by the Air Transport Board, 26; 1967, by the Air Transport Board, 27; 1967, by the Air Transport Committee, Canadian Transport Commission, 18; 1968, by the Air Transport Committee, 20; 1969, by the Air Transport Committee, 34.

2. Standard restrictions (in addition to usual conditions imposed upon licensees in other classes) relate mainly to type of aircraft to be used (maximum take-off weight on wheels not greater than 18,000 pounds), and to transportation of traffic (prohibition against transportation of traffic within Canada, restriction to traffic originating within a radius of fifty miles of the carrier's base, etc.).

3. None.

4. No special penalties except as provided in sections 4 and 13 of the Aeronautics Act. In addition the licence of any air carrier who has violated the conditions of such licence may be cancelled or suspended.

5. In so far as cancellation or suspension of licence is concerned: one.

PLANS FOR DARTMOUTH FEDERAL BUILDING

Question No. 746—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Have plans been made for a new federal building in the City of Dartmouth and, if so, when will such plans be proceeded with?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): No. Consideration had been given to the construction of a Federal building in Dartmouth. However, changes in Post Office Department requirements that included the leasing of space for Postal Station East and minor alterations at the existing building eliminated the need for a new Federal building at the present time.

INSTRUMENT RATING EXAMINATION OF AIRCRAFT PILOTS

Question No. 763—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. When conducting an examination to determine whether a pilot of an aircraft, that only requires a crew of one, has the skill and competence to meet the requirements for issuance of an Instrument Rating, do inspectors of the Department of Transport, who are conducting the test, accept the responsibility of acting as "safety pilot" and "lookout pilot" when the pilot being examined is "under-the-hood"?

2. Do inspectors of the Department of Transport, prior to conducting the examination require that the person being examined sign a waiver and, if so, what is the purpose of such a waiver?

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes.

2. Yes, to release and indemnify the Crown and its agent from claims with respect to the operation of the aircraft.

VETERANS AFFAIRS—SURPLUS STAFF REQUIREMENTS

Question No. 843—**Mr. MacRae:**

Of the 26 members of the Department of Veterans Affairs in New Brunswick who were notified they were surplus to staff requirements, which ones have now been placed in alternate employment?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Cooper, G. R., retained or reassigned

within the Public Service. Harquail, T. D., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Holmes, W. S., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Lanteigne, Miss M. C. D., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Mazerolle, J. F. A., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Oakford, E. C., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Parlee, Mrs. M. C., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Waddell, A. D., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Wilson, Mrs. M. A., retained or reassigned within the Public Service. Doncaster, A. A., accepted outside employment. Clark, J. L. J., resigned to take up training. Campbell, N., retired on superannuation allowance. Cosman, Mrs. I., retired on superannuation allowance. Wallace, Miss E., retired on superannuation allowance.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—4 CMBG MOVE TO BADEN-SOLINGEN

Question No. 845—**Mr. Ryan:**

1. By what date will the tanks of Canada's Fourth Brigade be completely moved to the Baden-Solingen, Black Forest area in Germany?

2. Is the terrain in such area, between the Rhine River and the Black Forest, suitable for tank training and tank warfare?

3. Will such tanks have the same freedom, upon payment of damages, to use the roads, lanes, barns and farmers' fields in such new area as they did in the Soest area?

4. Where is the nearest repair or servicing base for such tanks when moved to the Black Forest area?

5. Is there a probable threat in the Black Forest area that requires such tanks at hand?

6. How is it proposed to transport such tanks to the Black Forest area and what method of transportation will be required when they need servicing?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): 1. The tanks of Canada's 4th Mechanized Brigade Group will remain in their present area until at least 1 October, 1970. Firm timings for the move have not yet been decided.

2. Yes.

3. At this time, there is no indication of curtailment, nor are any difficulties anticipated.

4. Indications are that almost all repairs and servicing for tanks in the Battle Group will be done within the formation at its new location. The small amount of repairs beyond the formation's capability will be done by British Army of the Rhine Workshops in the Northern Sector to which they will be moved by rail.

[Mr. Dubé.]

5. On moving south the Canadian formation will be assigned tasks in the Central Army Group area which includes the Black Forest.

6. Shipment to the new location will be by railroad movement. Local movement in the new area will be by tank transporter or other means as appropriate.

BEAUCEVILLE-WEST, QUE.—POST OFFICE CONSTRUCTION

Question No. 851—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. Is the construction of a post office in Beauceville-West, Quebec, in the plans of the Department of Public Works?

2. How much did the site cost?

3. From whom was the site purchased?

4. Will this post office be built during the 1969-70 fiscal year?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Yes.

2. No site has yet been acquired.

3. Not applicable.

4 No. It is proposed for the 1970-71 fiscal year.

[*English*]

HONG KONG—IMMIGRATION APPLICATIONS

Question No. 859—**Mr. Ryan:**

1. What is the current backlog of applications, in respect to nominated relatives, in Canada's immigration office at Hong Kong?

2. At what rate per month is the Hong Kong police force processing applications, for the RCMP, in relation to the security risk aspect of (a) all applications (b) applications for nominated relatives?

3. How many applications were approved in 1969 by the Canadian immigration office at Hong Kong (a) from Taiwan and Hong Kong (b) from the Chinese mainland controlled by Red China (c) from other parts of the Far East?

4. Does the government plan to increase the size of the Canadian immigration office at Hong Kong, with relation to the security risk aspect?

5. Does the government plan to subsidize the Hong Kong police force so that they will be able to process more applications by intended immigrants to Canada?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Manpower and Immigration and the Royal Canadian Mounted Police as follows: 1. Statistics compiled by the Immigration office at Hong Kong are based on the number of persons registered for examination. As of October 31, 1969, there were 4,374 applicants for admission to Canada in the nominated relative category in process at the Hong Kong office.

2. A monthly average of 529 applications based on a six month period. Applications for nominated relatives cannot be segregated as all categories are treated in a like manner.

3. The method of compiling statistics at Hong Kong precludes identifying those persons who have come from mainland China. The following table reflects the number of visas issued by the Hong Kong office in the categories shown, between January 1 and October 31, 1969.

	Sponsored Dependants	Nominated Relatives	Independent Applicants	Total
(a) and (b)	1672	2931	1774	6377
(c)	162	157	303	622

4. and 5. No.

*DEER LODGE HOSPITAL, WINNIPEG—INCREASE IN RATES

Question No. 870—**Mr. Muir (Lisgar):**

Have charges for domiciliary care at Deer Lodge Hospital in Winnipeg been raised from $120 per month to $300 effective January 1, 1970 and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The answer is yes. The charge has not been adjusted since 1949, at which time a rate of $120 a month reflected the actual cost of providing this care. The new rate is somewhat less than current costs. It is emphasized that this rate will be paid only by those able to afford it. Between 400 and 500 patients out of a total of about 2,000 patients in this category at various departmental institutions across Canada will be affected, the majority of whom will be paying less than one half of the increase.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—REDUCTION IN RESERVES

Question No. 879—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

What savings are being effected by the reduction to nil strength of "C" Company, the North Saskatchewan Regiment and the closing of the Armoury in Lloydminster, Alberta?

Mr. D. W. Groos (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence): In arriving at an approximate cost of maintaining a militia unit certain factors that are difficult to estimate must be considered. The operating and maintenance costs of the armoury, pay of unit members, are basic costs, but there are other costs which are not as readily identified on a unit basis such as provision and maintenance of equipment, pay of regular force support staffs, travel, rations, clothing etc. It is estimated that approximately $50,000 will be saved by reducing "C" Company, North Saskatchewan Regiment, to nil strength and the closing of the Armoury in Lloydminster, Alberta.

VEGREVILLE CONSTITUENCY—POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

Question No. 880—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. Are any new post office buildings being considered for construction in 1970 in the Vegreville federal constituency?

2. What is the cost of the new post office now under construction at Holden, Alberta?

3. What firms submitted tenders for the Holden Post Office, what were the respective amounts and who was the successful tenderer?

4. What was the annual rental paid for the present Post Office facilities in Holden?

5. What was the effective date and length of duration of the lease for the present facilities in Holden?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. The program is under consideration.

2. $29,720.

3. Holzer Construction Ltd., Edmonton, $29,720; Watson (Tofield) Ltd., Tofield, $34,000; Nor-Way Construction Ltd., St. Albert, $34,975; Polar Construction Ltd., Edmonton, $35,903; Senco Construction Ltd., Edmonton, $37,873.

Successful tenderer—Holzer Construction Ltd., Edmonton.

4. $2,100 per annum.

5. Effective date, September 1, 1969. Duration of lease, one month, thence month to month.

AMHERST, N.S.—DISMISSAL OF PUBLIC SERVANTS

Question No. 883—**Mr. Coates:**

1. How many employees of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion at Amherst, N.S., have been informed their services will no longer be required after March 31, 1970?

2. What action will be taken to assist them in retaining employment in the Public Service of Canada?

Questions

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Six.

2. They will be given first consideration for reassignment to jobs for which they are qualified that are or become vacant in their own or other departments. The Public Service Commission co-ordinates such arrangements.

	Location
	Armstrong
	Beauceville-Est
	Beauceville-Est
	Saint-Ephrem
	Saint-Joseph
	Sainte-Marie
	Saint-Odilon
	Saint-Théophile
	Vallée-Jonction
2.	Location
	Sainte-Marie

[English]

NEWFOUNDLAND—REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Question No. 904—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. How many federal officers are involved in co-operation with the Province of Newfoundland in producing a Regional Development Plan?

[Mr. Coates.]

2. Who are the officers and what is their area of responsibility?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. Three chiefly, with support from others.

*POLISH SEAMEN DETAINED IN CANADA

Question No. 887—**Mr. Haidasz:**

1. How many Polish seamen are detained in Canadian ports?

2. On what grounds did these seamen request permission to remain in Canada?

3. Has the Minister of Manpower and Immigration applied any of the provisions of the International Convention on Refugee Seamen to meet the request of the Polish seamen now being detained in any Canadian port?

4. To date, have any requests of presently detained Polish seamen been refused by the Minister or the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

[Translation]

Mr. Rosaire Gendron (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. None, but presumably this question relates to a group of seven seamen who deserted the Polish vessel *Pomorze* at Halifax in November and December 1969, and one seaman let off the Polish vessel *Walsza* for medical treatment on August 14, 1969 who subsequently requested permission to remain here, about whom there was some publicity.

2. These seamen cited the economic situation and the denial of basic religious freedom in Poland as their reason for requesting permission to remain in Canada. Seven of these people wish to remain permanently in Canada, and the eighth has sought temporary entry until he can obtain a visa for the United States.

3. No. The International Convention on Refugee Seamen, known as the Hague Convention, deals specifically with the problem of refugee seamen on merchant ships who, owing to a lack of documents permitting them re-entry to any country, are unable to set foot on shore legally. This Convention obliges Canada to grant permanent admission to refugee seamen serving on Canadian ships, and in certain circumstances to refugee seamen who had served on Canadian ships in the past.

4. The seamen concerned have been allowed to remain in Canada under minister's permits.

[English]

BEAUCE CONSTITUENCY—PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

Question No. 895—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

1. What projects have been carried out by the Department of Public Works in the constituency of Beauce during the current fiscal year and what was the cost of each project undertaken?

2. Of those projects for which plans have not yet begun or been completed, how many will be undertaken in the constituency of Beauce before the end of the current fiscal year?

[Translation]

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

Project	Cost
Repairs	$ 4,060.
Interior painting	1,775.
Landscaping	686.75
Construction of Post Office	29,950.
Landscaping	1,950.
Repairs to heating system	663.46
Construction of Post Office	18,350.
Landscaping	1,595.
Additional postal boxes	1,700.

Project	Cost
Installation of new postal boxes	$3,000.

2. Mr. A. D. Crerar, Planning Division; Mr. J. G. L. Adams, Planning Division; Mr. R. P. Harrison, Implementation Division.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—AMMUNITION AND BOMB EXPENDITURES

Question No. 917—**Mr. Rondeau:**

1. Since 1960, how much has the Department of National Defence spent on the purchase of ammunition and bombs?

2. What kind of bombs were bought and from which company (ies)?

3. What became of them?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): 1. From 1 April, 1959, to 31 December, 1939—$238,211,000.

2. Bomb Type	Source
500 lb. MK 28 GP Bomb	USN
500 lb. Mk 82 Inert Practice Bomb	USN
25 lb. BDU-33A/B Practice Bomb	USAF
750 lb. BLUIC/B Fire Bomb	USAF
750 lb. CBU-2BA Cluster Bomb	USAF
5 lb. MK 106 Practice Bomb	Kemp Mfg. Co. (Ont.)
2,000 lb. BDU-8/B Practice Bomb	Olsen Mfg. Co. (Ont.)
350 lb. Mk 54 Depth Bomb	USN
16½ lb. Practice Bomb	USN
5 lb. Mk 23 Mod 1 Practice Bomb	Kemp Mfg. Co. (Ont.).

3. Practice bombs are used continuously for operational training. Live bombs are held in war reserve stocks except for small quantities which are used during Fire Power demonstrations and other special training manoeuvers.

[*English*]

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

PAYMENTS TO BELL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

Question No. 42—**Mr. Benjamin:**

What was the total amount of money paid to the Bell Telephone System by the Government of Canada during the last fiscal year?

Return tabled.

DISCUSSIONS WITH PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Question No. 333—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

What organizations and individuals have been in discussions with the Prices and Incomes Commission?

Return tabled.

ARDA—PROJECTS UNDERTAKEN UNDER AGREEMENTS

Question No. 876—**Mr. Corbin:**

1. How many projects have been undertaken under Federal-Provincial ARDA agreements in each of the following electoral districts (a) Témiscouata, P.Q. (b) Madawaska-Victoria, N.B. (c) Restigouche, N.B. (d) Kamouraska, P.Q.?

2. Where are these projects located?

3. What was the cost of each?

4. What was the federal government's contribution to each?

5. What is the nature of each project?

Return tabled.

[*Translation*]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, notices of motions for the production of papers Nos. 42, 61, 337 and 338 are acceptable to the government.

[*English*]

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER'S OFFICE AND HAROLD KENDALL

Motion No. 42—**Mr. Gleave:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence between the Prime Minister's Office and Mr. Harold Kendall of Manitoba regarding the sale and purchase of farm land.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTRIFICATION OF RIDEAU CANAL LOCKS

Motion No. 61—**Mr. Mather:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Department of Transport and those protesting the decision to electrify the locks along the Rideau Canal System.

Motion agreed to.

Motions for Papers

REAPPOINTMENT OF CONSUMER ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS

Motion No. 337—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Order-in-Council of December, 1969, re-appointing members of a Consumer Advisory Council on a temporary basis.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WELFARE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS

Motion No. 338—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the December, 1969 Order-in-Council appointing William Dyson to be Chairman of the National Council of Welfare and appointing twenty other members as well.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 335 is 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 or conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notice of Motion No. 335 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION GRANTS, IMPERIAL OIL, REDWATER

Motion No. 335—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence and other documents exchanged between the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and Imperial Oil Limited, Redwater, Alberta, concerning application and payment of two grants of $5 million by the Area Development Agency.

Motion agreed to.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call notices of motions Nos. 1, 43, 90, 171, 174, 186, 202, 216, 246, 284, 300, 308, 343 and 348?

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

[*English*]

COPPER EXPORTS

Motion No. 1—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all export permits granted for copper exports for the period January 1, 1969, to September 30, 1969.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

WORLD FARM MACHINERY PRICES

Motion No. 43—**Mr. Gleave:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report on world farm machinery prices by Dr. Clarence Barber.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture I may advise the hon. member that as indicated by the minister in his statement on motions on January 16, the final report of the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery is not expected to be available until late summer. When available it will be tabled. Under the circumstances the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Gleave: I agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

FINANCING OF PAN-AMERICAN GAMES

Motion No. 90—**Mr. Orlikow:**

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/or any minister or department and the City of Winnipeg, including the mayor, the city clerk and the city treasurer, since January 1, 1968, dealing with the financing of the Pan American Games in Winnipeg.

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the papers called for by this motion passed between the Minister of National Health and Welfare and the city of Winnipeg, and are considered to be confidential. Under the circumstances the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept that suggestion. I would like to have it transferred for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY COST STRUCTURE STUDY

Motion No. 171—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by economist David F. Smith of the

Mechanical Transport Branch, Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce on "The Effects of Canada-United States Wage Parity Upon the Cost Structure of the Canadian Automotive Industries".

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

PROGRAM TO ENHANCE PRODUCTIVITY

Motion No. 174—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the preliminary cost-benefit study on the new program of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce to enhance productivity (PEP) as referred to in reply to Question No. 1,955 as reported in *Hansard* of June 4, 1969.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT STUDY, CITÉ DU HAVRE

Motion No. 186—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report undertaken for Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation regarding the planning for a long-term development study of Cité du Havre in 1968, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) responsible for housing wishes to inform the hon. member that the study contains recommendations to ministers and such documents are deemed to be internal and therefore privileged. In view of this the minister would ask the member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: I call for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

TRADE PROMOTION COST-SALES RATIO

Motion No. 202—**Mr. Broadbent:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study on the Department of Industry Trade and Commerce trade promotion policies showing a 12:1 cost-sales ratio as stated by Mr. P. Schutte, Chief of the Trade Fairs Abroad Division of the Department.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

GUIDANCE AND ASSESSMENT OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Motion No. 216—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by the Economist Intelligent Unit on guidance and assessment of the Canadian textile industry, undertaken for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the fiscal year 1966-67, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

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 this study is of a confidential nature, the release of which would be detrimental to the future relationship between the department, the consultant and the industry concerned. In view of this the minister would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: I cannot agree to that, Mr. Speaker. I call for a vote.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

CANADIAN APPLIANCE INDUSTRY

Motion No. 246—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by the University of Toronto on the Canadian Appliance Industry undertaken for the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year 1968-69, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,323 of the past Session.

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 this study has not been completed yet. There is an agreement between the University of Toronto and the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce that a report, not including commercial confidential material, will be published within one year of data collection and analysis. It is expected that data collection and analysis will be concluded some time this year. In view of this the minister hopes that the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: I agree, Mr. Speaker, but retain the right to reintroduce it.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Motions for Papers

FIXED COMBINATIONS OF ANTIBIOTICS

Motion No. 284—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between ahe Department of National Health and Welfare and Canadian manufacturers of certain antibiotic combinations as mentioned by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in his statement to the House on November 27, 1969 and reported in *Hansard*, page 1297.

Mr. Stanley Haidasz (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, with reference to this motion my minister has requested me to inform the hon. member that the correspondence referred to does not exist. My minister's statement in the House on November 27, 1969, referred to discussions between officers of the Food and Drug Directorate and various drug companies. Officers of the department have offered to meet with the hon. member at his convenience to provide him with information. In view of this it is requested that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. Orlikow: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

REPORT ON ATTITUDES OF INDIAN PEOPLE

Motion No. 300—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report on attitudes of Indian people based mainly on a visit to the Six Nations Reserve on July 16, 1969, submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development by Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Ltd., as referred to on page 6 of the quarterly report on public relations activity, June, July, August, 1969 by the said Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Ltd.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

FEASIBILITY REPORT ON ALBERTA-MONTREAL PIPELINE

Motion No. 308—**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the feasibility report prepared in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce regarding the construction of an oil pipeline from Alberta to Montreal.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

[Mr. Speaker.]

TARIFF BOARD REPORT ON BINDER TWINE

Motion No. 343—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Tariff Board Report on Binder Twine and Twine for Baling Farm Produce.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Stand.

Mr. Speaker: Stand.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL REPORT ON FARM MACHINERY

Motion No. 348—**Mr. Gleave:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the interdepartmental report on farm machinery referred to by the Minister of Agriculture as mentioned in *Hansard* of January 19, 1970 at page 2530.

Mr. Yves Forest (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Agriculture I may advise the hon. member that there has been no report made by the interdepartmental committee dealing with the Special Report on Prices of Tractors and Combines in Canada and Other Countries tabled on Friday, January 16. Since there is no such report the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Gleave: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask, as I did a week ago today, when I might expect motion No. 80, standing in my name since October 23, to be called? I might say that its subject matter is relevant to a recent statement on pollution of the sea made by the Minister of Transport, and it would be very useful to have this correspondence.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire when I might expect that Notice of Motion No. 11, which I put down on October 23 last, will be brought forward? It deals with correspondence about tax concessions to Shaheen Limited of New York. In view of the interest in regional development and taxation matters, I think it is pretty important that we get that correspondence.

Mr. Forest: Mr. Speaker, I will look into this.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, with respect to Notice of Motion No. 32, in answer to question No. 2165 last year it was said that it was

expected that this work would be completed by the fall. When can I expect an answer to this motion?

Mr. Forest: I will look into this matter as well.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining Notices of Motions stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

FINANCE

SUPPLEMENTARY WHITE PAPER ON TAX REFORM—RECONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased indeed to see the Minister of Finance back in the House today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the difficulty we have had getting information we look forward to the exact, precise and informative kind of answers that the minister always gives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I ask the minister when we may now expect the supplementary paper on tax reform, which he had previously indicated elsewhere would be available, he hoped, by the end of January?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, what I said, and I explained it fully in the House, was that information would be provided to the House committee. My officials, from what I have read, are still appearing before the House committee. As soon as they have information they will provide it to the House committee.

Mr. Stanfield: That is a very disappointing start by the minister. I would ask him a supplementary question. Since it is now conceded by his officials that the white paper on tax reform has inflationary tendencies, are he and the government reconsidering the white paper with a view to eliminating these tendencies?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to suggest that perhaps the question as asked is not in order. The hon. member's question contains an allegation, and to this extent it would not be in order. Perhaps the latter part of the question might be replied to by the minister.

Mr. Benson: Having gone through one election my hon. friend is used to disappointing starts.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Don't worry, you did too.

Mr. MacInnis: Whom are you going to support at the next convention? The boys are already at work over there.

Mr. Benson: You mean the next Conservative convention!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, if I might answer the question, the hon. member knows that the whole question of the white paper is before a committee of the House and the Senate. We expect representations to be made there with regard to the effects of the white paper, not only on savings and inflation but on business and a great many things. When these representations have been made to the committee, we will give them consideration.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether he has consulted the Prices and Incomes Commission as to the inflationary or non-inflationary aspects of the white paper proposals? I should also like to ask the minister whether he considers it sound policy, as no doubt he does, for him to put forward a paper containing admittedly inflationary proposals, while at the same time the government has retained the services of the Prices and Incomes Commission to advise us how to fight inflation?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows full well, the earliest possible date for the white paper proposals to come into effect, or legislation arising out of them, is January 1, 1972. If we have the continued co-operation of the opposition, I am sure we will have the inflationary situation under control by that time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Finance.

Now that he is back, can he tell the House whether he is pleased with the talks that have just been held in Quebec City, since he managed to keep all the things that the provinces wanted to take away from Ottawa?

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct what I said just a minute ago; the earliest date would be 1971. However, I should like to point out to my hon. friend that we had very constructive meetings with the ministers of finance and provincial treasurers in Quebec City. We have approved a report of the tax structure committee which is to be submitted to the first ministers' conference which will take place later this month. I should also like to say that I enjoyed the carnival. It is just terrific.

Mr. Bell: On $30 a week?

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Finance would arrange with the Prime Minister that there be a long weekend at Harrington Lake for the provincial and federal computers to arrive at some form of agreement?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, now that we have the details of the calculations from the province of Ontario, we are looking at them very carefully. I should point out that in just glancing at them I found an error of several hundred million dollars because they had assumed revenue from oil and mining would come in earlier than proposed. These proposals would not go into effect until after the five-year period.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Finance advise the House how many people have asked for the opportunity to present briefs to the Standing Committee?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt if that question would be in order.

[*Translation*]

AVAILABILITY OF COPIES OF WHITE PAPER ON TAX REFORM

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

In view of the importance of the white paper on tax reform and also, in view of the limited number of copies available, could the Minister of Finance indicate to the House if he is in a position to order more copies to meet the government's wishes to inform and consult the public on matters related to the tax reform?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as I understand it we had approximately 150,000 copies printed. I will look into the availability of copies now, since I have been away for a few days. However, we do provide copies of the White Paper to anybody who writes and asks for them. It is proving to be a best seller.

Mr. Baldwin: So is Dante's Inferno.

Mr. Lewis: It is a best seller because it is a soporific, I suppose.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—POLICY TO BE PRESENTED BY PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION TO BUSINESS REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Finance dealing with the relationship between the Prices and Incomes Commission and government policy. In view of the fact that the Prices and Incomes Commission is meeting next Monday and Tuesday with representatives of the business community of Canada and is going to make, I assume, certain representations on policy, may I ask the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, whichever wishes to answer, whether there has been any discussion between the commission and the Minister of Finance as to the policy to be presented to this meeting next week?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, as I have made clear to the House on several occasions, the Prices and Incomes Commission is endeavouring, and the meetings on Monday and Tuesday are the culmination of this, to obtain from the business community an agreement to restrict their discretionary price increases.

Mr. Baldwin: How is the price of milk?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I suggest this is an important matter for Members of Parliament to know about. I have heard it all before but I want to know from the minister if he knows, and perhaps he does not, in which case I will forgive him as usual, whether the Prices and Incomes Commission has been given authority by this government to make certain suggestions on policy when it meets representatives of business and labour, setting limits on profits or wages, or are these suggestions on policy made by the commission without consultation with the government?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, there has of course been discussion between officials of the

commission and officials of the government, but the Prices and Incomes Commission is independent and speaks for itself, not enunciating government policy.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member it might be in order to go on to another subject.

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

QUEBEC—REQUEST FOR REFUND OF SOCIAL SECURITY TAX

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Finance about the possibility of Quebec imposing a double taxation system.

Would he consider giving back to Quebec the amount of the so-called social development tax of 2 per cent?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, we pay to Quebec far more than the amount raised in equalization every year.

OIL

PARTICIPATION IN PANARCTIC OILS LIMITED BY ADDITIONAL CANADIAN CORPORATIONS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. In view of his statement today with reference to Panarctic, and in view of the fact that the federal government has participated to the extent of 45 per cent with certain petroleum corporations in the development of the Arctic under a corporate syndicate known as Panarctic Oils Limited, would the minister and the government consider participation and sharing by more independent Canadian corporations in this development for the purpose of assuring continued Canadian investment? It is true you have listed the companies that—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I put the question?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me the question has been put. Perhaps the minister might be given the opportunity to reply.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I did not understand very well the hon. member's question. If he could rephrase it a little more clearly, I might answer it.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: I will be very happy to put it more clearly. With reference to the 55 per cent that is owned by corporations, and the minister used the word "international" today, will he assure the Canadian people that those corporations will be Canadian corporations and that further participation will be by Canadian investors?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we would be most pleased if Canadians wished to buy shares in the Panarctic Oils Limited and we would also be quite willing to transfer the shares, if necessary.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: May I put a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Would the minister be prepared, in view of his lengthy statement today, to give us a statement as to how many Canadian investors there actually are in those companies which carry Canadian names and which are participating in the 55 per cent?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister should not attempt to give that information now. Perhaps he should wait and give it by way of a statement on motions.

Mr. Woolliams: A question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I did not ask that he give it now, I asked that he give it later in a statement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it is quite easy to understand. At the present time, 70 per cent of the shares are controlled by Canadians, that is, 45 per cent by the federal government and 25 per cent by Canadian interests.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

GRAIN

FINAL PAYMENTS ON DURUM WHEAT—DEFERRED WHEAT DELIVERIES

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Since none of those ministers is here, may I ask whether the minister responsible for the Wheat Board will make a statement on motions regarding the Durum wheat accounts in order to explain the lack of final payments on this type of wheat and to clarify and update information with regard to the deferred wheat deliveries for the 1968-69 crop year?

Mr. MacInnis: Nobody answers for the Wheat Board on Wednesdays.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Florian Côté (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am taking note of the question and I shall pass it on to the minister responsible.

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

INCREASE IN RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES ON WHITE BEANS

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the minister's statement of January 13 to the effect that the railways had agreed to suspend any increase in freight rates at least until March 1, will he determine whether or not the rail rates for white beans moving to western Canada from Ontario have been increased by 2 per cent as of January 22?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that beans were included in the agreement, but I will look into the matter.

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Will he use his good offices to discourage the suggested further rate increase, reported to become effective as of March 1, on shipments of white beans to western Canada?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to look into this and pass on the information to the railways.

[Mr. Chrétien.]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

LISTING OF INGREDIENTS ON FOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can he tell the House how soon the Canadian people can expect ingredient listing on food products?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we announced some time ago that this was the direction in which we hoped to go. Since that time we have received a great number of representations from different manufacturers about some of the technical and complicated problems that might arise. We will be introducing, during the present session as previously announced, a packaging and labelling bill which I hope will allow us to make more progress in this matter than has been made so far.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

MONTREAL-QUEBEC LINE—CLOSING OF STATIONS IN EVENINGS—DISCOMFORT TO PASSENGERS

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

[*English*]

Has the minister received representations to the effect that all stations on the CPR railway line between Montreal and Quebec are closed in the evenings, thus forcing passengers waiting for trains to stay outside in severe weather?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: I think this question could be put on the order paper. However, if there is an emergency the Minister might answer it.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not want to question your ruling but—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will agree that I have suggested the minister may answer the question if he thinks there is an emergency. He might do it now.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will try to get the stations opened before the weather warms up.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

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

Since we care very much about the truthfulness and accuracy of what we say, in justice to the CPR I should like to correct an inaccurate statement I made a while ago, to the effect that all railway stations between Montreal and Quebec are closed in the evening. I must say that the station in the most beautiful city of the province of Quebec, Trois Rivières, remains open.

[*English*]

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice? Some time ago the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville presented to the House the report of the Parliamentary Committee on Statutory Instruments which contained a number of important recommendations about the control by this House over delegated legislation. Can the minister say whether the government proposes to take any action, and if so how soon, with a view to implementing the report and some of its recommendations?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have had discussions with the President of the Privy Council about the substance of that report. The Department of Justice is currently drafting a proposal which we want to discuss together and present to our colleagues.

FISHERIES

SEALS—ACTION ON PROTEST BY INDUSTRY

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries. Would he inform the House whether he plans to take any action on the protest made by the Canadian sealing industry concerning his announcement on negotiations with Norway on the killing of whitecoats?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I have no indication that any of our vessel owners who previously indicated they were going to sea have decided not to participate in the hunt this year.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister does not seem to be too well informed on this matter, would he consider meeting with the Canadian sealing industry to find out exactly what the position is in the industry vis-à-vis the statement made by the minister last Friday?

Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, we have had several meetings with the industry. I have been hearing from the industry in recent days as well.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister say what is the position of Canada on the request by the World Federation for the Protection of Animals—friends of the minister—that Canada should ban what is left of the seal hunt?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister did not understand my question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member asked the question clearly, but under the rules the minister is not obligated to reply.

POST OFFICE

POLICY RESPECTING CLOSURE OF LOW-INCOME BRANCHES

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Communications, may I ask the Acting Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary whether it is the policy of the government to continue the closing of low-income post offices throughout the country in view of the general protest of the population against this policy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. member is reiterating a question which has been asked on a number of occasions. If the minister wishes to reply to this kind of question, he can do so by way of a general statement on motions.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, may I transfer this matter for debate at ten o'clock tomorrow night.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

LENGTHY DETENTION OF ACCUSED MAN WITHOUT TRIAL

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minis-

ter of Justice? Has his attention been drawn to the case of the young man who was held in the Toronto jail for some months without having his case brought to trial? If so, will the minister look into the matter to see whether the rights of this person, as guaranteed under the Bill of Rights, were violated or whether new legislation is required?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we will have to discuss that with the Attorney General of Ontario as well.

Mr. Orlikow: Why, Mr. Speaker?

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

ABITIBI—CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROAD

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Has the minister received from the La Sarre Chamber of Commerce a letter requesting financial assistance from his department for the construction of the Villebois-James Bay road, and can he indicate to the House whether a favorable reply has been given in that respect?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that this question could be put on the order paper. I take the liberty to suggest to hon. members that such questions appear normally on the order paper, and when there is any urgency, hon. members can notify the Chair so that they may be debated at the time of adjournment.

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL RÉGIME

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Considering that for some time now the Prime Minister has apparently been giving thought to the establishment of a presidential system in Canada, and that he has stated, as shown on page—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows the Standing Orders. He knows that he must ask a question. It would seem to me that his remarks are not necessarily relevant to the question he wants to ask.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, my question is related to the following remarks made by the Prime Minister in the House yesterday: "That is how you get a presidential system". My question is as follows:

Will the government submit to the committee responsible for reviewing the constitution a working paper on the possibility of establishing a presidential system in the country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Oui, monsieur le président. In fact, we have already submitted to the constitutional conference a working paper stating the government position on this matter. I am surprised that the hon. member, who keeps up to date on these questions, has not read this document which is very explicit and states our position very plainly.

I might add that, as far as I am concerned, it is true that I am going to establish a presidential system and this is why I always address you as "monsieur le président" and not as "monsieur l'Orateur".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister discuss with the President of the Privy Council the question of referring to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization ways and means of permitting members on both sides of the House to combat the very alarming and dangerous increase in executive power?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, as I just said to the hon. member for Charlevoix, the government's position on this has been made public. Documents tabled in the House of Commons on the constitution show what the attitude of this government is vis-à-vis parliament. But if the hon. member has not bothered to read these documents, I cannot suggest that going before another committee would be the solution.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister if he speaks on behalf of the Liberal party or that of the Canadian government when he says that the position of the government is clear in this regard?

[*English*]

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—REFUSAL OF CREDIT TO UTILITY SHAREHOLDERS FOR TAXES PAID BY CORPORATIONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like some further infor-

mation from the Minister of Finance. I ask the minister whether the government is standing behind the proposal in the white paper to refuse to shareholders in gas and electric utilities in Canada any credit for taxes paid by their respective corporations? This proposal has already caused very substantial losses to shareholders in these corporations and is putting pressure on the provincial governments concerned to take over these companies.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): As I have already indicated, our proposals in the white paper are exactly that, proposals. It is proposed in the white paper that all the taxes from these particular utilities go to the provinces. Therefore, it is not proposed that the gross up and credit be allowed to the shareholders by the government of Canada for money it has not received. That is the proposal in the white paper. We expect to have submissions on it to the parliamentary committee, which the hon. member will admit is the proper way of dealing with the matter. It is presently before this committee.

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the policy of the government to pursue tax policies which encourage takeovers of these companies by governments in order to avoid the injurious effects of the minister's tax policies? Is it the minister's intention to pursue this unfortunate proposal or is he prepared to take it back and bring something forward along the lines in the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. Minister of Finance will allow me to suggest to him, and to the House, that perhaps what he is being invited to do now is to make a statement which is much too general in scope and which should rather be made by way of an announcement of policy.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

PROSECUTION OF IMPERIAL TOBACCO COMPANY FOR MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I wish to assure the minister that I will not ask the nature of the decision but simply whether a decision has been reached to prosecute or not to prosecute in the case involving Casino cigarettes?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that charges were laid in Edmonton on February 2 against Imperial Tobacco Products Limited arising out of alleged monetary prizes of "$5 in every pack of New Casino". Charges were laid under section 33D(1) of the Combines Investigation Act. It would be improper for me to go any further.

LABOUR RELATIONS

VANCOUVER—ACCEPTANCE OF COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT BY LONGSHOREMEN

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister inform the House when it will be known if the members of the International Longshoremen's Union have accepted or rejected the collective agreement signed on their behalf by their committee recently?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, they are voting on that particular contract today. Having gone through this agony on two previous occasions, I imagine the final results will not be known until about eleven o'clock tonight, Ottawa time.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH LONGSHOREMEN AT EASTERN CANADIAN PORTS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): A supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. Can the minister give us a progress report on negotiations with longshoremen at eastern Canadian ports?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I would like to be accurate in my answer in view of the hon. member's particular interest in the subject matter. I would prefer to make a more detailed answer tomorrow.

TRANSPORT

MOVEMENT OF GRAIN—RETURN OF CANADIAN BOXCARS FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In light of the series of questions put to the minister last week with respect to the return of our wayward boxcars from the United States, can the minister advise the House what success he had with officials of the Canadian railroads in this regard at the meeting he indicated would be held with them at the first part of this week?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Some success, Mr. Speaker, but perhaps not enough to satisfy hon. members opposite. They assured me they would do everything possible to repatriate as many of these cars as possible. In the meantime, both railways are undertaking a crash program to return to service a number of cars which I understand have been out of service for some time. There is a special effort under way in Winnipeg. I might add there is a search being made for additional locomotives in the United States which it might be possible to hire for use in this regard.

[*Translation*]

OFFICIAL LANGUAGES

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONER

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

Can he tell us when he expects to be in a position to give us the name of the Commissioner of Languages?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): In the very near future, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Indeed, whenever, in the past two months, we have asked the Secretary of State when he was going to appoint the Commissioner of Languages, he invariably answered: "Very soon".

An hon. Member: Be patient!

Mr. Asselin: Quite recently, he has appointed three directors for this organization without, however, appointing the president or the chief commissioner. I believe hon. members have a right to expect as soon as possible a clear and definite answer from the government since it has been two months—

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES ABM SYSTEM—EVIDENCE RESPECTING ESCALATION—CANADIAN REPRESENTATIONS

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a two-part question to the Prime Minister arising out of his answers last Monday concerning the United States anti-ballistic missile system. In the course of his remarks, the Prime Minister said that evidence which the government has does not show any evident escalation. Could the Prime Minister advise the House what his evidence constitutes since there has been no decision or no action by the U.S.S.R. and other countries which would indicate a similar view? Also, could he advise the House if it is the intention of the government, in a more formal and direct manner, to give notice to the United States government of the unhappiness of the Canadian government about the decision of that government?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): On the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that we have no evidence that the Soviet government, if that is the one the hon. member is thinking of, has considered this move as an escalatory one. I cannot add much detail to that. We have to rely on what information we get. The answer to the second part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is no, not at this time. I am not considering any further statement, nor is the minister.

PUBLIC WORKS

CHURCHILL—INQUIRY AS TO DEVELOPMENT OF TOWNSITE

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. In mid-November I directed a question to the minister asking him if he would enlighten the House in relation to the federal government's plans for the future development of the townsite of Churchill. At that time, the minister said it would depend entirely upon the relations between the federal government and the government of the province of Manitoba, and that discussions were then being held. I ask the minister if he has anything further to announce at this time or if he expects to make an announcement shortly.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Not at this time, Mr. Speaker.

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—CONFLICTING ESTIMATES OF INCREASED REVENUES

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Now that the minister has had a chance to communicate with the provincial treasurers, particularly the treasurer of Ontario, is he in a position to say whose computer was the most accurate and whether he proposes to make a new estimate on the proposed tax?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have the impression that the question asked by the hon. member is substantially the same as the one asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon.

TRANSPORT

EXPENSE OF ICEBREAKER SERVICES FOR SHIPS USING NORTHWEST PASSAGE

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I wish to rephrase a question I directed to the Minister of Transport yesterday. What is the policy of the government regarding the expenses of icebreaker services through Canada's northwest passage for ships of the Humble Oil Company or any other United States oil company that may be using Canada's Northwest Passage?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): There are no firm rules, if I might describe them that way, in this regard. I think we have to measure the benefits that may come to us from any experimental activity. I may say on the last and only occasion that we have been asked for that kind of help, there was a good deal of reciprocity. For example, some of the fuels for the icebreaker were provided by the Humble Oil Company. We do not have a policy. If it becomes a matter of fairly regular use, I presume we would come to some specific arrangement.

AIR CANADA

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON SENIOR PERSONNEL CHANGES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Will the minister, at an early date, make a statement in the House with regard to the changes in the senior administrative positions of Air Canada outlining the motivations behind these changes?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that is a proper matter on which I should make a statement. It is an internal arrangement within Air Canada. I will examine it. If it appears sensible for me to make a statement, I will do so.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Might I point out to the minister that he answers to Parliament on behalf of Air Canada and Parliament is asking the question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HEALTH AND WELFARE

PROGRAM TO COVER COST OF DRUGS FOR OLD AGE PENSIONERS AND OTHERS

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): I wish to address a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the very severe hardships being suffered in many cases by old age pensioners and those on social services payments who find themselves covered by medicare but not for drugs, will the minister take immediate steps to implement a program of drug care so that these people will no longer suffer neglect?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I would advise the hon. member that under the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan the provinces can initiate such measures themselves to provide drugs, and in some cases they do provide drugs to the poor and to the elderly under the plan. We share 50 per cent of the cost.

Mr. Rynard: I was addressing to the minister the question of urgency. I realize that this can be done, but in the case of urgency—

Mr. Munro: It can be done tomorrow.

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN CONSTITUTION

MODIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM ACCORDING TO LANGUAGE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Can he tell the house whether the text of paragraphs 1 and 3 of section 93 of the British North America Act has been changed in order to enable the Quebec government to modify the education system according to the language used by the population and no longer according to its religious denomination as is stipulated in the British North America Act?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member must admit that this question as put is not in order. He is asking a minister for a legal opinion and this is why, I think, the question is out of order.

[*English*]

THE MINISTRY

TYPE OF AIRCRAFT USED BY PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): I have a question for the Prime Minister. Is the right hon. gentleman aware that

Canadians across the country want their Prime Minister to travel by a means befitting his office, that is, by government aircraft?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether the question is in order and I do not think a supplementary question would be in order. However, I will give the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster the opportunity to ask a question in a few moments.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): One more question on the subject of air travel by the Prime Minister. Does the Prime Minister realize that while the Canadian people do want him to have the best while he is on government business, they never want him to use these planes for Liberal party trips?

SPORTS

PAN-AMERICAN GAMES—INQUIRY AS TO FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO WINNIPEG

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the minister now in a position to tell me the status of the letter he promised me many months ago concerning the possibility of a further government grant to Winnipeg in connection with the deficit on the Pan-American Games in Canada's centennial year? Or perhaps he is in a position to say now that a favourable decision has been reached?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): If I had mailed the letter, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should take up this question with the Postmaster General. Seriously, though, I did not mail the letter, because I was not satisfied with it. I promised it to the hon. member as soon as possible and I hope he will give me some leeway—the usual leeway.

An hon. Member: At least two more years.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

DELAY IN PAYMENT OF BENEFITS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): My question is intended for the Minister of Labour. In view of the long delays which have occurred, and the complaints all through industrial Ontario concerning the processing of unemployment insurance claims, would the minister use his good offices with the Unemployment Insurance Commission to get these things speeded up?

[Mr. Barrie.]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation and he has to assume the minister will take note of it.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will the minister recall that he stated, relative to the first atomic tests on Amchitka Island, that the results would be assessed by Canadian scientists, and will he assure us that the results of this study will be made public well before any other tests are made?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Our ambassador in Washington is inquiring of the United States government to obtain the results of the tests. This is in line with my answer the other day. These results will be examined by Canadian seismologists and other scientists. I am not sure whether the results of that study will be put out in a form suitable for publication, but I am satisfied I shall be asked the relevant questions in the House.

PUBLIC SERVICE

EXTRA CONTRIBUTIONS BY THOSE EMPLOYED TO COVER INCREASED BENEFITS FOR THOSE RETIRED

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): My question is for the President of the Treasury Board. Has the Treasury Board Secretariat advised the major bargaining agents for the public service that extra contributions will be made by those now working, and that part of those contributions will be used to help cover the cost of forthcoming increased benefits for those who have retired?

Mr. Speaker: I doubt whether the question is in order as asked. The hon. member is asking the minister whether such a statement has been made and the question cannot be put in that way.

Mr. Drury: I think I made it clear—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting the privileges of Parliament, because I have documents and evidence of what is contained in forthcoming legislation. As far as I know, this is the only means I have of asking the responsible minister whether certain proposals or statements

have been made. I am getting something through the back-door route which Parliament is not getting through the front-door route.

Mr. Speaker: Because of the circumstances he has outlined, the hon. member may have a grievance against the minister, but I do not think this would make it possible for him to ask his question in its present form at this time.

An hon. Member: Better lock your back door.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

LEGISLATION RESPECTING NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): My question is directed to the Leader of the House. Does the absence from his list the other day, containing 74 items of business, of a measure to deal with the unanimous report of the Special Joint Committee on the Royal National Anthems indicate it is not the intention of the government to deal with this matter during the present session of Parliament as was promised?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I regret to say that some complications have developed in connection with copyright. Negotiations are now under way to resolve this problem but it looks very much, now, as though we shall not be in a position to place proposals before the House during the present session.

Mr. Forrestall: Could I ask whether this matter of negotiations with the copyright holders is something which is in process, or whether it is, in fact, dead?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): It is my understanding that it is in process, but I have not received a recent report on the subject.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

APPLICATION RESPECTING FLOODING OF LAND NEAR SKAGIT RIVER

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has an application for further flooding of Canadian territory near the Skagit River, which is an international river in British Columbia, been received by the federal government from any source?

Mr. Speaker: This question should be placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Harding: A question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. This is a current question which is vital to the people of this area. Rather than wait two or three months for an answer, I feel we are entitled to a reply from the minister on this important issue.

[*Translation*]

INVITATION TO PRESIDENT OF FRANCE TO VISIT OTTAWA

Mr. Bernard Dumont (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Since the Prime Minister seems very well disposed towards presidency and presidents as a whole, I wonder whether he is thinking today of inviting President Pompidou to visit Ottawa when he goes to New York.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I had not thought about it, Mr. Speaker, but I thank the hon. member for that good idea. I will consider it.

[*English*]

HOUSING

BUILDING SOCIETIES—REQUEST FOR FAVOURABLE TAX TREATMENT

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister yet reached a decision regarding building societies and, if so, when can the House expect a statement from him?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I will look into this matter. I have reached a decision with respect to special tax advantages for building societies. I, personally, would not be in favour of special tax advantages for particular types of enterprises. There is nothing to stop them—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

NEWFOUNDLAND—DECISION AS TO INQUIRY INTO OPERATIONS

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, this question is for the Minister of Transport. Can the minister indicate, in view of the request for an inquiry into CN operations in Newfoundland some three weeks ago, whether we can expect his decision in the near future?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes Mr. Speaker. Some material

relevant to the question asked is being prepared by Canadian National and I undertake to make it available to the hon. member as soon as it reaches me, which should be early next week.

TRANSPORT

ATLANTIC PROVINCES TASK FORCE

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Transport. Can the minister tell the House whether the Atlantic provinces task force on transportation is still in existence? If so, has he received any recent progress report from the task force?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): It is still in existence, Mr. Speaker. I have not received any report recently, but I understand there was a meeting in Moncton, if not last week, this week, and I have prodded and asked them to give me some recommendations as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker: I apologize to the hon. member for Dauphin and the hon. member for South Western Nova for not recognizing them. We have already gone three minutes beyond time. I have personally referred to these hon. members so that I will remember tomorrow to give them precedence over other members.

PRIVILEGE

MR. NOWLAN—FAILURE OF PRIME MINISTER TO CORRECT "HANSARD"

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: That is all right, Mr. Speaker. Some hon. members may wonder why I rise now, after having sat through motions and the question period, but I had expected the Prime Minister to rise in his place to correct *Hansard*. It is because of the Prime Minister's failure to rise in his place to correct *Hansard* that I rise on a question of privilege which affects this institution and its procedures.

We have the interesting situation of the Prime Minister crying "foul" in the corridor but remaining mute in the House of Commons, not as the result of something that I or any other member of the opposition said, but something he said which is clearly and unequivocally recorded in *Hansard* for February 2, at page 3080.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

I might say, in order to assist some members opposite, that I have no desire to raise a picayune question of privilege on a picayune subject. The question I put to the Prime Minister on Monday, February 2, involved a very serious potential breach of parliamentary tradition on a most sensitive and potentially explosive subject. Certainly, it is a sensitive subject, Mr. Speaker. It involves the whole bilingual program and the third report of the B and B commission.

The interesting question I raised concerned whether the Prime Minister was trying to develop a policy whereby senior public servants would have the opportunity to express their personal views on this matter. I am glad that in the corridor, although not in this House, the Prime Minister corrected the record of the House of Commons. But that is not good enough. In view of the procedures of the House, I do not think members on this side have an obligation to try to correct ambiguous, controversial or contradictory reports of what a minister says in the House or what he says after going out into the corridor. I think it is incumbent upon the Prime Minister, if he feels he has been aggrieved because of problems in the House involving translation or because of commotion in the House, to stand up and clarify the record. I am glad he said something in the corridor. I still feel that he should have said it in the House.

What concerns me is that following the deliberations in this chamber, the Prime Minister clearly shouted foul because unanimous consent had not been given for him to make a correction. As has been demonstrated four times today, there is a time for members to rise in their places to correct procedural or substantive points in *Hansard*, and unanimous consent is not necessary.

I should like to refer to *Hansard* for February 2, page 3082, where it is recorded that I asked through you, Mr. Speaker, if the Prime Minister had correctly heard my question about the policy concerning federal public servants. You, Mr. Speaker, suggested the question was quite clear and that you had heard the answer. I repeated the question and answer before you started to cut me off, which it is within your discretion to do. After I had repeated the problem in respect of federal public servants concerning matters of government policy, the Prime Minister could have clarified the record and we would not have wasted the time we have. But because of the Prime Minister's peevishness, petulance

or pique he would not speak. So, we have the situation today of statements being made in the corridor which would imply there is a concept in Parliament, I suggest, of a mock principle of Prime Ministerial participation, because the explanation or the excuse outside the chamber was that parliamentary procedure runs amok. I am not quoting the exact words, but I believe the Prime Minister said that if procedure in the House runs amok, the Prime Minister will answer yes to anything.

I shall conclude in about two minutes, Mr. Speaker. The first thing that came to my mind when I heard this statement by the Prime Minister was that it was a reflection on the Chair to suggest that the proceedings in the House run amok. You, Mr. Speaker, with your tact, experience and good sense, would assist the Prime Minister in understanding the question. What bothers me more is the flimsy, flim-flam excuse outside the House that the proceedings ran amok. If the Prime Minister had risen and said that he felt he had been misquoted, and had given us a reason, such as a problem in translation in the House, this whole matter could have been avoided. Indirectly, it is a reflection on *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member I believe has made his point. I do not think we should have a lengthy debate on the matter raised by the hon. member concerning whether the Prime Minister did or did not have an opportunity to make a correction to *Hansard*. I do not think we should go into all other aspects. At the same time, I think the Prime Minister may have some comment to make and I will invite hon. members after that not to pursue the matter further.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My comments will be very brief. I am told I did not have the courage to speak in the House and went outside and cried foul. For the record, may I say that I did try to get the attention of the House to speak and it was because of some member in the hon. member's party that I was not given an opportunity to correct *Hansard*. Surely, under these circumstances, I cannot be blamed for having answered some questions outside the House which were asked of me on the subject on which I rose to get your attention, Mr. Speaker, concerning the fact that I said I wished to correct an error in *Hansard* which had just been brought to my attention. That is the fact of the matter. I had not seen *Hansard* earlier. I think an explanation is therefore in order.

The hon. member for Edmonton West referred to the unexplained absence of *Hansard*. The House did not have *Hansard* nor did I, at the time that we were on motions. Therefore I could not make my correction at that point. *Hansard* was just brought to my attention later. This is the very simple explanation.

Mr. Stanfield: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister what correction he wishes to make in *Hansard*?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to ask a question or has a point to make, I think he has a right to do so. I would suggest to hon. members that there is not much point, and I really do not see what can be gained, in pursuing the matter further.

• (4:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING LOCATING OF CLAIMS, ETC.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that Bill S-4, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill is relatively simple and straightforward, but I think I probably should take a few minutes in introducing the second reading of the bill to explain and outline what is proposed in this amending legislation.

This bill was passed by the other place on November 17, 1969, and after second reading in that place the bill was considered in the Senate Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce and was reported back without amendment. Today, the placer mining industry in the Yukon does not have the importance it once held. As you know, Mr. Speaker, placer mining was at one time a thriving industry, particularly in the Dawson area, and represents an important and historic phase in the history of the Yukon. It is this phase that we intend to commemorate with the historic sites program to which I will refer in a moment.

From the period of 1897 to 1904, it is reported that the value of gold production exceeded $100 million. Most of this production was recovered by hand methods, such as pans, rockers and sluice boxes into which bold bearing gravel was shovelled and then washed. As transportation improved, thousands of tons of equipment were brought in and the scale of mining increased. Many claims were acquired and consolidated by corporations, with the individual miner being gradually replaced by large companies operating hydraulic and dredging plants. At one time, the Yukon Consolidated Gold Corporation had 9 dredges operating in the creeks in the vicinity of Dawson City. However, all dredging operations were closed down in the fall of 1966 when recovery of gold in this manner became uneconomic. Today, placer mining is conducted on a very small scale, comprising some 30 small one and two man operations, using bulldozers to push the gold bearing gravels into sluice boxes. Most of the creek beds in the Klondike area, where for the past 72 years placer mining was concentrated, have now been mined in one way or another. There is, of course, still some gold in the benches and in the hills, but it is extremely unlikely that further large-scale recovery of gold could be economical.

Under the Act which is proposed to be amended by this bill, the person staking a claim has all rights, not only to the minerals but all surface rights. The government does not even have the authority to set aside lands for roads, railways or pipeline rights of way, an historic site, national park, or any other public purpose. In the Yukon, all surface rights which have not been alienated for private purposes are still vested in the Crown in the right of Canada. All of these lands, at the present time, are now available to the placer prospector for claim staking. Under bill S-4, the government will have the authority where it feels there is a need for a road, airport, national park, or what have you for public purposes, to withdraw such lands as are required for such public purpose from the operation of the Yukon Placer Mining Act. Then, those lands could not be staked for placer mining purposes.

Of course, this legislation is not retroactive. In the case of existing claims under placer mining regulations, if the government required the land on which the claims were staked it would have to deal with the claim owner in the regular way by purchase or expropriation. Under the existing statute, which we propose to amend, only lands within the boundaries of a city, town, village, land occupied by a building, or forming part of an Indian reserve, are not subject to claim for placer mining purposes. I might give hon. members the following example of the application of the present law.

On November 1, the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) announced in Whitehorse that the government had approved his recommendation for a $1.7 million historical sites program in the Yukon territory and also stated that the government had reached an agreement with the Yukon Consolidated Gold Corporation to purchase the "Gold Room" now located at the company's establishment at Bear Creek near Dawson City and which the government, through the department, proposes to move to Bonanza creek. There is already a commemorative plaque erected near the site of the "discovery claim" and a considerable amount of public funds have been spent in maintaining this site. As previously stated, there is no provision in the Act to protect such lands from its application.

Considering, therefore, the limited extent of the industry to-day, the amendments proposed in the Bill are of minor significance. As I have mentioned, these proposals are not retroactive and cannot, therefore, affect existing rights. As hon. members know, after second reading the bill will, of course, be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Of course, hon. members of the committee will have an opportunity, if they wish, to examine this measure in more detail.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a few brief comments to make on this bill because, as the parliamentary secretary has said, it will be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, where questions in detail will be asked.

It is my hope, and perhaps the parliamentary secretary can give us some assurance in this regard, that there will be people from the Yukon who may wish to make representations before the committee. While I realize that this is up to the committee to decide, I hope the parliamentary secretary will use his good offices to ensure that those who might wish to make appropriate statements to the committee will have the opportunity of doing so. I hope such arrangements will be made for those from the Yukon who are interested in doing so.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, in introducing the bill the parliamentary secretary was, in effect, telling the House that there is no more gold in "them thar hills". I suppose this is one way of announcing the passage of an era that made Canada famous around the world at the time the original rush to the Klondike occurred. I am not sure that one should feel he is optimistic in hoping there might yet be some places within the boundaries of the Yukon or in some other part of Canada where the kind of activity that is characteristic of a placer gold mining rush might again occur.

The bill, as it is proposed, should find general acceptance by members of the House because it does meet some of the situations which arise, other than historic ones, in respect of placer mining in the Yukon. It does clarify the prior right for land use and other purposes, particularly public purposes. I was glad to hear the reference to the proposal, which this bill will safeguard, for the development of the Dawson area as a national historic site in Canada. Those of the members of the committee who had the privilege of visiting Dawson, and being entertained there, I think would all agree that it has an attraction which is unique and can properly be considered to be part of our national heritage. I suppose in discussing this bill one could raise the issue of whether or not the legislative jurisdiction which is being exercised by this Parliament should not more properly be put in the hands of the Territorial Council of the Yukon. However, I think perhaps there are, and will be, other more appropriate occasions on which to discuss this issue in a broad way.

• (4:10 p.m.)

There is one particular point that I would like to mention because I did not hear the parliamentary secretary touch upon it. I did some research into the proposed changes, and it may be important to note that the bill does not change the exemption of Indian lands which is provided for in section 17 of the Act. I took the trouble to check the meaning of the section, which refers to the Territorial Lands Act, paragraph (d) of section 18, and noted that reference is made in that section of the Territorial Lands Act to lands for the use of Indian people. Therefore, the bill does not forfeit, as I was initially afraid that it might, the exemption that is provided in the present act for lands that form part of an Indian reserve. This is a subject matter which we may wish to explore and have more fully clarified in the committee. As I understand the situation, however, that is the meaning of paragraph (d) as it appears in clause 1 of the proposed new legislation. The parliamentary secretary might wish to make some comment to clarify my understanding of it when he closes this debate.

Having said that, I agree with the proposal that full opportunity should be given to anyone, particularly from the Yukon, who wishes to make representations on the bill, to the committee, to do so when the bill is before the committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, at first sight at least, there should not be any objection to this bill, particularly in view of the fact that the Créditistes have been telling the whole world, and even our leading economists, that our currency was not based on gold.

Money should at least be based on real credit, on real values, on true potential. This is what is meant by confidence in money.

They used to poke fun at us a few years ago when we said to the people that the value of our currency was not based on the famous gold standard. Since then, everyone has recognized that gold has practically lost all its value. It costs more to mine than it is worth. Therefore, it follows that this bill—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I would suggest to the hon. member to confine his remarks to the bill which is now before the house because I think that he is now out of order.

Mr. Matte: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I thought that the bill was dealing with gold.

As I was saying, we will not oppose this bill. However, it would be advisable to bring in a few amendments since, in any case, gold today has practically no value compared to the cost of mining it.

When the bill is before the committee, I might add a few other comments.

[*English*]

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to raise one or two points with regard to this bill. I was wondering perhaps whether the minister would consider allowing the Yukon Council to help define what land should be set aside for public purposes rather than have this done by the Governor in Council. It seems to me that some of the unhappiness with Ottawa stems

from the fact that decisions are made in Ottawa rather than by representatives who are closer to the developments in the Yukon and the Northwest Territories. I discussed some of these matters with these people and they argue, rightly or wrongly, that Ottawa does not understand the problems that they have in that area and that perhaps decisions could better be made by local representatives, people who live there and who are going to suffer or benefit from some of these recommendations or laws that we pass here in Ottawa.

I wonder if the minister would consider this point? I also wish to ask him whether the Yukon Council made representations on this or any other matter. Have they asked for some voice in this type of local legislation in which they are vitally concerned? I support the bill. I think that there are probably considerable amounts of minerals in the Yukon, but perhaps we will have a chance to have a closer look at the bill when it goes to the committee. However, I raised a point and I hope the minister will care to comment on it.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, this is in fact becoming a northern day in the House of Commons. Earlier this afternoon the interesting announcement was made that the government has decided to continue its participation in Panarctic's exploration in the Canadian Arctic. Now, we have a further indication of the government's growing awareness of the importance of the north in the form of Bill S-4, and also in some of the comments that were made by the parliamentary secretary when he introduced the bill before us.

I would like to join those who have spoken briefly this afternoon in encouraging the closest possible consultation with the Council of the Yukon Territory with reference to this bill and, of course, with reference to all the interesting developments that are taking place in the Yukon at present.

• (4:20 p.m.)

One of the growing concerns of Yukoners is the fact that they are not being permitted by the government to exercise sufficient control and influence in determining their own destiny. All they are really asking for is the acceptance of a fundamental principle of democracy, and that is the right of self-determination. I think that when this bill goes before the committee it would be an excellent idea if a member of the Council could appear

[Mr. Thomson.]

before it so that he might comment on the attitude of the Territorial Council with reference to this important development.

The comment by the parliamentary secretary that drew my attention when he was introducing the bill was the fact that at long last the government is deciding to continue the program of historic restoration that was begun back in 1960. This has been a sensitive and delicate point to the Yukon Territory. I am sure hon. members are aware that following the upsurge of interest in historic prospects of the Yukon, largely centred in the old city of Dawson and the route that was made immortal by the gold rush of 1898, interest subsided. It was only the continuing enthusiasm of the Yukoners themselves that maintained interest in the historic prospects, and in the meantime other areas of Canada which I shall not mention—

Mr. Barnett: Like Edmonton, for example.

Mr. Dinsdale: —which I shall not mention to avoid being controversial, had picked up the idea of the Klondike theme and were exploiting it for commercial rather than historic purposes.

The result of that development, as those of us who are interested in the north are fully aware, was a Yukon Protective Society. Many of us joined it and gave financial support. We are proud owners of certificates which indicate we are a part of that relatively small number who are anxious that the historic rather than the commercial aspects of the historic past of the Yukon Territory should be preserved. I think it was largely due to the efforts of this Yukon Klondike Protective Society that certain parts of Canada, again that we shall not mention in order not to be controversial, were prevented from using the Klondike theme at the Great Canadian World Fair that was held at Expo in Montreal during our centennial celebrations.

Mr. Woolliams: Judy La Marsh wasn't very kind.

Mr. Dinsdale: I would think that this unfortunate and very diversionary tactic which detracted from the exact locale of the gold rush of 1898, could have been avoided if the government had shown more continuing interest. Perhaps I am a little over-sensitive on this issue because, when I was the responsible minister the expenditure of a sum of some $500,000 for historic restoration was severely criticized as being extravagant and wasteful. It was said the Yukon Territory was

not worth that sort of expenditure, even though we were putting millions of dollars into the preparation of Expo, an event which lasted for one year.

The then Liberal opposition had the audacity to criticize this relatively small expenditure on the commemoration and preservation for posterity of what has now become regarded by all Canadians as our historic gem. The criticism at that time of course was more politically based than it was historically based, because the Yukon Territory, like other parts of the north, does not represent any substantial political force in terms of membership in this House of Commons. There have been these significant developments in the past few years in the north and the government has belatedly decided now to continue the program that began in 1960. We have already heard today that the government is continuing its support of Panarctic Oils. Last week the Anvil Mining Corporation officially began its operations in the Yukon. This represents a development that will have the same economic impact on the Yukon that the Pine Point Mining Development has had on the Northwest Territories.

It was rather an ironic twist of fate and fortune that the part of the north which gave the most enthusiastic support to the idea of commemorating the gold rush of 1898 during the festivities of 1961 was the State of Alaska. Alaska, a part of the United States, was far ahead in its development of its part of the north, further ahead than we were. As a result, again unhappily and unfortunately for the economic prospects of Canada, they were the first to discover a large reservoir of oil up on Prudhoe Bay. Now everybody wants into the northern act.

I am sure that if the government of Canada, since 1963, had continued to support enthusiastically the work that had begun in the north, without the long years of delay, it is quite possible that Canada would have had the first oil discovery rather than the United States of America in the State of Alaska.

In 1961 a ceremony took place at Bonanza Creek which officially declared the whole complex of Dawson City to be an historic site. The $1.7 million that the parliamentary secretary has mentioned as being made available for the continuation of the restoration in Dawson City and along the gold rush trail, will at least make up for some of the years that have been lost over the long period of the government's negative response to this positive program for the north.

The tragedy is that some of the pioneers who were still living in 1961 are no longer with us. There were still some of the old sourdoughs who had crossed the trail of 1898 in the land of the living when the cairn was unveiled on July 1, Dominion Day, in 1961. I had the privilege, as the responsible minister, of presiding at the ceremony on that occasion. They have gone but the story of romance and adventure that they left behind has been written for all to read in the works of Jack London and in the poems of Robert Service. I would commend the government for its decision, even at this late date, to carry on this important work of historical commemoration.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a few words on Bill S-4, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act. I have listened with interest to the explanations of the legislation given in short talks by the other members. However, there is one section here to which a reply should be given in closing the debate. I notice that section 19, which relates to surface rights, has been knocked out of the act. I feel that a little further information on this section could be given to the House when the debate is closed.

There are a couple of other points that I should like to draw to the attention of the department. I see that people can stake placer claims in most areas in the Yukon but one of the forbidden areas, of course, would be a national park. We have had occasion to set up additional national parks, and I do not think there is any doubt that some more will be opened in the Yukon area. There should be some provision in this bill to deal with the situation where an individual has a claim, and then a park is established around it. Now that the act is open, I see no reason why a technicality of this nature should not be dealt with.

When we talk about placer claims, Mr. Speaker, most people imagine that it means an individual going out with a little gold pan and testing the rivers and streams that abound in that area. But this is not always so. Sometimes placer mining is done on a huge scale, with dredges and sluicing though I believe most dredges in the Yukon have been shut down. The chances are, however, that in the years to come there will be very extensive dredge work in this area because there is no doubt that there is still lots of gold there. People will go back at a later date with more refined equipment to attempt to recover it.

In my opinion, every piece of legislation affecting this area should first be discussed fully with the Territorial Council. Some day the area will be self-governing, and we should be seeking the advice of people on the spot with regard to legislation such as this bill.

The other point that I should like to draw to the attention of the department relates to pollution regulations, in which I am extremely interested, but I am not trying to stop any placer miner from getting a panful of gravel or from carrying on a sluicing operation. This government has already indicated that during this session there will be a bill which will deal with oil and other pollution in the Arctic. This is urgently needed. Oil drilling and exploration is just one phase of the mining activity carried on in the north. There is no reason why some sort of pollution regulations should not be included in this act. As I say, I am not thinking in terms of the very small operation but in terms of the future when new equipment can be brought into the area, new techniques can be used, and when pollution could become a major hazard. I do not think there is any legislation that should not have this type of protection in it. It should not be so restrictive as to stop people from carrying out the normal operation of placer mining, however.

There is not very much more I want to say, Mr. Speaker. The amendments are fairly simple and the government seems to have made one or two steps forward in the changes they are making. I think there are other sections of the act, however, that should be looked at now that the act is open. I trust the two or three suggestions I have made will be considered by the department and perhaps followed up by some minor amendments to the bill before us.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I must advise the House that if the hon. Parliamentary Secretary speaks at this time he will close the debate.

Mr. Honey: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to deal with the several items raised by hon. members opposite in the helpful participation of this debate, and possibly I should try to deal with them in the order in which they were raised.

The hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) suggested that he would be hopeful, and I join him in that hope, that interested people from the Yukon would be heard by the Parliamentary Committee. The hon. member knows that it is not within our respective jurisdictions to direct the committee, but I know that the chairman and members of the committee will be aware of his suggestions in this regard. I might just comment in passing, Mr. Speaker, that I hope, and I know my hon. friend from Oxford would agree, that there might be more interest shown than there was when this legislation was before the Senate Standing Committee on Banking, Trade and Commerce, when there were no witnesses or representations other than the departmental officials.

The hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) asked me to reassure him that the provision withdrawing Indian reserves from the operation of this legislation, which did exist in the previous legislation, was not removed in the amending legislation. I can give him that assurance and confirm what I gathered were the results of his research in this regard.

The particular section of the amending legislation now before the House, Mr. Speaker, is section 1 (2) (d) which says in effect that staking of placer claims will not be carried out in various areas, and one of them under subsection (d) does not apply to lands set apart and appropriated by the Governor in Council for any purpose set out in section 18 (d) of the Territorial Lands Act. Maybe I should read that particular subsection into the record. It provides that the Governor in Council may:

> set apart and appropriate such areas or lands as may be necessary to enable the government of Canada to fulfil its obligations under treaties with the Indians to make free grants or leases for such purposes, and for any other purpose that he may consider to be conducive to the welfare of the Indians;

I think that answers the concern expressed by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the parliamentary secretary will permit a question? If I heard him correctly, he made a reference to legislation respecting the Territorial Council. My understanding is that the Territorial Lands Act passed by this parliament is in relation to the Territories. Is this correct?

Mr. Honey: Perhaps I could deal with that question within the context of the matter raised by the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson). Under clause 1 (2)

of Bill S-4, there is reference, to lands that are set apart and appropriated by the Governor in Council, that being the Governor in Council with respect to the federal authority, for any purpose described in paragraph (d) of section 18 of the Territorial Lands Act. The reference there, of course, is for purposes for which Indian reserves are set aside for the benefit of Indians. In that regard, the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley raised the question of whether the Council of the Yukon Territories is consulted, particularly with respect to lands to be withdrawn for public purposes. I am assured that that is the case.

I think I might spend a minute to draw a distinction, because the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley asked if the Yukon Territorial Council had a say in what lands are to be withdrawn from the operation of this act. Of course, I can assure him that there is consultation. It is important for us to keep in mind that under the Territorial Lands Act, the Council of the Yukon Territory may withdraw, appropriate or set aside lands for its purposes. Passage of Bill S-4 which we are now considering will not interfere with that right of the Territorial Council. That is not the intention. Subclause 2 of clause 1 of the bill refers to lands to which the Yukon Placer Mining Act does not apply. It refers to lands which are to be used in the right of Canada and, if I may use the expression, for federal purposes. It is important to keep that distinction in mind.

The next question or suggestion was made by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), who is concerned about the question of close consultation with the Yukon Territorial Council and groups in the Territory. I was in Whitehorse with the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) in November last and had the opportunity personally of meeting with the executive of the Yukon Chamber of Mines. Among the things discussed was this legislation. The Chamber has copies of the legislation and I am sure it has considered it. So, I think I can put the legitimate concern of the hon. member at rest in that regard because the people who would be most directly affected, those whose mining interests are represented by the Chamber of Mines, have been consulted and are aware of this legislation.

Lastly, may I refer to the questions raised by the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), who asked why section 19 of the placer mining act has been removed by this amending legislation. If hon. members will look at the explanatory note they will see why section 19 is being repealed. When section 19 was in force, it was possible for a mine owner to tie up not only mineral rights but surface rights in a particular piece of land indefinitely, because he was given, and the Crown was required to give this to him, the first chance of refusal of the purchase of the surface rights. The effect of this legislation, together with the removal of section 19, will mean that it will be possible to have multipurpose uses of a particular piece of land, as is the general practice throughout Canada where mineral rights may be vested in one person or corporation and property rights in another. By repealing section 19, the effect of the amending legislation is that one person cannot tie up a whole estate in a particular piece of property. I do not say necessarily that this would happen, but there was that freedom of action.

Mr. Woolliams: The parliamentary secretary is filibustering his own bill.

Mr. Honey: Mr. Speaker, I think these are the only remarks I wish to make about the questions that have been raised. Perhaps I could deal with other matters in committee, when officials of the department will attend.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

NATIONAL PARKS ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DEFINITION, ACQUISITION, ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (for Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved that Bill C-152, to amend the National Parks Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. Russell C. Honey (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, in introducing this legislation for debate on second reading may I spend a moment or two in referring to some of the legislation background of the bill. Hon. members who were in the House in 1967 will recall that the standing committee on northern affairs and natural resources dealt with this matter. No doubt they heard the minister of the day indicate to the committee that it was his intention to bring forward legislation with respect to a leasehold corporation within the reasonable future. He indicated he would

recommend this type of legislation to Parliament. The minister of the day had under his name on the Order Paper a resolution indicating his intention to introduce this type of legislation. On May 10, 1967 the resolution authorizing the establishment of a Crown corporation for leasehold purposes in national parks appeared on the Order Paper. For reasons that are not relevant here, that particular notice of motion was not proceeded with. I expect hon. members have had an opportunity to read Bill C-152—

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I hope that the parliamentary secretary today will not leave the impression that the standing committee he referred to met in Banff and Jasper, that briefs were presented by citizens of the area and that in one of those briefs they asked for this kind of legislation. I was a member of the committee and I say that if the minister made the kind of suggestion to which the Parliamentary secretary referred, it was not made in front of the people of Banff or Jasper. This is a cover up.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Honey: Mr. Speaker, I take it my hon. friend heard my remarks a moment ago and that he can understand them as well as anyone. They are on record in *Hansard*. I say to the hon. member that I did not intend to leave the impression that the remarks meant anything more than what the plain, ordinary sense of them on reading will indicate.

As I said before the interjection of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, members have had an opportunity now for some time to read Bill C-152. I would like to say something about the bill and the reason we are asking Parliament at this time to amend the National Parks Act.

During the past few years the rate of social, economic and technological change has increased the complexity of administering Canada's national parks. Visitation to the parks has increased tremendously and is continuing at the rate of approximately 10 per cent per year. In addition to the basic requirement for additional visitor accommodation in the parks, the increased visitation has also underlined the need for many new national parks and for rationalization of the use that is made of existing parks. In other words, it has become more important than ever before to ensure that our parks are used consistent with the best national interest.

The department's leasehold policy, covering both private dwellings and commercial establishments in the national parks has gone a long way to ensure that private interests in the national parks do, in effect, serve the needs of the nation and the visiting public. Under departmental policy, persons in business or employed in the parks may reside there. Commercial leases are granted only where, in the minister's opinion, there is a need for this or that particular visitor service. Assignment and reassignment of leases are controlled by the department. Also under our policy, the duration and conditions of leases, and particularly commercial leases, must be such that full control is exercised by the government, on behalf of the people of Canada, on what services are provided, where they are provided, how they are provided and for what duration.

There is yet another aspect of our policy dictated by the underlying principle that national parks are public lands held in trust for the benefit, enjoyment and education of all Canadians. That aspect, Mr. Speaker, is the question of financial return to the Crown as a result of private commercial activity in the parks. Such activity thrives and grows, to a very large extent, by virtue of the very presence of the parks and the millions of dollars invested by the Canadian taxpayers in their acquisition and development. Consequently, it is important that there be a commensurate financial return from the commercial opportunities offered within the parks.

The point I wish to make here, Mr. Speaker, concerns not only the merits of our policy, but the need to choose the best instrument available to implement the policy. The minister thought it important to show, in a general way, how our policy is essential to the best use of Canada's national parks. I now want to show in more detail how and by what instrument this policy can best be applied. The instrument that is being proposed is the National Parks Leaseholds Corporation. The institution of this corporation is the main object of Bill C-152. The bill also deals with several other matters that I shall mention later.

The National Parks Leaseholds Corporation is conceived as a commercial Crown corporation to administer all leases in the national parks and those public park lands intended for commercial uses that may be entrusted to its management. It is not intended that the corporation engage itself in any way in the administration or management of park lands as such, or what may be more generally described as "green areas". We are convinced that a commercial organization is indeed best

suited to administer what are essentially commercial interests. However, it must be a publicly owned commercial organization, accountable to the government and ultimately Parliament, because it will serve objectives that must be consistent with the purposes of national parks and more generally with the best public interest.

The establishment of the Leaseholds Corporation will have an important effect on the national parks administration. It will free the parks organization from the complex and specialized business of commercial property management, thereby enabling it to concentrate its efforts on the planning, development and preservation of national parks. Bill C-152, in so far as it concerns the National Parks Leaseholds Corporation, provides for the constitution, organization, financing and the powers of the corporation. The objects and powers of the corporation are such that it will be able to assume the control and management of such public lands in the parks, and of such commercial facilities within the parks as may be entrusted to it.

The powers of the corporation will be sufficiently broad to enable it to construct and operate commercial facilities in the parks or alternatively to arrange for the construction and operation of such facilities if it so chooses. The intention here is that the corporation be in a position to satisfy the requirements of the parks for visitor services in the most advantageous way within the context of the National Parks Act and Regulations. Thus, development could range from construction and operation by a lessee, through a partnership arrangement with the corporation to a situation where a facility is constructed and operated by the corporation itself.

In the latter regard, there have been and presumably will continue to be, instances where there is a need for visitor service facilities but where economic and/or social conditions are not conducive to an investment by the private sector of the economy. I am reminded of at least two instances in the relatively recent past, Terra Nova Bungalows, Terra Nova National Park and the Alpine Chalets and Motel, Fundy National Park, where a demand existed for public accommodation but where the prospective rate of return on an investment by the private sector was such that no one could be interested in fulfilling this demand. In these two instances, the department financed the construction of the required facilities and, in due course, leased them to private groups for their operation.

In all matters assigned to it, the corporation will operate within the context of the National Parks Act and regulations, and such other governing legislation as may apply. In the discharge of its responsibilities, the corporation will, with the approval of the Governor in Council and in respect only of limited estates or interests in public lands in the parks, have the powers of the Crown as provided for in the Expropriation Act. Thus, the corporation's powers of expropriation are less than those now available to the minister. The right of expropriation will enable the corporation to assemble public lands in the parks for redevelopment purposes or to extinguish, with compensation, certain rights previously conveyed by the Crown.

The corporation will be subject to legal recourse by its lessees, agents, contractors, or the general public; in other words, it may sue or be sued in any court that would have jurisdiction if the corporation were not an agent of Her Majesty.

It is intended that the corporation be allowed to borrow money from private sources at its discretion. Under such circumstances, however, these loans would not be guaranteed obligations of the government of Canada. This authority precludes the necessity of the corporation looking to public funds for such things as short term borrowings, working capital requirements, etc.

The financial provisions of the bill enable the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to make loans to the corporation on terms and conditions approved by the Governor in Council. Such loans cannot exceed $20 million in aggregate. The corporation will be able, however, to borrow money from other sources, thus precluding the necessity for it to come back through government machinery for capital. This will provide the flexibility and initiative necessary for the corporation to develop, within the limits of what is appropriate in a park, all of the commercial possibilities with a maximum return to the corporation.

• (5:00 p.m.)

While the corporation must have considerable latitude in these and other matters, it will not have unlimited scope. The control of capital and operating budgets, as provided under section 80 of the Financial Administration Act, will apply. In other words, it is envisaged that the Leaseholds Corporation will function in a budgetary control sense in the same way as the Northern Canada Power Commission, Crown Assets Disposal Corporation and

others. Also, Treasury Board may establish the maximum amount in terms of the Corporation's gross receipts that it may spend annually for administration purposes. I particularly want to emphasize that while the corporation should have as much freedom as possible in the conduct of its business, it will by law be restricted to enterprise that is consistent with the purposes for which the parks are dedicated. Inasmuch as the corporation will be subject to the National Parks Act and regulations, and inasmuch as the Governor in Council and the minister retain the right to remove from the corporation's control any lands or facilities, the minister will always have the authority necessary to control the activities of the corporation in all parks.

The net earnings of the corporation will be credited to a fund to be known as the Parks Development Fund. This fund will be used by the corporation in the conduct of its business. Provision is made whereby the Governor in Council may establish the maximum amount that the Parks Development Fund may contain, and earnings in excess will be deposited in the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to summarize the remaining aspects of Bill C-152. The bill provides authority for members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to collect volun ary penalties for infractions of the National Parks Highway Traffic Regulations. Present regulations require that traffic violations be heard before a court of law. In many cases, this represents delays and inconvenience to visitors, especially to those who live far from the park and who are travelling on a schedule.

The bill also provides for new legal descriptions of Banff, Jasper, Waterton Lakes, Yoho, Kootenay, Mount Revelstoke, Prince Albert, Riding Mountain, Georgian Bay Islands and Prince Edward Island National Parks. As well, it provides for the deletion of Fort Beauséjour Historic Park and Fort Anne Historic Park from the schedule of national parks. It is proposed that these two parks be set aside as national historic parks by the Governor in Council pursuant to section 10 of the National Parks Act.

The amendment further provides for a legal description of Terra Nova National Park in Newfoundland to be added to this schedule. When Terra Nova was proclaimed a national park on May 11, 1957, a legal survey under the Canada Lands Surveys Act had not been completed. The legal description should now be included.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Bill C-152 also provides for the establishment of a national park in the area of Kejimkujik Lake in Nova Scotia. Since 1963, negotiations have been taking place with the Province of Nova Scotia for the establishment of a second national park in that province. Agreement has been reached with the province on the boundaries of the proposed park and the province has made the land available, free of all encumbrances. The area of the new park, to be known as Kejimkujik National Park, is approximately 145 square miles.

The bill further provides legislative authority for the Governor in Council to add, from time to time, Crown-owned lands to the national parks. Under the existing legislation, additional lands acquired for park purposes can only be added to the schedule by amending the National Parks Act. Until such amendment is made, the lands cannot be managed under the authority of the act or regulations. Bill C-152 will enable such new lands to be brought under the National Parks Act and regulations by order in council. While the amendment will facilitate the addition of lands to the system, an act of Parliament will continue to be required before any lands may be removed.

I have to thank hon. members for allowing me this opportunity to introduce the bill on second reading. When it has been given second reading it will, of course, be referred to the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Interested people—and I know that a considerable amount of interest has been shown in this legislation, particularly by those in the parks area—will have an opportunity to appear before the committee as, of course, will senior officials of the department.

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Before commenting on the substance of the bill before us, I must at this point register my strongest objection to the manner in which this legislation is being presented in the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Nesbitt: This bill has been put forward and presented by the government, with all the publicity available to it, as one of the major pieces of legislation to be dealt with during the present session. What happens? It was brought in this afternoon, and there was no minister here to present it. This is no reflection on the Parliamentary Secretary, who is doing his job very well. But there is no minister here to present the legislation, and it is my understanding that the minister

concerned will also be absent from the House when the debate continues tomorrow. In all the years I have been here—and their number is considerable—I have never known Parliament treated in this cavalier fashion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deachman: On a point of order. If this is such an important piece of legislation, where are your members? Why are they not listening to it?

Mr. Nesbitt: I was just hoping somebody across the way would ask that question. I think they were so disgusted at the don't-give-a-damn attitude of the government with regard to this legislation that they didn't feel like coming; they chose to do other work. A few moments ago there were only 11 Liberal members in the House. It is up to you to keep a quorum.

An hon. Member: There are 15.

Mr. Woolliams: They are coming in, now. Here is the beard boy.

Mr. Langlois: I should like to see you with a beard.

Mr. Nesbitt: Members over on that side do all their talking from their seats. I have a great deal more to say on this subject.

This whole performance, this whole effort to play down the bill in front of us, may have something to do with the manner in which the minister was received when he was out visiting the national parks area of Banff and Jasper recently after he had addressed his wellknown admoni ion to the leaseholders out there: If you don't like it, get off the property; go east, go west, but don't stay here. This whole attitude is typical of what we have seen in the last few months in this Parliament.

As I say, this bill was announced as one of the great pieces of legislation to be presented to Parliament this session, though, of course, the government must have changed its mind in this regard because they do not seem to be treating it now with the importance they had previously ascribed to it. What does it do? It makes some relatively minor adjustments in the boundaries of the national parks, reducing the size of most of them, from what I have been able to gather. What else does it do? In a nutshell, it sets up a corporation to carry out the administration and to make policy for the national parks. If ever I saw a glorious, grand and blatant opportunity for patronage, this is it.

• (5:10 p.m.)

This is a deceptive bill. At first glance it does not appear to give an unwarranted degree of power to the National Parks Leasehold Corporation. The object of the bill, apparently, is to put into the hands of the corporation the day to day management of the properties of the federal government in its national parks. As the parliamentary secretary put it, this would have quite an effect on the management of the parks. I think that is putting it mildly. The bill is drafted in such a vague manner that in practice the powers to be exercised by the corporation may be considerable. There are many examples of such dangerous vagueness. I know it is not the custom at this stage of a bill to go into the detail of the clauses. I do not propose to do so, other than to illustrate the point that the bill is very deceptive and vague. In my view it is purposely drafted to mislead members of the House into voting for something for which they would not otherwise have voted. One example is new section 15(1) which reads:

> The objects of the Corporation are to develop, manage and maintain, on a basis that is economically sound and consistent with the purposes for which the National Parks are dedicated, property in the Parks the direction of the administration, management and control of which is entrusted to it.

Who is to decide what is an economically sound basis? What will be the situation if the public does not agree with what the corporation thinks on this question? Is the corporation itself to decide what is consistent in respect of the purposes of the national parks? What can be done should a citizen feel that the corporation's interpretation in this regard leaves something to be desired?

Another example of excessive vagueness is new section 15(2)(b) which states that the corporation may lease or otherwise make available on a commercial basis and subject to such terms and conditions as it considers necessary or desirable any property under its control. Again, this would seem to involve a rather wide authority. Presumably, the corporation could grant leases in such a way as to nullify zoning regulations in the parks. If it should set such lax terms in respect of leases that shoddy buildings are erected in the midst of great natural beauty, what can be done. There are a great many more sections to which I could refer. However, I think this might more properly be done before the committee.

I am concerned about new section 20 (1) which says that no by-law shall come into

force until it is approved by the Governor in Council. Here we have a lovely situation. For all practical purposes, the administration and policy in respect of our parks is to be turned over to a Crown corporation. This is similar to the situation of a few years ago when, in respect of transportation, the power of this Parliament was removed and placed under the Canadian Transport Commission. In this case, the government is attempting to have the best of both worlds. It is setting up a corporation with a president, a vice-president and five directors.

Mr. Woolliams: A great patronage pool for the Liberals.

Mr. Nesbitt: You can bet your bottom dollar they will all be friends of the government. If something should go wrong which causes public controversy the government can shrug its shoulders, as a certain member of the government frequently does, and say this is a Crown corporation with which the government cannot interfere. The government can say it has been set up to deal with parks, leaseholds and everything else without interference from the government. On the other hand, if the government should not like what is done by these boys whom it has chosen, the cabinet has a veto over what is being done. That is having things both ways.

Mr. Woolliams: That is called the musical ride.

Mr. Nesbitt: My colleague says that is the musical ride. I would call it a musical snow job. There are quite a number of other items here on which I might comment. We have seen government press reports and have heard rumours to the effect that the minister hopes to undertake a vast program of expansion of our park system so that the land area encompassed in national parks will be doubled in ten years. Such reports also indicate that the minister plans to develop a series of non-wilderness parks located close to centres of heavy population and suited to intensive public use. It would seem from this bill that so far as actual parks are concerned, all the government is doing is altering the boundaries of existing parks so that there will be a net loss of park area. The bill is a downright dangerous piece of legislation in so far as the provisions for a leasehold corporation are concerned. The granting of power is extremely poorly defined. Secondly, where the granting of power is clear it is also clear that the corporation will have responsibilities in respect of what amount to policy making activities.

I say that this is a dangerous and repugnant situation with regard to the administration of our parks. The corporation is given power under section 95 (2) (b) to lease or make otherwise available on a commercial basis, and subject to such terms as it considers necessary or desirable, any property under its control. But the power to set the conditions of leases is the power to set over-all policy for the parks and to effect to a large extent the way in which the parks are developed. Suppose, for example, the corporation should decide, as the parks department has in recent years, to offer no guarantee to commercial leaseholders that their leases will be renewed or even that they will receive compensation for capital improvement to the land. This can only encourage the commercial developers to adopt a get rich quick attitude. Scalping of tourists is likely to result.

There are a great many other things with which I should like to deal. However, a number of other members of the House I am informed are anxious to speak on this bill. Many of them represent areas in which there are national parks. These members will wish to discuss in great detail the many complaints, fears, worries and apprehensions people have as a result of this bill. When the time comes my colleagues and I will certainly find it necessary to vote against this legislation. In our opinion it is a bad bill. It simply provides an opportunity to the government to evade its responsibility by establishing a corporation behind which it may hide. This corporation will be able to do what it likes in respect of leases and conditions of leases. It is such a blatant example of potential patronage I am surprised the government would bring it before the House. I suppose one becomes bolder and bolder as time passes.

More important from a long range point of view is the fact that for all practical purposes this bill would take the administration of our national parks virtually out of the control of Parliament. This is another example of what this government has been doing and which its immediate predecessor has done for a number of years. It has cut down the power and responsibility of Parliament. The government would appear to have one particular desire. I am not referring to government backbenchers. They have been very conscientous in committee work and in respect of matters such as this. I am referring to the members of the treasury benches. The intention would appear to be to cut down the responsibility of

this House and the effective participation of members in the running of our country. This is being done consistently all the time. It is another example, if this activity is not stopped, of the fact that by the time this government's term of office has expired there may not be any use for this House at all.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I have heard the comment that the motto of this government is peace, power, patronage and perpetuity. If ever there was an example of this motto, this is it. As I mentioned earlier, the members of this party take great exception to the way this bill has been presented to the House. The minister has other engagements and I am not questioning the importance of those engagements. What I am objecting to is the way the business of this House is run by the government and the house leader. It is so bad that provision is not made to have the responsible minister in the House to present important legislation.

Possibly there is an excuse for the minister's absence this afternoon. We are told that all day tomorrow as well, the minister will be gallavanting, or perhaps attending to important business, out west visiting Indian reservations. There is just no excuse for this. It is the minister's duty to be in the House when measures as important as this are presented. No one would object or complain about his absence. What we are complaining about is the fact that when this major piece of legislation is presented he is not here. Representatives of his department are here, but he has responsibility for the bill. I think the minister should return to his duties. We are not prepared to continue the debate on this motion until he does return.

For this reason I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale), that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. Sulatycky: Mr. Speaker, I should like—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not know whether the hon. member is rising on a point of order, but the motion is in order and it is not debatable. Is the member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Sulatycky: Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to ask the previous speaker, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), a question.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is on the motion by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) that this House do now adjourn. All those in favour will please say yea.

Division

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those against will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

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

• (5:30 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander	MacInnis (Mrs.)
Asselin	MacLean
Baldwin	McCleave
Barnett	McCutcheon
Bell	McGrath
Benjamin	McIntosh
Bigg	McKinley
Burton	Marshall
Cadieu (Meadow Lake)	Mazankowski
Carter	Monteith
Coates	Moore
Code	Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys)
Comeau	Muir (Lisgar)
Crouse	Nesbitt
Dinsdale	Noble
Downey	Nystrom
Fairweather	Peters
Forrestall	Ricard
Gleave	Ritchie
Grills	Rose
Gundlock	Rynard
Hales	Saltsman
Harding	Scott
Howe	Simpson
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)	Skoberg
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)	Southam
Korchinski	Stewart (Marquette)
Lewis	Thomas (Moncton)
Lundrigan	Thompson (Red Deer)
MacEwan	Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)	Valade
	Woolliams—63.

NAYS

Messrs:

Barrett	Cantin
Basford	Chappell
Béchard	Chrétien
Beer	Clermont
Benson	Cobbe
Blouin	Comtois
Borrie	Corbin
Brown	Côté (Richelieu)
Cafik	Côté (Longueuil)

Division

Crossman	Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Cullen	Lind
Cyr	Macdonald (Rosedale)
Danson	MacEachen
Davis	MacGuigan
Deachman	Mackasey
Dionne	McIlraith
Douglas (Assiniboia)	Mahoney
Drury	Marchand (Langelier)
Dubé	Matte
Dumont	Mongrain
Duquet	Murphy
Émard	Orange
Forest	Osler
Fortin	Pelletier
Foster	Penner
Francis	Pepin
Gauthier	Perrault
Gendron	Pilon
Gervais	Portelance
Gibson	Richardson
Gillespie	Roberts
Givens	Rodrigue
Godin	Rondeau
Goyer	Roy (Timmins)
Gray	Smerchanski
Greene	Smith (Saint-Jean)
Groos	Stafford
Guay (Lévis)	Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
Haidasz	St. Pierre
Hogarth	Sulatycky
Honey	Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Hopkins	Tolmie
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)	Trudeau
Hymmen	Trudel
Jerome	Turner (London East)
Kaplan	Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Laflamme	Wahn
Laing (Vancouver South)	Walker
Lambert (Bellechasse)	Watson
Langlois	Weatherhead
Laniel	Whicher
Latulippe	Whiting
Leblanc (Laurier)	Winch
Lefebvre	Yanakis—109.
Legault	

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost. Order, please. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, I think the situation has been very—

Mr. Woolliams: I just wanted to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the minister was not here this afternoon but he is here now.

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): On the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I think I have a very good parliamentary secretary. I have confidence in him but I understand—

An hon. Member: Honey for president.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I do not know whether the hon. member for York South wishes to comment on the point, but I might say that I do not consider this a question of privilege unless—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the minister has answered—

Mr. Korchinski: The minister will go to the Senate.

Mr. Lewis: The minister's answer on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, entirely misses the point. It may well be—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Comox-Alberni.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, there may not be any point of order or any question of privilege, but there is certainly a question of debate involved in what has just been happening. I supported the motion that the House adjourn because it was an attempt—

Some hon. Members: Order, order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I wonder if we can have order, please. I recognized the hon. member for Comox-Alberni because I assumed he wanted to continue debate on Bill C-152. I wonder if we can have order. please. If he does intend to do that, I am certainly prepared to recognize him but I prefer that he confine his remarks to the bill before the House at this time.

Mr. Barnett: Mr. Speaker, had I had the opportunity of making the speech I intended to make this afternoon, I would have said that this bill had been on ice for a long time. I felt that once the ice thawed, it would appear to be a somewhat fishy proposition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Barnett: What has happened here this afternoon has, I think, underlined the point I intended to make. As far as I am concerned, the members of this House are entitled to hear from the responsible minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am afraid it is now 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, February 5, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

LABOUR RELATIONS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—REJECTION OF COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT BY LONGSHOREMEN

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think it is my duty to inform the House of developments that have occurred in the last 24 hours in the various ports of British Columbia. As hon. members may recall, agreement between management and the negotiation teams of the ILWU was reached on two previous occasions, only to have both agreements rejected by the general membership when submitted to them for ratification.

After the second rejection the unions agreed to extend the old contract for a period of 90 days. It was further decided that a new negotiating team would be formed and that negotiations would resume during this period. Sunday night this newly-formed negotiating team did arrive at a new settlement, which was presented yesterday to the membership for ratification.

The contract was rejected by a margin of 53 votes out of a total of 2,726 members voting. Hon. members will note that the percentage of votes against ratification has fallen steadily, from 70 per cent on the first agreement to 58 per cent on the second to 51 per cent on the third.

To further complicate the issue, three of the six ports voted for ratification. It is significant that in all three rejections the ports of Vancouver and New Westminster have been consistently opposed to any settlement.

Shortly before entering the House, I was informed that work is progressing at all ports other than New Westminster and Vancouver. However, it is significant that bulk cargo is being processed by the longshoremen in Vancouver.

Whilst I have consistently stated my respect for the rights of management and labour under the laws of this country to engage in free collective bargaining, including the right to strike or lockout, I have never hesitated in stating publicly that periodically the overriding importance of the public interest must be recognized as paramount.

The ports of British Columbia are not the property of the BCMEA or the ILWU. In the final analysis, they belong to all Canadians and they are of particular significance to British Columbia and western Canada in general. This fact, Mr. Speaker, should become more apparent by the hour to both the BCMEA and the longshoremen.

• (2:10 p.m.)

In view of the closeness of the vote and in view of the fact that work is proceeding almost normally, there is still an opportunity for both parties to show their concern for the public interest. If over the weekend they cannot resolve their differences or do not intend to, or should work come to a complete stoppage, then I shall not hesitate to recommend appropriate measures to my colleagues.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the minister's statement which I received just prior to entering the House. Although it is short, it deals with some matters that I submit we ought to look into closely. We must agree that of foremost importance to this country is the upholding of the public interest.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEwan: In this regard we hope that as a result of the work of task forces such as the Woods task force the minister and his department will be able to bring forward quickly amendments to the present labour legislation. He pointed out that the ports of British Columbia are important to western Canadians because wheat and grain are transported through them. The ports are a channel which must be kept open, and the government has the responsibility to do this.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEwan: It has been suggested that some of our markets for wheat and other grain have been lost, and we have had much debate in this chamber on the subject. I trust that, if necessary, appropriate legislation to deal with this problem will be speedily forthcoming. I note that recently the minister set

up a mediation service, which is something that we on this side of the House might support. I believe he appointed five mediators who will deal with various industries in this country and important matters that arise before contracts terminate. I believe we can support this action and I hope it will work. In any event, we hope that up-to-date legislation will be forthcoming soon so that the interests of the public on the west coast and in other parts of Canada will be upheld.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, in common with other hon. members and people throughout the country, I regret that a settlement has not been reached. I and my colleagues in this House do not take second place to anybody in our concern for the public interest. However, I suggest that before people become hysterical it should be remembered that part of the public interest in a democracy is the right of workers to organize, to collective bargaining, and to refuse work if the conditions of work are not to their liking. I suggest that this is as much part of the public interest in a democracy as any other consideration.

Mr. Woolliams: Tell that to the farmers of western Canada.

Mr. Lewis: Therefore I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the minister has not taken any steps to interfere now. I express the hope with him that the parties will meet this weekend and arrive at a settlement. Indeed, settlement must be very close when the agreement was rejected by a margin of only 53 votes.

It has been my view for some years, and I stated it in the House in 1966, that the federal and provincial departments of labour ought to employ personnel who could become involved in these disputes before they reach the breaking-point. I am glad that the minister himself has done this in many instances.

I conclude by expressing the hope that the employees, the members of the union concerned, will find some way of reaching a settlement without putting the country and Parliament to additional difficulty.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION

ABNORMAL INCREASE IN POWER AND AUTHORITY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion:

That this House refer to the Standing Committee of the House on Procedure and Organization the question of providing for members ways and means of meeting the serious situation brought about as the result of the extent to which the government in general and the Prime Minister in particular—

[Mr. MacEwan.]

Mr. Trudeau: You can't be serious!

Mr. Baldwin:

—have obtained abnormal increases in power and authority while downgrading the role and decreasing the effectiveness of the House and to recommend ways and means of coping with this alarming situation including such changes in the Standing Orders as may be required.

As this motion speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, the only comment I would make in urging hon. members to accept it is that it is becoming very clear that the whole structure of responsible parliamentary government is being threatened. A solution must be found—Your Honour has referred to some of these problems—that will provide ways by which private members may have a chance of bringing to a vote their resolutions and public bills and ways by which hon. members opposite may be able to express by their actions in the House the views they voice outside. Despite our understanding last session, no attempt has been made to call the committee and the only proposal is a very limited one with regard to television. If it will be persuasive, I am prepared to recommend that we have no debate on this motion and that the question be put to the House forthwith.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have unanimous consent to proceed with this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity. The motion cannot be proceeded with.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

NATIONAL PRICE RESTRAINT CONFERENCE—AUTHORITY AND ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for York South, to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the National Price Restraint Conference called by the Prices and Incomes Com-

mission scheduled for Monday and Tuesday of next week and whether and to what extent the Commission will be acting on government authority when it makes recommendations of policy at this conference, the establishing of this commission by Order in Council, making it extremely important and vitally urgent that there be a full and comprehensive debate in Parliament in order to determine the relationship between the policies of the commission and those of the government prior to the National Price Restraint Conference.

Mr. Speaker: The motion proposed by the hon. member suggests the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing three questions: the National Price Restraint Conference, the authority of the Prices and Incomes Commission and the establishment of the Commission itself by Order in Council.

In order that the House can be adjourned to discuss these matters, the Chair must be satisfied that the question raised is one which is in the nature of an emergency rather than one which has been of continuing concern to Parliament. Hon. members will recognize, I am sure, that the subject proposed for discussion at this time under Standing Order 26 is not by any means a new one. The point whether the commission will be acting on government authority when it makes recommendations was raised in question No. 331 placed on the Order Paper on October 30, 1969. The question was answered on December 8 last. During the last few months there have been daily oral questions directed to the ministry about aspects raised in the hon. member's proposed motion. The fact that a conference would be held has been common knowledge for some time and the actual announcement that it would be held next Monday and Tuesday was made more than two weeks ago.

• (2:20 p.m.)

The whole matter in all its aspects having been before the House on so many occasions, I find it difficult to agree that we should now have an emergency debate. While the Chair fully recognizes the importance of the question, I do not think I am at liberty to agree that an adjournment at this time for the purpose suggested by the hon. member for Waterloo would be warranted.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

POLLUTION

CHEDABUCTO BAY—ACTION TO PREVENT CONTAMINATION FROM GROUNDED TANKER

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): In the absence of the Minister of Transport I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. What steps are being taken to prevent major pollution in Chedabucto Bay, Nova Scotia, as a result of the grounding of the Liberian tanker, the *Arrow*, in that body of water?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a report on this event. As to the steps which are being taken I can say that the Minister of Transport and the officials in his department are looking at the problem. Inspectors of the department are on the scene now, and I am also informed that there is a Fisheries Department vessel in the area as well as another tanker which is on the way to take the oil off.

Mr. Stanfield: Is a foreign tanker such as this Liberian vessel subject to any control or supervision after it enters Canadian territorial waters?

Mr. Trudeau: I am sorry—

Mr. Stanfield: Is a foreign tanker entering Canadian territorial waters such as Chedabucto Bay subject to any controls imposed by the government of Canada?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is referring to legal controls or regulations—

Mr. Stanfield: Regulations.

Mr. Trudeau: If he is, I shall have to refer the question to the Minister of Transport who will be in the House—

Mr. Stanfield: May I request the Prime Minister to interest himself in this matter since there are, I am informed, some 8,000 tons of water on this vessel—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: —of oil on this vessel. Oh, it may be a joke to some hon. members opposite, but 8,000 tons of oil could seriously contaminate the water in this area unless energetic measures are taken.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): May I ask the Prime Minister this question:

who is legally responsible—the owners of the vessel or the charterers?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will recognize, I am sure, that the question as asked is not in order. He is asking the Prime Minister to express a legal opinion.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister or some other appropriate minister whether consideration is being given to setting fire to this ship and its oil as suggested by certain concerned biologists and oceanographers at Dalhousie University?

Mr. Trudeau: I repeat that the minister is very concerned about this problem and that he is working on it now.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Can the right hon. gentleman tell us whether the information he has in front of him indicates a worsening in the amount of leakage as reported in the press earlier today?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker, I have no confirmation of that report.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): May I ask whether regulations concerning liability for pollution damage have been laid down by the government as outlined recently at the Brussels conference?

Mr. Trudeau: This whole question, as the House knows, was brought up at the meeting in Brussels some months ago by the Minister of Transport. Until this date there has been no international agreement as to the way in which these matters should be settled, but Canada's position was made clear at the conference.

Mr. Harding: In view of the minister's statement that Canada was willing to go it alone if no agreement could be reached, are these regulations in the process of preparation by the government?

Mr. Forrestall: Perhaps I might direct my supplementary question to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. Can he shed any light on the question just asked as to liability in the event of oil spillage for removing the cargo from the ship?

Mr. Speaker: I have some reservations about the acceptability of the question. If the hon. member is asking the Minister of Justice to express his view as to liability, I do not think the question is in order.

[Mr. McGrath.]

Mr. Forrestall: Then may I ask the Minister of Justice whether or not this matter is under consideration by his department?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Yes, sir.

IMMIGRATION

DEPORTATION OF DESERTERS FROM U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration arising out of a matter of which I have given him notice. The question concerns three young United States deserters who were admitted to Canada legally but who were deported to the United States by officers of the department or by RCMP officers without either hearing or authority. Can the minister inform the House whether he has instituted an inquiry into this incident and whether he has received any report concerning it?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I thank the hon. member for giving me notice by letter today of his interest in this matter. Following receipt of the letter I asked for a report from the field. Before I came into the House today I again asked, but the report has not yet come forth. As soon as it does come forth I will be happy to report to the hon. member and the House.

Mr. Lewis: A short supplementary question. This matter is of such importance that I am constrained to ask the minister whether he will undertake, when he receives the report, to report not only to the hon. member but to the House?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Can he tell the House whether the government agrees with the President of the United States who said assistance will have to be given to Israel should the arms situation favour the Arab world?

[*English*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS TO RED CHINA RESPECTING ATTITUDE TOWARD VIET NAM WAR

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the recent diatribe in Red China in favour of North Viet Nam continuing the war at all costs, will the government, through its officials in Stockholm, intercede with Red China to modify its inflammatory attitude and thus assist in a peaceful settlement in this troubled area?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I hope this means that the official opposition is supporting our efforts to try to bring about diplomatic relations with Peking so as to make such representations possible.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Lest the minister run away with any idea that I support his position, may I say that I strongly oppose recognition. I ask the minister whether he has caught up with Mao's representatives in order to present on bended knee Canada's desire to recognize that country?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have some doubt about the form of the question asked. Perhaps I might forget the form and give the minister an opportunity to reply to the substance of the question asked.

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, it is quite clear from the question that the opposition is divided on the matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp: May I suggest to the right hon. gentleman that he catch up with public opinion and with his own party.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether the answer he has given is in accordance with the lead taken by the Prime Minister the other day in indicating that on occasion he answers questions jocularly and means the House to understand them as serious.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I recognize that when a minister of the government is asked a question he is not obliged to answer. However, I suggest to the minister and to the Prime Minister that a minister is not entitled to answer a different question. If a minister is not prepared to answer the question put to him, he needs only to indicate that he will not answer it, instead of making remarks or a speech on a different matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is a very interesting proposition. Perhaps the Chair should not be asked to rule on the validity of the procedural aspects of the point of order.

SCIENCE SERVICES

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON POLICY

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister when we can expect a statement dealing with priorities, etc., as laid down in a good science policy for Canada?

MANPOWER

EFFECTIVE USE OF SCIENTISTS IN DEVELOPING POLICIES

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): As the Prime Minister does not care to answer, I will direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration that is more serious and is brought about by the fact that the unemployment rate is rising rapidly. In Newfoundland I understand it is now up to 20 per cent. Is it the intention of his department to step up its programs by making more effective use of scientists in order to accentuate more effective manpower policies?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question of the hon. member is, of course, a very good one. It appears to me that he has invited the minister to make a statement of a very general nature which should perhaps be made on motions. The minister might like to reply to the question along those lines.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the question is so general that I can answer the hon. member very briefly by saying yes.

[*Later:*]

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

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member for South Western Nova rising on a point of order?

Mr. Comeau: Yes. The minister can say yes all he wants but the fact is that the President of the Canadian Association of Physicists has

said he was very disappointed that he was not able to get co-operation from this department.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I submit that is not a point of order but rather a point of debate.

SUMMER EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister is giving consideration to making a statement that will specifically indicate to the House what his department is doing about summer employment for university students?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, to clear up any misunderstanding about the former answer, I answered yes to the question itself, not to the request that I make a statement. In reply to my hon. friend from Dartmouth-Halifax East, I will be making a further statement in respect of the plans for summer employment in the near future.

Mr. John M. Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. When may we expect a statement on motions in respect of summer employment for students?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I made a statement just a few days ago in respect of the results of the program last summer. The results have been very encouraging. I hope to continue these plans for next summer and when there are additional elements to the program I will announce them to the House. I have no definite timetable at the moment for a statement to the House on this subject.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report of the department on last year's summer employment of students indicates that a very substantial percentage of students worked only about half of the summer and therefore their efforts to obtain enough money to go back to school were very seriously affected, I wonder whether the minister would look into that aspect of the problem?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes. I think my hon. friend has put his finger on a point which emerged from the survey. If there is an improvement to be made it is in the length of employment for a certain percentage of the students. We hope to promote this aspect of the employment situation next summer.

[Mr. Comeau.]

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he has any estimate as to the number of students who will be seeking employment this summer?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to give an exact figure, but I think about 500,000 would be the estimate we are working on at the moment.

HOUSING

ALLEGED FIVE-YEAR AGREEMENT WITH QUEBEC RESPECTING NHA FUNDS

Mr. Barney Danson (York North): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister responsible for housing. Will the minister offer Ontario the same five-year agreement in respect of NHA funds that Ontario's Minister of Trade and Development publicly declared has been given to Quebec?

Mr. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the premise is inaccurate. The master agreements with the province of Quebec are for one year, not five years. There have been two agreements, one for 1968-69 and one for 1969-70. These covered only certain specific programs, not all NHA projects, and still required individual project approval by CMHC. Ontario chose to operate on a somewhat less formal exchange of letters although the other arrangement was available to Ontario as it is to all provinces. I am rather surprised at the inaccuracy because I conveyed this information to the Chairman of the Ontario Housing Corporation just a few days before Mr. Randall made his statement to the—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Is the minister responsible for housing in a position to tell us whether it is true that the province of Quebec has turned down the $25 million offered by Ottawa for urban renewal in Montreal?

[*English*]

Mr. Andras: No such information has been conveyed to me, Mr. Speaker.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

REQUEST FOR INCLUSION OF ALL SASKATCHEWAN AS DESIGNATED AREA

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister

of Regional Economic Expansion. In view of the fact that Saskatchewan is facing a deepening financial crisis, is the minister now prepared to consider the inclusion of the entire province as a special designated area under the Regional Development Incentives Act?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would not think that the question is in order. We have had similar questions in the past and I have suggested to hon. members that if questions are asked along similar lines about the different parts of Canada we would perhaps spend an inordinate proportion of the question period on such questions and answers.

Mr. Nystrom: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this question has been asked a number of times and there is a real emergency at this time. I think the minister wants to answer the question.

Mr. McGrath: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on the point of order?

Mr. McGrath: Yes. In order to facilitate Your Honour on this matter, perhaps it would expedite things if the minister would designate the whole country.

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—MEASURES TO LOWER INTEREST RATES

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Could he tell the House whether he intends to adopt measures to reduce interest rates, which are one of the main causes of the rise in the cost of living, in order to halt the recession which is increasing daily?

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister might reply to the hon. member's question by a general statement on motions.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POLICY RESPECTING DELEGATIONS TO MAURITANIA AND NIGER

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Can he tell us whether a formula has been found for agreement about the membership of the Canadian delegation to the coming conferences in Mauritania and Niger?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not think there will be any difficulty about the conference in Mauritania. The principles that were followed in the past for attendance at educational ministers' conferences are well established and will be followed. There is some disagreement about the constitutional conference at Niamey. There the discussions are continuing. I have hopes a solution acceptable to all will be found.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Will the Canadian delegation have two co-chairmen, as was the case for the Niamey conference?

[*English*]

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, the important issue here is the signing of the international agreement. I think hon. members will agree that international agreements can be signed only by sovereign countries.

LABOUR RELATIONS

ASSURANCE FROM LONGSHOREMEN'S UNION RESPECTING MOVEMENT OF GRAIN THROUGH B.C. PORTS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Labour whether he has had any assurances from the Longshoremen's Union that they will keep the ports open in western Canada in view of the fact that British Columbia and the prairies could be seriously affected?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Is the hon. member referring specifically to wheat?

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, particularly to grain.

Mr. Mackasey: The hon. member knows that, to the union's credit, in the 39 days they were on active strike they moved the grain, and there has been as of this morning absolutely no change in that plan. However, should the union strike on Monday I have no assurance whether or not they will move some commodities and not others. I think I made clear in my statement that the public interest is becoming paramount. I am not unaware of the importance of grain in the over-all scheme of things in western Canada.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, is the minister or the government giving consideration, in view of what he has just said, to any legislation in this regard?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, important as grain is, I have had very strong representations from certain premiers telling me just how important potash is and others telling me how important lumber is and so on. Therefore it would be very hard and unfair to single out one particular commodity. I did do this for 39 days. I think the obvious and logical solution is to bring the strike to an end so that all commodities will be treated with equality in the future.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Labour. Do we have the minister's assurance that if there is a tie-up over the weekend whatever action is necessary will be taken to see that these ports remain open and serve the country?

Mr. Mackasey: I think the hon. gentleman can refer to no better authority in *Hansard* tomorrow than the gentleman who spoke on behalf of his party about what should be considered as a very sound philosophy for a democratic country.

AGRICULTURE

POSSIBLE MORATORIUM ON DEBTS TO FARM MACHINERY MANUFACTURERS

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In his discussions with the farm machinery manufacturing companies was the question of a possible moratorium on debts outstanding to those companies considered in light of the difficult financial position of the farmers of western Canada?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the discussions I had with the heads of the farm machinery companies earlier this week centred around the findings and recommendations of the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery. That particular point was not dealt with in the report.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent findings of the Barber commission on farm machinery, would the minister now consider the point I have raised and discuss it at the time of future meetings with the farm machinery manufacturing companies?

Mr. Olson: I suppose we could discuss it and it would be very easy to give an undertaking that we would consider it, but I think the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, who is responsible in certain other areas respecting a number of federal acts, would be the appropriate minister to consult in connection with the question of a moratorium on debts or anything of that nature.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question may I ask the minister to advise us if he and the government have rejected out of hand the proposal made by the National Farmers Union and Mr. Goldenberg in respect of amendments to the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act?

Mr. Olson: I have not, Mr. Speaker, but I gave the hon. member an adequate reply to that question some time ago. Although it may be one with which he does not agree, that does not mean it is wrong.

FURTHER REPORT BY BARBER COMMISSION

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Agriculture tell us whether we can expect a further report from the Barber commission on farm machinery prices and whether he is able to confirm that the report will indicate that the farmers of this country have been overcharged on combines as well as tractors by North American manufacturers?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): In reply to the first part of the question, the commission has indicated to me there will be a further report dealing with costs and arrangements in respect of services, repair parts and that sort of thing. This will be available to us within a very few days. I cannot answer the other part of the question because that would require anticipating what would be in the report and I certainly do not know what will be in the report.

IMPLEMENTATION OF BARBER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that the machinery companies have indicated they will not reduce prices in Canada, what steps is the government taking to carry out the recommendations of the Barber commission report in case this situation develops?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Both the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and I have already indicated certain

other action we are taking currently while the discussions with the farm machinery companies are going on.

Mr. Howe: Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago when I directed a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs he indicated his officials were meeting with officials of the United States and Great Britain in connection with the fact that machinery dealers in Great Britain were told they might lose their franchises if they sold machinery to Canadian farmers. What position has been taken by the officials of these countries with regard to this matter?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): The intention was to inform the officials of these countries of the nature of the situation. That having been done, the matter is being followed up by officials of other countries to see what they can do to alleviate the situation in Canada.

INDUSTRY

MASSEY-FERGUSON LAY-OFFS—TRANSFER OF WORK TO OTHER COUNTRIES

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the international nature of the Massey-Ferguson Company and in view of the Barber commission findings on the allocation of markets, is the minister conducting an investigation into the operations of the Massey-Ferguson Company in light of the extensive lay-offs affecting 2,400 workers in Canada in order to find out whether this work has been transferred to other countries?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not know of such an inquiry but I was assured this morning that it is unlikely there will be further lay-offs in the foreseeable future.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

AGENDA FOR NEXT CONFERENCE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he is in a position to announce the agenda for the forthcoming federal-provincial conference.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not recollect whether there was agreement between the provinces and the federal government to announce the agenda at any specific date. It is an in camera conference. This has been agreed to. I think I would have to wait until the conference begins to seek agreement from the premiers on whether or not we should release the subject matter of the discussions.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. My recollection may be at fault but I understood from a previous answer that the Prime Minister would inquire of the provincial premiers whether or not the agenda would be released. My supplementary question is whether the government of Canada proposes to make any arrangements for observers from the opposition parties to attend the conference.

Mr. Trudeau: On the first part of the question Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's recollection is correct. But I recall that at the time I referred to correspondence I was having with the premiers concerning the whole question of whether the conference would be in camera and the question of the agenda itself. Now that the decision has been taken to have the conference in camera I cannot recall whether there has been agreement on the part of all parties to release the agenda. The federal government certainly has no objection to that. I will inquire whether there is any objection on the part of anyone and if not I will gladly tell the hon. member in the House what the agenda is. It is a very simple one. What was the second part of the question?

Mr. Stanfield: Whether any arrangements were being made for observers.

Mr. Trudeau: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no. The decision has been taken to have the conference in camera. It will involve only governmental representatives of the provinces and the federal government.

HOUSING

CONSIDERATION OF INTEREST-FREE LOANS OR DIRECT GRANTS FOR REHABILITATION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. The other day the minister referred to his hope that loans under section 40 of the Housing Act would be made available for rehabilitation of homes of persons on low incomes. In view of the fact that these loans carry high interest rates and are therefore inaccessible to people of low income, has the government given consideration to interest-free loans or direct grants for these purposes

and would the minister make a statement on this some time in the future?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, as with many other things we are giving careful consideration to this matter, but I do not think I can undertake to make a statement in the foreseeable future.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ISRAELI-ARAB CONFLICT—STATUS OF FOUR-POWER FORMULA FOR SETTLEMENT

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs of which I have given him notice because of the seriousness of the situation. Will the minister advise the present status of the so-called four-power formula for settlement of the Middle East conflict?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for having given me notice of this question. Perhaps I might be permitted to say that there are three things that might be helpful at the present time in the current dangerous situation in the Middle East. The first is a strict observance of the ceasefire arrangements on all sides. The second is that the countries supplying arms should refrain from another sterile and dangerous round of arms supplies and, third, I would hope there would be another attempt by the four powers to help Ambassador Jarring resume his efforts for a peace.

Mr. Fairweather: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does Canada support the proposal current now in Britain that Europe's middle powers should step into the Middle East crisis with an effective guarantee of the territorial integrity of the countries in the Middle East, provided that such powers acted under the United Nations and in support of Ambassador Jarring's mission?

Mr. Sharp: Well, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the Security Council that Ambassador Jarring is trying to promote does provide for secure and recognized boundaries. The question of how they can be best guaranteed is a matter for negotiation, I think.

[*Translation*]

TRADE

EFFECT OF IMPORTS ON CANADIAN KNITTING INDUSTRY

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

[Mr. Brewin.]

Since representatives of the Canadian Association of Chemical Producers and of the International Garment Workers Union have said that the continuing increase of knitwear imports threatens both employment and production in Canada, what measures is he considering to deal with the situation and to protect the jobs of Canadian workers?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The matter is now before the antidumping court, Mr. Speaker. It would not be proper if I made comments on it at this time.

Regarding the total problem of textile products, I can only assure the hon. member that the government is making strong and constant efforts to develop a better policy than the present one with regard to the textile industry.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

LACK OF PROTECTION UNDER IMMIGRATION LAWS FOR CANADIAN ARTISTS AND WRITERS

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the recent brief to the minister from ACTRA concerning the lack of employment protection accorded Canadian artists and writers by our immigration laws, is the minister considering proposing amendments to our laws to provide greater security for Canadian creative people?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the brief to which my hon. friend refers was prepared by ACTRA at my request following a meeting we had to outline the nature of the problem, and there is a problem. At present there are discussions going on between Canada and the United States in an effort to solve the matter in that way. If these discussions fail I believe we will have to consider some alternatives.

Mr. Rose: A supplementary question. In view of these discussions and their possible failure, will the minister confer with his colleague the Secretary of State so that the implications of this problem may be examined in great detail?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is making a suggestion or representation which we assume has been noted by the minister.

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

MONTREAL—EFFECT OF PARTIAL STRIKE OF DELIVERY EMPLOYEES

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications.

Could he inform the House on the actual mail delivery situation in Montreal due to the revolving strike of people employed in this service and what action his department intends to take to ensure adequate service to the population should a general strike occur?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, I was informed that all truck drivers had reported for work this morning as usual. Of course, the Post Office and Communications Department is taking all necessary steps to ensure a normal service to Montrealers.

Mr. Valade: Can the minister state whether his department has taken action to see to it that employees fired by these firms are reinstated, especially by the Department of Manpower and Immigration?

Mr. Kierans: Reinstated where?

[*Later:*]

MONTREAL—JOBS FOR DISPLACED EMPLOYEES

Mr. Valade: I wish to put my question again to the minister, who seemed prepared to answer it but apparently did not understand it well.

Can he tell us what action he is taking with his colleagues to assure other jobs to those workers who will be displaced in the mail delivery service?

Mr. Kierans: Mr. Speaker, I met with officials of the C.N.T.U. Friday night, and I have advised them that they should contact my colleagues the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) or the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. MacEachen). In addition, the Montreal postmaster has discussed with the new contractors the possibility of hiring the drivers who are doing the work at the present time.

Mr. Valade: Can the Minister of Manpower and Immigration tell us if the officials of the C.N.T.U. have contacted him, and what action his department intends to take to assure jobs to laid off workers?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I would have to check with the regional directorate in Montreal to determine whether that contact has been made, and I will report tomorrow to my hon. friend.

RURAL CLOSURES—CONSULTATION WITH MUNICIPAL COUNCILS

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Postmaster General. In view of the number of rural post offices being closed, does the Post Office Department consult with municipal councils before post offices are closed in their areas?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): We make a survey, Mr. Speaker, in each area.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF QUEBEC BILL 62

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question to the Prime Minister.

Can he inform the House whether he has received any requests urging him to give his opinion as to whether Bill 62 recently passed by the Quebec National Assembly is constitutional or not?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I did not receive any such requests, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

POLLUTION

ABATEMENT PROGRAMS FOR FEDERAL PROPERTIES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Is the government giving any consideration to allocating X millions of dollars to pollution abatement programs in federally responsible properties?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the question. Would the hon. member mind repeating it?

Mr. Skoberg: Is the government giving any consideration to allocating X millions of

dollars to begin pollution abatement programs in federally responsible properties across the country?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is a little general. Perhaps he might want to put it on the Order Paper.

Mr. Skoberg: If I may rephrase it, Mr. Speaker, has the government given any directives to federal agencies across the country as to a federal pollution abatement program?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, general directives have been given and this program is under immediate surveillance. I notice that in the United States the President has announced a program exactly on these lines and has stipulated an exact amount, but here we have not stipulated an exact amount.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs but he has gone, no doubt to attend to important business.

FISHERIES

SEALS—DECISION ON REQUEST FOR COMPROMISE IN DATES OF HUNT

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries who is now coming into the House. Could the Parliamentary Secretary indicate the position of the Department of Fisheries with respect to the request they have received from the seal fishermen on the east coast of Newfoundland asking for a compromise in the early and late dates of the opening of the seal fishery?

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe any decision has been made and I do not know whether it will be changed at all.

Mr. Lundrigan: Would the Parliamentary Secretary or the minister indicate to the House tomorrow the decision they have taken on this request which was received today from the seal fishermen of the east coast?

Mr. Whelan: I will ask the minister to consider this, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

FINANCE

INCREASE BY BANKS IN INTEREST RATE ON LOANS TO FARMERS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance this question could be directed to the minister who is acting for him today. It is matter of extreme importance to farmers who have borrowed money to buy machinery under the farm loan and farm improvement plans, under which the interest rate is 5 per cent. Would the minister communicate with the chartered banks and point out the injustice that is being done today by those banks in that as soon as a farmer finds himself unable to pay any portion of the principal, even when the interest is paid to date, the interest rate is increased from the level of 5 per cent to 10 per cent or 11 per cent?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I will bring that question to the attention of the Minister of Finance.

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

CLOSING OF BRANCHES—REQUEST FOR APPEAL BOARD

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Postmaster General and Minister of Communications? Could he tell the House whether he is planning at present to promote the setting-up of an appeals committee within his department in order to give the municipalities deprived of a post office following a unilateral decision by the minister the opportunity to put forward their arguments and thus to give the population a voice within the department?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): No, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

LIFTING OF FREEZE ON LETTER CARRIER DELIVERY

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have been neglecting the Postmaster General for some time, so I should like to ask him a question today, too. Would he please tell me and the House when he is going to lift the freeze on the extension of letter carrier delivery services across Canada in communities which are entitled to have them?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Postmaster General and Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, over recent weeks I have been getting lonesome for the hon. member for Hillsborough, and I was going to ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition to bring him back. Today hon. members are making up for his absence. I think that question should more properly be addressed to my colleague the President of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Stanfield: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Hillsborough is trying to make up for the deficiencies of the Secretary of State for External Affairs in working out some of the problems in the Middle East.

AGRICULTURE

PROGRAM OF WHEAT ACREAGE REDUCTION INCENTIVES

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the cash shortage affecting grain farmers and the fact that seeding will begin in the prairies in about two months, is the minister planning soon to introduce a program of wheat acreage reduction incentives?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Wheat Board, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt, has made comments on this both in the House and outside the House in the last few days.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to set out the business of the House for the coming week, if I may.

The business for today will be as announced previously, order No. 25, Bill C-138, with regard to the Cape Breton Development Corporation; order No. 7, Bill C-5, with respect to Criminal Records and the third item, order No. 29, Bill C-152, with respect to the National Parks Act.

Tomorrow, the first item will be order No. 46, Bill C-161, with respect to the Dominion Coal Board, followed by order No. 40, Bill C-158, with respect to Nuclear Liability.

On Monday, we will take order No. 23, the report stage of Bill C-136, the Expropriation Act, to be followed on Tuesday by order No. 61, Bill C-179, respecting investment companies; on Wednesday, order No. 49, Bill S-5, with regard to the Oil and Gas Production and Conservation Act.

Thursday of next week will be an opposition day under the auspices of the New Democratic Party, I understand.

• (3:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT

GUARANTEE OF REPAYMENT OF MONEYS BORROWED BY COMPANIES AND PERSONS

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion) moved that Bill C-138, to amend the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this small bill is very simple. It is to bring the powers of the Cape Breton Development Corporation into line with those that Parliament has given to my department.

The corporation was established in 1967 with the power to make grants and loans to enterprises that can contribute substantially to the industrial development of Cape Breton.

In setting up my department, Parliament created the same powers to assist industrial development in other areas that are designated, in consultation with the provinces, as special areas. But there is an additional power. Besides giving grants or making loans direct from government, the departmental legislation also gives authority to guarantee loans from normal commercial sources.

This may be an important means of improving the availability of credit to enterprises in the special areas. A government guarantee may enable an enterprise in a special area to borrow at a reasonable rate of interest in circumstances where it would not otherwise be able to find a bank or investment company willing to lend.

It would be possible, of course, for my department to provide guarantees to enterprises in Cape Breton, by making it a special area. But that would be rather a complicated duplication. The Cape Breton Development Corporation already possesses all of the other powers that my department has to assist industrial development in special areas. It is therefore, better that in Cape Breton the corporation should have all of the powers

that can be used to assist industrial development, rather than divide the responsibility between the corporation and the department.

[*Translation*]

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this Bill would grant the Corporation the right to guarantee loans up to $100 million. The Corporation will have this means of action to fall back on when a guarantee appears to be the right way to help any industry wishing to settle or expand in Cape Breton.

I must point out that we are dealing with only one aspect of the work done by the Cape Breton Development Corporation. This amendment does not in any way change the function of the Corporation with regard to coal-mining operations on the island. The amendment to the present act deals only with the Corporation's activities for the development of industries other than coal mining.

For this reason, the bill is brief, simple and, in my view, not controversial. It is important, however, because it will round out the powers of the Corporation which will then have all the means required to promote industrial development.

[*English*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) how fortunate he is, and possibly how fortunate the people of Cape Breton are, that Mr. R. B. Cameron has made himself available to take over as chairman of Devco. It is hoped that Mr. Cameron, whose ability has been so well demonstrated by developing the Sydney steel operation into what it is today, will be able to do the same thing with the Devco Corporation.

The minister explained that this is a simple bill in that it adds to the powers of Devco and their ability to aid in the financing. He referred also to the fact that since Devco already have these powers there will be no need for his department to divide these powers in this area.

I want to start out, Mr. Speaker, by asking that every member present in the House relay to each and every one of his colleagues what I am saying to the minister. The president of Devco has accused the members of Parliament of passing legislation which violates existing agreements and contracts, despite the fact that following the passage of this legislation the minister himself indicated in this House that all existing contracts and agreements would be honoured. And Mr. Ord, the president of Devco, in addition to breaking the minister's word and placing the blame on Parliament where it does not belong, has written a letter which the president of Dosco co-signed guaranteeing no change in working conditions as a result of the take-over.

I have made many complaints here, Mr. Speaker. I though I might catch the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) before he left the House to indicate to him that my complaint about the Unemployment Insurance Commission fund is not a complaint about the operation of the unemployment insurance office. I have made that quite clear but, unfortunately, the minister has twisted this around to say it is quite all right for an employer to subsidize the unemployment fund of any employee working for him. I ask hon. members to consider this: Who is subsidizing whom when you consider that an employee with a family allowance of $3,000 a year is forced to retire, can collect $2,756 from the Unemployment Insurance Commission and receive from Devco, the Crown corporation, the difference between that amount and $3,000. Why, Mr. Speaker, some men are receiving less than $10 a month from Devco, whereas they were promised they would receive $3,000. I am sure that no UIC manager in any district would agree that the way UIC funds are being used in this regard is proper.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to stop the hon. member talking about Devco, but we are now talking about a very limited amendment which would give authority to raise guaranteed loans from $20 million to $100 million. That is all this bill does. The House will have an opportunity to discuss Devco, and problems relating to Devco, when the Devco estimates are before the House. Personally, I intend to answer only questions which are related to the amendment. I ask, Mr. Speaker, should this debate be related to the activities of Devco?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The point is well taken. I was about to ask the hon. member to restrict his remarks to the bill.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I could speak all day on that point of order or a question of privilege because, in his opening remarks, the minister said that the purpose of this amendment was to increase the powers of Devco. My submission is this: Mr. Ord and Mr. Blackmore should not be given further powers but should be immediately dismissed for their lying approach to this matter. I will

again refer to what the attitude has been. Our miners in Cape Breton have been told, "If you have a complaint, sue us." That is the government's challenge. This is what I say to Messrs. Ord and Blackmore and I will be only too happy to repeat it to members of the press who hold a microphone up to my face or who have a notebook ready to take down notes. Messrs. Ord and Blackmore approached this matter with lies because the miners of Cape Breton were told with respect to what was done, "This is the law of the land." That is not so.

I had checked with the principal law officers of the Crown—these remarks are recorded in *Hansard*—and what was done was not according to the law of the land. What else did these men say? They said that 77 per cent of the men had accepted this program voluntarily. That is not so, and no one knows this better than the minister. I was in his office, along with the executive of the UMW and the executives of 26 locals, and the minister was told in front of those union executives that the suggestion that 77 per cent of the people involved had accepted the program voluntarily was a lot of nonsense. No doubt the minister can recall that. Therefore, Messrs. Ord and Blackmore were inaccurate when they said that 77 per cent of the men had accepted the program voluntarily. The program was perpetrated on many of the miners who have been forced to accept it under duress.

I maintain that what was done violated legislation that was passed in the House of Commons, and I ask hon. members on the government side to remember that we are accused of voting against labour. I ask any hon. member, including the minister, to stand up and show me where there is anything in Bill C-135 that could be construed by Messrs. Ord and Blackmore as supporting the contract violation. It seems to me that Messrs. Ord and Blackmore brought in a bylaw that violated existing contracts and agreements.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether the hon. member is still speaking on the point of order?

Mr. MacInnis: That shows you, does it not, that the minister does not know where he is, what he is doing or what he is here for. And this has been the situation since the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act was passed. Parliament passed the bill, and then the corporation passed the bylaw which it said was the law of the land. I submit that was not correct, because it was not the law of the land.

Let us look at what the approach was at the meetings of the committee on regional development. Is it any wonder that the former chairman packed up and left? He had been adding a good deal to the confusion himself. The chairman of Devco said on November 26, 1968, as recorded in the minutes of the committee which the minister can examine, that the immediate background of Devco comes from the Donald report on coal that was made in May, 1969. Two days later, the same chairman said before the same committee, "Well, the fact is that the Devco approach is based on the Cape Breton Development Act; it is not based on the Donald report." So, here we have the chairman completely contradicting his own approach to the matter within two days.

Then, there is a record of the minister's answers. How did the minister accept this? I say that the delegation made up of the executive of members of the UMW—

An hon. Member: What is the UMW?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): That is a good one. The Liberals do not know what is going on; they do not know what the UMW is.

Mr. MacInnis: I will excuse that. After all, the government only spent $20 million in the Port Hawkesbury area and on Devco. When I first asked the present Prime Minister a question about Devco, he wanted to know who Devco was. This was after the government had spent $20 million on the idea. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) tried to jump in and bluff an answer, but he was not the right minister. Then, the Prime Minister turned to the Solicitor General, (Mr. McIlraith) only to find out that he was the wrong minister. So, there we had three ministers, not one of them knowing who had authorized the spending of $20 million, and all the time the minister responsible was sitting alongside the Prime Minister with a smirk on his face. When a Liberal member asks, "what is the UMW", that is quite all right with me. Let them ask all the questions of that type they want, because it only proves to the miners and unions of Cape Breton that the Liberal party does not give a damn about the situation it has allowed to develop.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacInnis: Again I say, although you may accuse us of voting against labour you, yourself, stand convicted by the actions of the president of Devco.

• (3:20 p.m.)

An hon. Member: May I ask a question? How old is he?

Mr. MacInnis: I think he is about your age.

Mr. Smerchanski: And how old are you?

Mr. MacInnis: I have tried to indicate to the minister where the corporation has gone wrong, and what has been going on down there. I have referred to the approach Messrs. Blackmore and Ord have taken to the matter and, yes, that they have been lying to the public of Cape Breton. Why do I say that? How can I back that up? I can do that very simply. I am sure the minister can hear me. I am going to use him to support my charge that Mr. Blackmore has lied in this instance. I have made complaints in this House. I have asked the government to investigate the hiring policy of Devco as there are now men coming from outside Canada to work for this company.

Mr. Blackmore has interpreted the mining regulations of Nova Scotia to mean that it is necessary to have a man with a college degree to be a mine manager. He is entirely wrong. The best of our managers are those who came up through the ranks. Mr. Blackmore says we need professional men because it is sophisticated equipment that is going to be used in the coal mines. Let me put on record that there has never been a mine manager who has used sophisticated equipment or any other kind of equipment. No matter what equipment is to be used, it will be the miner who will use it. If he needs instructions or a demonstration, this will be provided by the supplier of that equipment. There has never been a manager in the Cape Breton coal mines who knew the equipment better than the man who was handling it. The approach of Mr. Blackmore is an underhanded method of putting in a bunch of outsiders as managers or senior officials of this corporation, thereby displacing qualified Cape Bretoners. That statement applies not only to Nova Scotians but to all Canadians because these people I have referred to came from outside Canada.

I complimented the government on the fact they made a choice of a chairman and did not have to go outside of Nova Scotia. This was the choice they should have made originally. This mess was developed by the former chairman, Mr. Fullerton, who I understand finally turned his back on it. Hon. members know who informed me that the government asked him to resign. I could not swallow that, despite the fact I received the information from a Liberal member of Parliament. I said I could not accept that fact because if he was asked to resign, then why would he be placed in charge of the National Capital Commission in the city of Ottawa where he could get himself all fouled up the same as he did in Cape Breton? Members of Parliament from the Ottawa area would be well advised to examine very closely what side of the argument they take, because I was severely criticized for taking the side of the argument they seem to be inclined to adopt.

Hon. members should take a close look at Mr. Fullerton because he turned out to be the wrong choice. He is the gentleman who told the committee that the immediate background of Devco came from the Donald report, and two days later said it was not based on the Donald report. This gentleman also made a statement that the minister came very close to repeating the other day. I refer to the statement the minister made following the representations by my colleague, the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir), on behalf of the CBRT team which had made complaints and the government was being asked to make certain investigations in respect of their claims.

The minister at that time said this was a group of superannuated employees who did not have any representation in the union. He practically said the union was not doing anything on their behalf. How wrong can be he? The CBRT is a bigger union than UMW District 26 is. The minister sloughed them off as some superannuated employees, not realizing that the objections were coming directly from people involved and working for Devco. The minister's statement came very close to the statement made by the chairman of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, this same Mr. Fullerton, who said:

> In terms of ability to apply pressure, however, the pensioners tend to be a dispersed force.

In other words, Mr. Fullerton, at that time the chairman of Devco practically said, forget about the pensioners; they are a dispersed force. This is very close to the answer the minister gave to the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys when he referred to the CBRT as a bunch of superannuated employees, an insignificant lot.

The minister is aware that many protests have been made. I have protested on many occasions. What gripes me most is the use of the unemployment insurance fund and the arrangement that is talked about. I wish to

emphasize that is not a proper use of the unemployment insurance fund. I am sure any regional manager in the unemployment insurance offices would tell the miners that it is not a proper use of the fund. The minister keeps twisting it. The minister can say what he wants about the pressure I am trying to bring to bear on the Commissioner of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, but I want to make it quite clear that the UIC did not have a choice in this case.

These men are unemployed and therefore they are receiving their benefits. The legislation provided that a married man with dependants could collect $3,000 and a single man $2,400, yet $2,750 of this amount can be collected from the UIC. The miner who was forced to retire is eligible to collect, and the government says this is quite all right. How ridiculous can they get in their approach?

Devco have now notified the retired miners, those voluntarily retired as well as those forcibly retired, that they should make application for seasonal benefits. What is a retired miner to gain from that? It only means that he ties himself to the UIC office. If he is not collecting UIC benefits, then Devco is fully responsible for the $3,000 or $2,400, whatever the case may be. Devco is now instructing these men to collect the seasonal benefits. Devco is telling these miners that they should keep trotting back and forth to make themselves available at the UIC office.

I said to the head of Devco and, I now say to the minister, that this should not be called a pension. It is not a pension. It is a pre-retirement leave plan which is no longer available once the man qualifies for old age security. He then falls back on the original $75 which used to be the Devco gratuity. The minister is still worried about his point of order.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Let me hear a little bit about the amendment.

Mr. MacInnis: You left the door wide open, but then again you don't know what you are doing anyhow in this case. I intend to take full advantage of it. I say the minister does not know what he is doing. If he does know, then he is taking a very careless approach to the attitude developed in Cape Breton by Mr. Blackmore. While the minister was out behind the curtain I was going to call on him to support the lies Mr. Blackmore has used. I am using this word very liberally, but I am prepared to go on a public platform outside this House, make these charges and make them stick. The minister himself is going to make them stick because I have complained about the hiring practices of these people who came from overseas. I was thinking of the British Isles when I used the term "overseas". I did not want to say England because there might have been a Scotsman or Welshman. I could refer to these people as outsiders. The minister could check to see where these people came from. The minister referred to them as foreigners.

When I asked the minister a question in this House, he referred to a report given to him by the Devco people. Who in Devco is responsible for the coal division? Mr. Blackmore is. Any advice the minister has imparted to this House has necessarily come from Mr. Blackmore, the president of the coal division. The minister indicated to me the information he had. In fact, he showed me the information. I told him at that time he was still wrong and that his advisers were lying to him. The minister knows very well that I can substantiate that statement because he has put the proof in writing for me.

Why are these men permitted to get away with this? I have warned of the purchasing policies that Devco is following, but these warnings have been sloughed off. They say the representations of the member do not mean a thing, we will wait for the reports from the union. The unions have already made those representations that the purchasing policies of Devco were creating a safety hazard. I think any number of government departments could get themselves involved in this question. Does Devco have a purchasing agent who goes overseas to make these purchases, or do the suppliers send representatives here to make their sales pitch? What are the arrangements and who makes the profit on these purchases? It would be enlightening to look into this. I recall that previously, under Dosco, some very interesting things came to light with respect to supplies arriving from the old country.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The local unions have protested the purchasing policies of Devco on the ground, as I say, that they were creating a safety hazard. At the time, they were talking about a replacement of mine safety lamps. Here, again, is an indication of the high-handed methods of Mr. Blackmore. In this case Mr. Blackmore authorized the changing of these lamps without the approval of the Nova Scotia mines inspection department. Mr.

Blackmore has adopted a high-handed attitude, running roughshod over the miners and the people of Cape Breton. He is even disregarding the regulations laid down by the department of mines. I make these complaints, but because the minister does not read his mail, because the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) does not read his mail and because other responsible ministers do not read their mail, hon. gentlemen opposite are unaware that protests have also been made by the unions. These protests have been completely ignored. No doubt, my hon. friend from Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir) will refer to the minister's attempt to slough off union representations in the House the other day. I say these people have shown a callous, calculated, underhanded approach to the situation in Cape Breton.

The minister must know something of the background involved here. The former Secretary of State, who is no longer sitting in this House, was recently running a television program in which controversial subjects were discussed. She invited speakers concerned with different sides of the subject to discuss these matters on the air. I am referring to Miss LaMarsh, a former cabinet colleague of the minister's. She asked whether I would agree to appear on one of those programs and I volunteered to do so. Then, she wanted to know whether there was a miner available to speak directly from a miner's point of view, and one was found. Then, the people in charge of the program got in touch with Devco to arrange for someone to make the Devco position clear. All this can be checked out. Mr. Blackmore was not available. He was in England. There was a very odd suggestion made at the time, one which I do not intend to repeat here. Since then, developments have borne out the reason it was made.

In any case, Miss LaMarsh was not satisfied with the representation which Devco wanted to send along, so I guess further telephone calls and requests were made. Lo and behold, Mr. Blackmore appeared on the scene. He had got back in an awful hurry. In fact, he had not even been in England; he did not want to face a discussion of the situation which had developed in Cape Breton. When he did appear, he made a few faux pas. The Cape Breton retirement plan did not even go into effect until the spring of the year. Yet he told this miner who had been forced to retire: Had we known about this earlier, we could have done something about it. The miner told him right there and then that the situation had in fact been talked over with him in February. Mr. Blackmore lied again. He has continued to sell his lies to this government and they have continued to believe them.

The other day the minister made a statement about pensioners indicating, it seemed, that they did not mean anything. He was wrong there. He must be aware of the fact that the pensioners recently voted in an election in Cape Breton. He must be aware also of the fact that the miners were told, with respect to the vote on their most recent wage agreement and contract, that if the contract was not accepted the former miners would be denied any payments. The vote was carried successfully. The miners today will tell you it was a "sweetheart" vote in the first place; it was brought off just before Christmas when each and every miner has some back time coming. As the miner said on the television program, it was a "sweetheart" contract—the wives wanted this extra money to buy a turkey and a bag of toys.

But in addition to pulling off the contract vote at that particular time, what else did Mr. Blackmore do? He left the impression with the miners of Cape Breton that if they did not approve this contract former miners would receive no benefits. This is another lie. Why does the minister permit this man to come into the country, bring in his buddies to displace qualified workers in the area, and lie to the people and the government and get away with it?

After the vote had been taken, Mr. Blackmore patronizingly said he would bring it to the attention of Mr. Ord so that Mr. Ord could in turn bring it to the attention of the Treasury Board and the miners could receive what was due to them, tied in with the contract. This was the lying approach taken by Mr. Blackmore supported by Mr. Ord himself. These are the men who are running things in Cape Breton, men in charge of arrangements which are supposed to be for the benefit of Cape Bretonners. What have they done in the mining towns affected? The early retirement of 1,300 or more miners has simply had the effect of reducing considerably the money available to the economy of the area. Nothing helpful has been done. What about the alternative work which this legislation was supposed to provide? As I said, this pensions issue was tied directly with the recent vote; the indication was given to the miners of Cape Breton that if they did not approve the contract put before them, former miners would receive no assistance.

I asked the minister to check the legislation as it appears in section 18 of the act:

> The Corporation shall, by by-law, provide for the establishment, management and administration of ... all arrangements for the benefit of persons and dependents of persons formerly employed.

How in the name of Heaven can we, as members of Parliament, permit ourselves to be accused by these men of being anti-labour and stand by while legislation which Parliament has made mandatory is tied in with a contract? The legislation made it mandatory but they sold to the people of Cape Breton the idea that if they did not vote for this contract, former employees on pension would receive nothing. How much are we going to have to take from Blackmore and Ord? Are we going to allow Mr. Ord each and every day to continue leaving the impression that members of Parliament, through legislation passed by this House, have violated existing contracts and agreements? If so, then I declare that this is not the kind of assembly of which I want to be part. Never in my life have I agreed to the kind of hanky-panky that is going on now.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Oddly enough, I wrote a considerable amount of the story and released it to the press, but it never appeared in the press. Why? I will sign my name to it, and I will repeat outside this House my challenge both to Mr. Ord and to Mr. Blackmore. Let them come on a public platform with me in Cape Breton and I will call them what they are. I will point out to them, as I have tried to point out to this government, where they have been going astray, how they have been selling the men the idea that unless they support the contract there will be nothing available for them. The legislation is there in black and white for all to see.

People who do not wish to retire have been forced to retire, and we are told this is the law of the land. They were told they were making a big fuss and that everything was going to be perfect. Then, I reminded the officials that they had not even received the approval required from Treasury Board to make certain legislation valid, and for two or three days there was a great flap. Finally, they pulled in their horns, got the necessary approval and proceeded from there.

But just how did they proceed from there? What has been their approach to the matter? Why should miners in Cape Breton be under duress to vote on their own contract? They feel compassion for former employees, some of whom perhaps are fathers, uncles or older brothers, and are being asked to support a contract, which was not all it was said to be despite the glowing terms in which it was painted by Mr. Blackmore.

I think the minister should take a serious look at this particular situation. I repeat, since they sold the 77 per cent idea, the minister has had representations made to him—he cannot slough this off—by the union executive, by the local union executive and by municipal authorities. Yet, he has taken no action. He does not care.

The minister now says that the powers of Devco will be broadened, and that is fine. I am sure that under the able direction of Mr. Cameron drastic changes will come about, changes that will bring about much improvement. I ask the minister: Why not give Mr. Cameron an assist and make the task of the new chairman as easy as possible? Why not examine the representations that have been forwarded to the minister by Mr. Blackmore so that the minister can see where Mr. Blackmore has not been advising him correctly and he can dismiss Mr. Blackmore? That is not an unreasonable request to make.

If the minister thinks it is an unreasonable request, then I cannot see why. The minister made representations to this House based on information that was passed to him by Mr. Blackmore, supposedly a responsible officer in the coal division. The minister has made these representations to the House, and Mr. Blackmore—I hate to use this expression—has made a fool of him, an absolute fool.

The minister showed me the representations he received and I told him they were lies. The minister knows that I have in my office correspondence supporting the validity of the representations that I made at that particular time. The minister has a choice: Is he going to dismiss Mr. Blackmore from his employment, or is he going to rely upon this man, as head of the coal division, to keep feeding him information that is probably full of holes and false?

I made reference to purchasing policy and the desirability of examining that policy. When things are bought and sold there is always a profit involved. Have Devco appointed their own purchasing agent, and did they send him to England to purchase equipment? They would not send him anywhere else, because to my knowledge no equipment is coming from anywhere else.

I should like to know what is behind this. Let the minister examine the supply system, and also the regulations that are being run-over roughshod by Mr. Blackmore, who is completely ignoring regulations applicable to the province of Nova Scotia where he is operating. I realize there is a divided authority here which I understand has been called upon, for different reasons, during the last few days. But we cannot escape the fact that today Devco is a crown company under the jurisdiction of the federal government, and as such the federal government should take an interest in what these people are doing. I ask: Why were these regulations flaunted? Why was Mr. Blackmore allowed to do the things he has done in Cape Breton? And why does Mr. Ord support them?

I have referred to the fact that the legislation itself was set up in light of the prevailing social and economic problems in coal mining towns in Cape Breton. The legislation has seen fit to deal with the economy of the island of Cape Breton, which is quite acceptable. A few investments have been made at the other end of the island which are laudable. But what about the economic and social problems of the mining towns that are affected? What has been done in these mining towns?

I repeat, the only thing that Devco has done so far is to reduce the money supply available to the economy of these towns. The social problems of these towns have been completely ignored. Devco is of the opinion that it can dictate to the communities of Cape Breton. It long ago left the impression that the only way to save Cape Breton was to try and impose its opinions on the municipalities of the island. Possibly, in the long run that may be the answer; in the meantime Devco need not depend on this approach to tell the people of Cape Breton that Devco is their only salvation. Devco has a responsibility to the mining towns that are affected about which it has done nothing.

The minister is now asking to increase Devco's powers. All that Devco has done, I say again, is to violate existing agreements and to blame members of Parliament for passing legislation, which I claim cannot be substantiated.

Mr. Ord, the chairman of Devco, has also made some weird statements. The purpose of Devco is to promote industrial growth on the island of Cape Breton, and whether or not it has been anywhere near successful, I do not know. As I say, it has supported substantially

[Mr. MacInnis.]

an oil industry in the strait area, and no doubt has pumped quite a bit of money into the economy of that area. But what else has it done?

I am sure the miners in the mining towns of Cape Breton, for whom nothing has been done, will derive quite a bit of comfort from the fact that, through the courtesy of the research department of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, it is now known that 376 cars crossed over the strait of Canso in the second week of July last year. Big deal! We are now told by the research department of the Cape Breton Development Corporation how many cars cross over the strait of Canso during any given week of the year. This is supposed to be a contribution to the economy of Cape Breton. Strangely enough these figures were always available to us through the tourist department.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Let me jump back again to the purchasing policy and the callous approach that these gentlemen have taken. I say "gentlemen" and I really take that back in a hurry. In referring to the approach that these men have taken in respect of Cape Breton, I ask the minister to look at something else. He is worried about the time. Again I say, Mr. Minister, you opened it up.

The minister is fully aware of the fact, and if he is not he should be, that the unions have been complaining about this purchasing policy. The unions have been complaining about the use of UIC funds to substantially meet the cost of the first year of retirement of the miners. He knows they have been complaining about the layoffs. He knows they have been complaining about compulsory layoffs and he knows they have been complaining about broken contracts.

Let me refer to the first appearance of the Devco people before the regional development committee at which time certain facts came to light. In order to clear up any misunderstanding about this, let me repeat that this early retirement leave plan was never a negotiated plan. Mr. Blackmore himself has put that on the record, although he has left an impression otherwise in Cape Breton, and the union leaders have left a different impression. The impression is that this was a negotiated plan. That is not the case. Mr. Blackmore is on record before the regional development committee as having said this was never the case and this was never a negotiated plan. He said there was nothing in the legislation that

compelled them to negotiate. He said it was discussed. He said it was never negotiated but it was discussed among the union members.

There again, this is not true. This is not the case. Mr. Blackmore's own words can substantiate that this is not true. There are seven or eight unions involved. Mr. Blackmore said he only spoke to one union because this union makes up 92 per cent of the working force. That is not an excuse or a reason to exclude the other six or seven unions involved. It certainly does not substantiate Mr. Blackmore's statement, that Devco did not have to negotiate because they discussed it with other unions. This is not true.

I say to the minister that I have complained and my colleague the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir) has complained about this. These complaints have been forwarded to the government by wire and letter. I know of one case in which the government said it did not receive a wire that was sent. A check was made with the CN people in Sydney by the union concerned, and it was confirmed that the wires were delivered yet the government has not acknowledged having received them.

Once more I go back to the purchasing policy. Why is this not being investigated? Substantial amounts of money are being spent in England to bring in supplies that could be provided here in this country at lesser cost and of higher quality. If the minister does not care to accept that from me let him examine the correspondence he has received from the union.

Why did Mr. Blackmore arbitrarily change the safety lamps used in these mines and bring in a lamp that was inferior to the one already in use? This was done without the approval of the mines department. He was completely flaunting the laws of the province in which he was working.

While the minister is investigating that, would he also investigate why it is necessary to bring in a piece of equipment from England at a cost of $400,000 when there is other equipment available on the site which could do the job until the Lindgan mines are developed. At that time changes would have to be made in that particular equipment? I ask the minister why Devco should be authorized to spend $400,000 to purchase a piece of equipment from England when there is equipment lying around in Cape Breton that could do the job efficiently for now? Are we fighting inflation? If you are fighting inflation you have not got Mr. Blackmore on your side.

When the legislation to set up the Cape Breton Development Corporation was before this House I think it received unanimous support. I am not aware of anybody who spoke against it. I might add that the bylaws Devco adopted violated contracts and responsible agreements, in spite of what Mr. Ord said. Imagine the president of a corporation putting in writing that there would be no change in the working conditions of employees after the take over, and then before he gets the seat warm he violates not only the intent of the legislation but the promises in his own letter. The corporation brought in the early retirement plan.

I asked the minister to examine the legislation. Nowhere does it give the Devco people the authority to prematurely retire people at age 60. Somebody says this represents the greatest good for the greatest number. I subscribe to that philosophy in many instances, providing that the basis on which you start is related to a certain rung on the ladder and that this will bring them up the ladder. I do not subscribe to the philosophy of the greatest good for the greatest number if you are going to cut the feet out from under the fellow at the bottom and sink him deeper in the hole. This is what has been going on at Devco. This idea of the greatest good for the greatest number is a lot of nonsense and nothing but propaganda. This is part of the 77 per cent that was lost. It was made quite clear to the minister and his office that this was not the true picture, in spite of the fact that Devco provided the minister's parliamentary assistant with all this information before it was officially released to throw back at the members.

The least you could do, Mr. Minister, is familiarize yourself with what is going on down there. Up to now you have not been doing that. You have overlooked the representations made in your own office. You have overlooked the representations I have made in the House. These same representations in respect of what is going on in Cape Breton today have been forwarded to you by wire and letter.

How could Devco have tied in the most recent wage contract with what the legislation made mandatory? For that alone, Mr. Blackmore should be dismissed. I might say here and now that many of the labour problems, and there are a few that have developed within the UMW, can be laid at the feet of Mr. Blackmore. I think his intentions are to wreck the union. If it is not his intention to

wreck the union, what he has been doing so far has gone a long way towards accomplishing this.

Look at what is going on and examine what these men are doing. They like to quote the law of the land and like to tell you that everything is above board, everything is being done right. I should like to ask the minister, in respect of the allowances made to these men, what happened to the four per cent they were supposed to get in respect of their earnings during any calendar year in which they worked? That is the law of the land. That is part of our legislation. They are forced to retire without the 4 per cent of earnings for the portion of the calendar year in which they worked. This is the law, Mr. Minister, and it is there for everybody to see. What happened to Mr. Blackmore and his just society? What happened to this outsider whom this minister referred to as a foreigner, and what is going to happen to the others he has brought in to displace Cape Bretonners?

• (4:00 p.m.)

You, Mr. Minister, have gone to Nova Scotia and have selected a chairman to run this operation. Co-operate with that chairman. Today, you have a chairman who has proven himself to be a very capable man. He has revived the Sydney Steel operation which was supposed to have been a gone goose. Despite the fact that representatives of this government appeared before 20,000 people in Cape Breton and said no stone would be left unturned, not a finger was lifted. The government of Nova Scotia was fortunate enough to have Mr. Cameron take over, and today this is cause for celebration in the city of Sydney because of the promise he has brought for the people of the area. Now that we have a man to operate the Cape Breton Development Corporation who has proven ability let us waste no time in making his job function as smoothly and easily as possible. I say, get rid of Mr. Blackmore and Mr. Ord and let us give Mr. Cameron the best possible chance to make this a going concern.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak for long. I say to the minister I can well appreciate his desire to limit the scope of the debate to the couple of amendments which are proposed in this bill and which he suggested are not controversial. I remind him, however, with respect, that this is the second reading stage of a bill and that the general principles of this bill have to do with what Devco is supposed to have accomplished for the people of Cape Breton. It is therefore perfectly legitimate to tell the minister, as I do immediately, that from my knowledge of the situation in Cape Breton Island Devco has failed to accomplish anything worth while for the people of Cape Breton. The minister is faced with a population there which is becoming increasingly resentful and which has the same feeling of hopelessness the people of this island have had for many decades.

It is not enough for the minister to say he is giving us two simple amendments and then ask us to please let him have them so that he can go on to do what? To continue to do the totally ineffective and inadequate job which has been done in the past under two years of existence of this corporation. When this question was debated in this House both on second reading and in committee in 1967, if you will permit me to quote a sentence from *Hansard* during the second reading debate, I said:

> But it is totally wrong in principle, and does not deal with the problems of Cape Breton Island, to give the corporation the authority to throw miners out of work before alternative jobs are available. This is precisely what this bill does.

At the same time, as recorded at page 1662 of *Hansard* for June 19, 1967, I said:

> —I emphasize, underline and repeat this because it seems to me to go to the core of the problem. In my respectful submission the core of the problem is that no coal miner on Cape Breton Island should lose one day's work as a result of the reorganization by the corporation of the coal industry. Not a single coal miner should be laid off by the corporation until the other arm has created jobs to which those miners may go. Not until then should the closing down of mines or the reduction of coal production take place.

I said to the minister that whether the reduction in the standard of living of the miners is produced by an actual closing down of the mine or whether it is produced by a compulsory pre-retirement plan, the result is the same. The result in the case of the miners of Cape Breton who are affected is that their annual income is reduced from $5,000 or $6,000 a year as miners to a maximum of $3,000 a year under the compulsory pre-retirement plan. In other words, the income and standard of living of those affected has been reduced by about 50 per cent by the pre-retirement plan. To me, as I stated in 1967, this would seem to be contrary to the principle of the bill and a betrayal of the welfare of the people of Cape Breton Island.

I say to the minister without any reservation, and knowing as I do that his own

experience in the labour market should make him sympathetic to this situation, that it is significant that when the board of Devco presented a so-called plan under section 17 of the act it dealt with the problem of producing alternative jobs in very general terms so that one does not know exactly what is proposed. The only precise plan that was produced was the early retirement plan for miners. There was nothing precise or definite in respect of the other operations of the corporation to provide alternative jobs. However, there were very definite and precise plans in respect of the compulsory pre-retirement plan.

I am not sure I agree with every other criticism uttered, but I have been concerned about the use of unemployment insurance benefits for the purpose for which Devco is using them. The unemployment insurance fund does not belong to any one group of employees. It belongs to all employees and employers who have contributed to it. I see no reason in the world why Devco should be able to dip its hands into the unemployment insurance fund to meet its program on compulsory pre-retirement. I agree with the hon. member who preceded me that this kind of dipping into the fund is unjustifiable and is unfair to the fund and the people who have contributed to it. From the discussion in 1967 and 1966, from reading the various reports produced in an attempt to see what it is were are trying to do, the only point of importance would seem to be that the miners were not to be hurt, neither they nor their families, by the progressive reduction in the coal mining production of Devco. Devco has not laid off people in the normal way but has reduced the income of the miners affected by 50 per cent. It has forced them to reduce their standard of living by 50 per cent. How can the minister and the board of Devco justify this? Why is it possible for them to do it? In the second annual report dated December 31, 1968 there is a very pregnant sentence which begings at the top of page 8. This report was tabled about a year ago. The sentence reads as follows:

> While the Act does not demand it, Devco has undertaken to lay off men permanently without offering them either the Pre-retirement Leave Plan or reasonable alternative employment opportunities.

Two years and some months ago my objection to the bill was precisely that it did not state that the miners should not be laid off or have their income reduced without alternative employment. I moved an amendment at that time, supported by the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir) and others, to the effect that the act should contain a specific statement prohibiting Devco from reducing employment partially or wholly until such time as alternative work is provided by the corporation. That was denied by the then minister who guided the bill through parliament. So, there is nothing in the act which would make this a requirement. Therefore, the corporation is able to say the act does not demand it but that out of the goodness of its heart it will force some people to reduce their income by 50 per cent until there is alternative employment.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I, therefore, say to the minister that this bill is of little value. It does not contain important amendments to the act. What it proposes will be of little value to the people of Cape Breton, of as little value as many of the other things that are now in the hands of his department, and the result of which is that none of us is able to see so far the real development of industry in the disadvantaged areas or a real step toward eliminating or reducing the regional disparities which affect and afflict this country.

I think these are statements of fact, Mr. Speaker. And if one speaks a little bitterly about it it is because one warned the government that the way it is going about these things is not going to produce results. I remember pleading with the minister, and I plead with this minister now—I think the minister at the time is now the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin)—that he is not going to be able to do good for the people on Cape Breton Island if he relies entirely, outside the coal mines, on private enterprise to provide him with job opportunities for the people of Cape Breton.

Just look at what he is doing. Look at what the treasury of Canada, the taxpayers of this country, are asked to do to attract a private company, maybe in Houston, to come to Cape Breton Island. First, this corporation can lend the company money with or without security and at such rate of interest as the corporation considers appropriate, or without interest. Secondly, the corporation may make grants to this private company that deigns to come to Cape Breton Island, or it may buy some of its shares. Finally, the minister adds the proposal that, in addition to loans without interest if considered necessary, in addition to grants, in addition to investment by the purchase of shares and securities of the company, he is now going to guarantee the repayment by the

private company of loans which it may make elsewhere, loans from the banks. The corporation may guarantee the repayment of those loans to the banks and the interest on the loans.

What is the private company going to do, Mr. Speaker? What risk is it going to take? For what reason should it be there? For an attempt to make a profit? What are the people of Cape Breton Island going to get out of it when all the risks, all the capital, all the loans, all the grants are guaranteed by the federal treasury? And the minister says this is a non-controversial bill. So far as I am concerned, it is a very controversial bill because it will again leave the miners of Cape Breton Island, and all the people dependent on their income, in the same hopeless state they have been in for decades, from my personal experience and from the experience of those who have themselves suffered amidst the people of Cape Breton Island.

Obviously, if this is the way the government is going to go about it, to provide Devco with the right to guarantee loans up to $100 million instead of $20 million within the framework they support, that is the right thing to do. My colleagues and I do not propose to vote against the bill because at least it will give Devco a little more leeway with regard to private industry. But I repeat what I have said—

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I rise just for the purpose of indicating what is the objective of the bill. It does not raise the $20 million to $100 million, it adds $100 million to it.

Mr. Lewis: That is right. I thank the minister. The $20 million was for another purpose. The $100 million is for the guaranteed repayments for which the bill provides. The minister is quite right, which makes my case if you like, Mr. Speaker, that much stronger. Anyone who knows Cape Breton Island, and I am sure the minister knows it as well as I do, and the people of Cape Breton, anyone who has watched the people of the island for the last 30 or 40 years, as those of us who have been there and particularly the people who have lived there, have done, know you have a community that has gone downhill almost irreversibly for three or four decades when coal was gradually being displaced by other energy sources. And all that time we assumed that if we paid subventions and held out carrots to private enterprise, this situation would be improved. However, during that period all that has happened has been that the situation has become increasingly worse. How much longer do we permit this to continue?

I fully sympathize with the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) for his vehemence and the depth of his feeling, and I am sure the depth of his sincere feeling about it. I might not use some of the words he uses, and sometimes I sit here and envy him that he does have the courage that I have not got to tell people that when they are misleading people they are not merely misleading, they are lying. There is some value in that. My particular upbringing makes it difficult for me to do it that way. But it is true, Mr. Speaker, that all that Devco has accomplished until now has been to reduce the standard of living of a number of the miners on Cape Breton Island.

Is that what we set it up for? Perhaps the minister hopes that in a year or two years from now something more may come. I hope he is right. I believe he is not. I believe that the whole structure of Devco and the approach to the situation in Cape Breton is a false one, just as I believe the whole approach to get rid of regional disparities is a false one. Just as I am depressed, disappointed and chagrined by the failure of his department in other areas of Canada, so am I disappointed and distressed at its failure in Cape Breton to date.

Maybe if we all live 100 years we may see some results from the hesitant and useless steps that are being taken, but I say to the minister that the only way to deal with a situation such as that in Cape Breton is not to be straitjacketed by ideological objection to public investment in enterprise but to go in there with the help of the Canadian people, with Canadian taxes.

I notice in the report of Devco that they undertook to build an apartment complex, and in a typical elitest approach, managerial approach which is not concerned with ordinary working people—I have not got the report before me now and I am going to state from my memory what I am certain is correct—the report said they had to set up this apartment complex in order that managers and other executives attracted to Cape Breton Island might have a decent place in which to live. To the devil with these managers and executives! Where is there a decent place in which the ordinary people of Cape Breton may live?

All that this board of Devco is able to tell us is that it is building this apartment com-

plex in order to attract—I am paraphrasing—the managerial and executive personnel that industrial development in Cape Breton may require. What this points out, Mr. Speaker, is that you have got to have on the island the building up of a total infrastructure. Not only are apartments needed for managerial and executive types—they are entitled to live in decent places, I am not denying them that right, but so are ordinary people entitled to live in decent apartments and decent homes. You require schools not only to house the children of the managers and the executives but schools to house the children of the ordinary people. You require roads. You require all sorts of things to make it possible for industry to develop, and you require the courage and the desire and the readiness to innovate. You require funds from the public investment in order to make sure that the industry is there and that profitability will not be the reason, the only criterion for its remaining there.

• (4:20 p.m.)

If the minister is going to spend $120 million now and more tens of millions later to attempt to attract private industry, I wonder why it is not possible for him to add what I pleaded with the then minister in 1967 to add to the provisions, enabling Devco itself to undertake the establishment of appropriate industry so that the process might be speeded up, so that new jobs might be created more quickly than is now the case, so that the minister and his department do not have to go cap in hand, begging for private enterprise to come in, offering them all sorts of concessions such as grants, loans without interest, guarantees for loans from the bank and all the rest. Why should we do it that way? Why should it be necessary to lose the time that will be lost before obtaining suitable industries for Cape Breton Island if reliance is placed on dangling carrots before private companies who have not shown any interest before and are not likely to show interest now unless the minister can guarantee the kind of profit which these companies require?

It is in this framework that I look at this bill and I think it is horrible, shameful even, to add the interest for loans made by banking and other institutions to the other advantages which the act already offers companies who can be induced to come to Cape Breton. I think it is shameful that the most which Devco has to show now is the reduction of the standard of living of miners between 60 and 65 years of age. I think it is dreadful that as a result of Devco's operations to date all we have in terms of the morale of the people of Cape Breton is a great deal of uncertainty, a great deal of resentment and a great deal of bitterness. It is unforgiveable that the result of the government's action should be in most cases a division of the union, disagreement as to what should be done with this pre-retirement plan and a great deal of conflict within the ranks of the miners.

The minister may say that this is a little bill which makes only a small change and that it ought to pass quickly. I say to him that this bill, little though it may be, reminds us of the total failure of his efforts and the efforts of the minister who preceded him. It is a total, shameful, criminal failure and inadequate to deal with the problems that face the people of Cape Breton Island. Instead of that, Devco has done the things I have already referred to, the things that the speaker leading off for the Conservative Party referred to, the things that are mentioned in the hundreds of letters I have received from Cape Breton about the situation there.

I said I would not be long, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to be because I would just be repeating what I have said already. However, I want to say in conclusion that when a community in a country has suffered disadvantages such as the people of Cape Breton have for so many years, when at last the Parliament of Canada says to these people, here is a plan that is going to help you, it is little short of betrayal to let these people down. Canada as a whole, through the government, has raised the hopes of the people of Cape Breton that perhaps at last they can look forward to an improvement in their situation, the removal of the feeling of insecurity and the removal of the feeling of economic inferiority with respect of the rest of Canada, the feeling of hopelessness and helplessness which the constant reduction in steel and related production on that island has brought to them. But for the corporation to have been in existence for two years, for the people of Cape Breton not to have reason to feel that even a small step has been taken toward the achievement of that objective, is nothing short of betrayal of the interest of the people of Canada and of this Parliament.

I plead with the minister to take another look at this, at the bureaucratic cuts in the income of the compulsorily retired miners. I ask him to take a second look at a corporation which is approaching its job with little plan and even less imagination. I ask the

minister to take a second look at a bill which continues to depend on private enterprise which has never shown any interest in Cape Breton Island and which continues to hold out guarantees to these companies which have not responded in a way the situation requires. I ask the minister to bring in a bill to amend the act that will mean something to the welfare and future of the people of Cape Breton instead of an act which will merely add to the bureaucratic control by his department in a hopeless situation.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I shall not be very long, either. I shall only take a few minutes to comment on this bill—

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Half an hour.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): The minister interjects, but I did not hear what he said.

An hon. Member: It does not matter.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): In any event, Mr. Speaker, the member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) has certainly brought to the attention of the House and to Canada many of the problems with which we are confronted on the island of Cape Breton through the operations of what we term Devco, which is the shortened version of the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

We heard the views of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) with regard to many of the things that were happening—or perhaps I should say not happening. They are not happening because this minister does not seem to want too much to happen in the Cape Breton area. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that time and time again we inquire from the minister about problems affecting the work force of Devco but he has a way of sloughing off his responsibilities and his duty to reply in this House regarding these problems.

I am only going to mention a few matters because the member for Cape Breton-East Richmond has pretty well covered the field, as has the member for York South. The greatest objection I want to raise is the fact—I regret the minister is leaving the chamber but he undoubtedly is going to smoke a cigarette and will be able to hear me from that vantage point—that a man who has a union background and has led unions in this country, has been involved with the working people of this country over many years, has shown such a lack of ability for proper liaison between those who are affected by the operations of Devco. I think he, of all people, should be in a better position to know that there should be good relations between himself and the members of this House, between himself and the unions involved, the work forces that are being directed by Devco. However, as I have already mentioned, he does not seem to want to co-operate.

With regard to the question of the method of paying the retirement allowance, I have on occasion brought this to his attention in the House and have made the suggestion to this minister, as well as to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), that we all have views on the manner in which these moneys are being paid, where the moneys are being taken from and so on. I have suggested that there should be an investigation which could clarify the proper situation, but this request has been refused. It has been ignored by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the Minister of Labour and for what reason I do not know. Surely, there is nothing to hide. Surely, nothing would be heard as a result of such investigation that the government would not wish to hear. The investigation would clarify the situation for all concerned.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I support the bill, although I cannot say that it is earth shaking by any means. If it will attract industry to Cape Breton Island, contribute to the progress of the area and assist the officials of Devco, I endorse it and hope that it will be successful in its aim of inducing industry to go to Cape Breton. That is not an easy job and, as I have said before in public forums, the people associated with Devco certainly have their hands full. They have a big job in trying to induce industry to go to the island, because all Canada wants industry and it is not easy for some areas to obtain industry. The people all over this country are trying to attract industry to their regions and as a result Devco faces much competition.

With regard to the recent appointment of Mr. R. D. Cameron, may I say that Bob Cameron has made his mark on the industrial life of Nova Scotia. It amazes me that for some months this government and this minister were looking for someone to be the new chairman of Devco, and undoubtedly the pro-

vincial government of Nova Scotia was as well, while the man who was needed was right under our noses. There is a man, I feel, who will do a tremendous job with Devco. These remarks are not a reflection on those who have served in that office before. We never heard the real reason the former chairman retired; personal reasons played a part in his resignation. I hope that in committee the minister will advise us why the resignation took place, and also advise us of many actions which have taken place within Devco.

The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond talked about the change-over of the mine lamps that were used. Like the hon. member, I worked in the coal mines for many years. The lights used in the Cape Breton coal mines were provided by Mine Safety Appliances of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, through a Canadian outlet. To my knowledge, they were safety approved, but they are not to be used any more. We are to have different type of lighting equipment which must be purchased in Britain. I do not know the reason for this; this provision is unusual.

Another unusual provision is that the supervisory staff of Devco apparently must come from Britain. I really think that there are in this country Canadians with brains; I do not think we have to bring these people over from Britain. May I ask the minister a question that has to do with the people being brought over. Is it correct that Devco will allocate funds to the people coming from Britain for the purchase of or construction of new homes at low or no rates of interest, with the proviso that Devco shall have the option of buying back the homes if they are no longer used by the persons being brought in? Is this correct?

I should also like to know from the minister why there is such a rapid phasing out of the coal industry in Cape Breton Island. Oh, yes, we have been assured in the House by the minister, by others concerned and by the officials of Devco, that no one will walk the streets until alternative employment is provided. This, in large part, has been done by a method of shuffling around miners. When one mine has been closed, its personnel have been placed in another mine.

I am vitally interested also to know the future of Princess Colliery in the town of Sydney Mines. The mine is the backbone of the area's economy. According to evidence presented before the Standing Committee on Regional Development, before which Devco officials have appeared, the mine at one time had 1,110 employees. I understand that as a result of putting people on pension and, as the hon. member for York South said, making them submit to a lower, more meagre standard of living by virtue of the allowance provided to them, Devco has succeeded in reducing the work force to approximately 800 people. By the same token, because these people are being made subject to the provision of the retirement program, there is no money in the area to be expended on services. As a result, the whole economy of the area is suffering.

Then, will the minister tell us what is to be done about the new generation which is available for work in the area. True, the authorities have been trying, but without much success, to bring in new industry; and from time to time we hear great statements put out by the public relations people of Devco to the effect that a great new industry is to come to our area. I want to know how many jobs have been provided by Devco since it was created by legislation. I doubt whether we can point to many jobs which have been provided.

It is very difficult and almost impossible for us to obtain information from this minister, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why he is so close-mouthed about the operations of Devco or about other areas coming under his responsibility. I recall that when he first came to this place he was a most co-operative individual. In the past couple of years, it seems that he has not wanted to provide any information to the House. Maybe he cannot; maybe the poor soul cannot, because many times when you ask him a question he shakes his head, stirs himself a bit and gives an answer relating to something about which you have not inquired.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): What information does the hon. member want?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I would appreciate receiving, now that the minister has certainly left himself wide open, answers to those questions which have been asked today by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond and—

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Which ones?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I would appreciate full answers to every question asked. That is the only way the minister will be able to justify his existence. The hon. member posed some very penetrating questions.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes, very penetrating.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): The hon. member for York South also asked some penetrating questions yet the minister says, "What do you want to know?" Well now, Mr. Speaker, this great fund of knowledge has shaken itself from its lethargy and is now about to open up and disclose to Parliament and the country answers which we have been seeking for so long.

The other day we posed a question because of representations that were received regarding the method of paying the pension allowances. I am speaking of the legitimate appeal that came from those members of the CBRT who are employed by Devco. They have a grievance. They have a problem and they want an answer. They want to be given consideration, but the minister sloughed off the question with the attitude that they constitute an insignificant group of people. His attitude was, "We have received no request from the officials of the United Mine Workers of America regarding these men. These people are not important. This is only a small handful of workers."

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. MacInnis: He called them superannuated.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): That's right; he did call them superannuated. He did not seem to be aware that they are not superannuated. At the present time they are employed by Devco which comes under the responsibility of the minister. He was referring to those people on this allowance as superannuated. They are Canadian citizens who have a grievance which should be corrected. They should not be sloughed off as a group of old men on pension that we do not want to hear from any more.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I want the hon. gentleman to cite from the answer I gave to see if it corresponds. This is not correct, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think it is honest.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that we have aroused the minister to the extent that he will at least try to straighten out what he did say.

Mr. Danforth: You are being optimistic.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): It is very difficult to be optimistic about this minister. It really is. I am stating what I think the minister said. Of course, when we read *Hansard* he is not in fact recorded as saying that. I checked *Hansard* because a number of my colleagues believed the minister referred to old men. I also thought I heard this statement, but I could not find it in *Hansard.*

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): No.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Isn't that most unusual?

An hon. Member: It was cleaned up.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): There were many people sitting around me at the time. In addition to that, there were two ladies in the gallery who happened to be from a constituency in Cape Breton, not my constituency. They stated that they also thought they heard the minister say that. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) seems to be of the same opinion as I am. In any event, the reference did not appear in *Hansard* and therefore I have no recourse other than to take the word of the minister.

Mr. MacInnis: Let him repeat his words.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I will gladly do that.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I never said it.

Mr. Nystrom: Check the tapes.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I wish the minister—

Mr. MacInnis: I rise on a question of personal privilege. The minister just interjected from his seat that we are a bunch of liars. He can deny that if he wishes, but my hearing is not that bad. I call Your Honour's attention to the fact.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I suggest if that was said the minister did not intend it. As is well understood, and I think generally accepted by hon. members of this House, terms such as that are not used and I am sure it will not appear in *Hansard.* Being as generous as possible to the hon. member, I have some misgivings about the degree which we seem to be ranging from the bill. I realize it is a rather general subject, but I invite the hon. member to restrict his remarks as much as possible. With that suggestion, I invite the hon. member to continue.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): As usual, Your Honour is very kind and courte-

ous. I have listened with great interest to what Your Honour said. Maybe I misunderstood, and for guidance I ask Your Honour to help me. I thought I heard Your Honour say that possibly the minister said we were a bunch of liars, but it would not go on *Hansard*. Does that make it any more correct? If the minister did not say that, let him say so because I now rise on a question of privilege. I ask him to again make the comment he made a moment ago which was referred to by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond or is the record to indicate that we on this side are a bunch of liars?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the hon. member was referring to people in the gallery who understood the words he was reporting, I believe not necessarily in the House. I say that those people who told him that are a bunch of liars. That is all.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I think that is a weaseling and sniveling way to get out of something. The minister now says that I am not a liar, the member for Cape Breton-East Richmond is not a liar, the people in the Commons are not liars, but the people who sat in the gallery and told us that are liars. Good heavens, what are we coming to when a minister of the Crown acts like a child?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: He used to be a wise man.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Yes, one of the three wise men from the province of Quebec. Wise, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Dinsdale: One of the three blind mice!

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): One of the three blind mice, that is correct. This minister should lean toward the working man so far as this bill and Devco are concerned because of his background.

An hon. Member: Where did he work?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I don't know where he worked. He was supposed to be involved with a union in the province of Quebec for many years. Surely, this minister who is piloting this small piece of legislation through this House should lean toward the working man for whom he professedly fought as a union leader for years. We are now told that people who sit in the gallery and state something are liars. These people's husbands are coal miners. However, the minister has clarified his statement in this august body. We, here, are not liars.

We wonder why there are so many problems with regard to Devco. How could it be otherwise, Mr. Speaker, when we do not have a minister who will smarten up, be responsible and do his utmost to work in co-operation with members of this House and representatives of Devco? Is it a fact that there is no liaison between the Devco officials and the minister? Is it a fact that he is minister in name only and that the deputy minister, Mr. Tom Kent, tells the minister what is going on, but the minister is not intelligent enough to carry little tales from the deputy minister.

An hon. Member: We have heard of Tom Kent before.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): We certainly have; we have heard too much of him.

Mr. Peters: People knew what to do with him.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I ask this minister to make a statement as soon as possible with regard to the future of Princess colliery at Sydney Mines, the backbone of the economy of a town of 9,000 people. Up the present time, there has been no new industry brought into that area by Devco. It is my wish that the town of Sydney Mines get new industry. I think this minister and the officials of Devco owe to the mayor, councillors and the people of that town, advice as to what the future holds.

During the Christmas recess I was interviewed on television. I said it had been rumoured that the Princess colliery will close in approximately two years. This is what I have been told. When you are here a few years you get a few friends in different departments who advise you about a few things. I have been requested not to divulge that person's name and I will not do so, but I want the minister and Devco officials to correct me if I have been erroneously informed. This would be great. It would be wonderful. If I have been correctly informed, I ask them to come forward and say what is going to happen to Princess colliery.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I believe it is the duty of Devco and of the minister to take this responsibility seriously

and disclose what is the future of the area from which men are drawn to work in the Princess Colliery. They do not know what tomorrow will bring. Will it bring industry, as a result of this amendment to the bill? Let us be reasonable. That will take some time even though we have Bob Cameron—and there are some good people in Devco who work hard. We cannot expect success overnight. You cannot turn a key and establish an industry the next day. We know there is a problem involved here. But let us be open with the people who are most directly concerned, those whose lives depend on what Devco plans to do. As a fellow by the name of Johnson said in the United States some time ago: "Come, let us reason together." Is that in the thoughts of the minister?

An hon. Member: Not likely.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): "Not likely" is right. He continues, through the operations of Devco, to reduce the standard of living of those living in the towns affected by the phasing out policy at much too fast a pace. Until there is alternative work, no man should lose his employment. We were assured that this was what the government had in mind. Nevertheless, they are now engaged in this phasing out process and reducing the working staff of the coal mines, though no alternative employment is being provided.

At this moment I see the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is telling weirdo jokes about Stockholm—how he crawled on his belly to the agents of Mao Tse-tung. And the minister is laughing his head off.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): You say something, and I will listen.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Now, we are getting the hon. gentleman stirred up. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I do not agree with many of the things the minister says. In fact, there is very little he says with which I agree. Nevertheless, I shall defend to the death his right to be ignorant. It is only proper we should do that. I hope that when this amendment goes to the committee the minister will appear before that committee, together with some of the people from Devco, and be in a position to answer the questions which he said today he would be glad to answer. It may be that the minister will be able to answer our questions this evening. I am sure he will be glad to answer all the questions which have been posed to him this afternoon.

[Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys).]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Which one?

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Oh, he acts like a stupid little idiot. He sits there and says "Which one? Which one?" The question is really so foolish. It is unusual to find one of Her Majesty's ministers behaving in such a stupid, silly, ridiculous, childish manner.

An hon. Member: Look at yourself.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Oh, someone who is still sitting on his little brain is commenting, now. Why doesn't he identify his constituency?

Mr. Gibson: Pursue your personal vendetta elsewhere.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would ask hon. members, and the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir), to restrict their remarks to the subject of the debate. I must say I am a little troubled by the direction in which it is going; I do not know whether this concern is shared by other hon. members but I do invite the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys to restrict his remarks to the bill before the House.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): I thank Your Honour for that advice. I certainly feel I should be reprimanded on occasion, but since all the members of this House got here the same way I think Mr. Speaker might take notice of other remarks which were made, especially by the hon. member for Hamilton Wentworth (Mr. Gibson)—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I was not restricting my comment to the hon. member. I was suggesting to all hon. members that we limit interventions and confine our observations to the bill. I was certainly not trying to single out the hon. member.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let us hope the minister will do his utmost in the future to provide some information concerning Devco and the nature of its future plans for the areas concerned, particularly with regard to future employment. Let us hope the minister will give this information either in this House or before the committee at the first opportunity. There is great unrest. I should like to invite the minister to go to Cape Breton and conduct an on-the-spot investigation him-

self—not of Devco, not of anything in particular, but of the situation generally. Let him sit down with the miners' representatives, with groups of civic authorities from the towns concerned, and with his officials from Devco. We know the minister has a difficult job. We know how difficult is the task before Devco. But there must be better liaison, more information forthcoming about what Devco or the minister are trying to do. This is all we ask. I plead with the minister to follow this course.

The amendment is good as far as it goes—I have said that already. I shall close by making just one point. Despite the fact that the minister and I cross swords in the House, he knows that we can co-operate with him, and often do co-operate with him on various occasions. He does get a little peeved and upset at things which are said to him, but anyone who has spent as many years in the union movement as I have knows that you fight a little rough, sometimes—it is possible that the minister himself has done so on occasion. This is all we are asking. We want the minister to take some action, to smarten up the people in Devco, to take a little more interest in his portfolio as it concerns the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

Mr. Peters: Since it is almost five o'clock, Mr. Speaker, may I call it five o'clock?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It being five o'clock it is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 40 to outline the questions to be raised at the time of adjournment: the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall)—Public Buildings—Stephenville, Newfoundland—construction of new facilities; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—The Canadian Economy—inflation—increase in bank directors' fees; the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain)—Canadian Pacific—Montreal-Quebec line—closing of stations after six o'clock—lack of comfort for passengers.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

CABINET COMMITTEES

REQUEST FOR LIST OF COMMITTEES AND MEMBERSHIP

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North) moved:

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the list of all cabinet committees of the Government of Canada and the federal ministers belonging to each of these committees, as mentioned by the Prime Minister at a press conference on October 15, 1969, at the National Press Building.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my motion calling for the tabling of a list of cabinet committees and their membership appears to me to be a simple and reasonable one. It is part of my belief that the business of government, which is the business of all the people of Canada, should be conducted as publicly and openly as possible.

It therefore appears obvious to me that if the public, members of Parliament and members of the press want to know which problems are being discussed by the government, and which ministers are involved, there ought to be no question about the government's willingness to table the information quickly.

I am not surprised that the government has refused to accede to this request. After all, there are now more than 350 notices for the production of papers on the Order Paper. Of those which have been dealt with, I venture to say that more than 90 per cent have been turned down by the government because, in the words one hears almost every week with monotonous regularity, it is not considered in the public interest to provide the information sought. It would be funny and ludicrous if it were not so serious and tragic.

• (5:00 p.m.)

We have a government that is led by a Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) whose reputation is based on his supposed belief in participatory democracy, in involving all the people in government and in a discussion of government problems and policies, a Prime Minister who is involved, as I think the young people say, in tuning-in the people to what is going on.

We have a government that has set up a task force to look into the information services of the government. Lord knows, we spend enough millions of dollars on information, supposedly for the public. This task

force brought forth a report that recommended the setting up of something called Information Canada. In response to repeated questions about whether the government intends to implement the recommendation of the task force and set up Information Canada, the Prime Minister said he would make a statement in the near future.

As a matter of fact, some members of Parliament and some members of the press already know that a group of civil servants are working as part of Information Canada. What is Information Canada? Supposedly, it is a body that will give the people of Canada more information about government operations and policies. I submit that it is just one more attempt—which undoubtedly will be to an extent successful since the government has the power it needs to ram through the measures it wants—to set up a propaganda machine that will churn out information that is favourable to the government, information that the government wants disseminated.

I submit there is a basic philosophical difference between the Prime Minister and people in government and people like myself. I believe that the business of government should be public. I believe we ought to follow the Swedish example of making all government documents public unless, for special reasons that are explained by the government, they must be kept private. But the government follows a policy that is the exact opposite of this. Like the kings in past feudal societies, the government considers it should have absolute power; that it has the divine right to say that reports and studies done by the government or for the government are the property of cabinet ministers.

I submit that what we have here is censorship of the worst type. What we have are the makings—if the government has its way—of, in effect, a one party state. If the people cannot be given detailed information on which proposed government policies are based, then the people will not be able to make choices which, I submit, in a democratic society they are entitled to make. Without this information they are to a large extent powerless.

From the reaction of the government to what I submit is a very simple request on my part, and from the reaction of the government to other motions, we see what is the position of the government. The position of the government is that hon. gentlemen opposite are the government; that they have the right to ask for information; that they have the right to increase the Prime Minister's staff in the Privy Council office by 200 to 300 per cent in one year or less; that they have the right to spend millions of dollars hiring private consultants to make specific studies on behalf of the government, all of which information becomes the property of the government and must not be divulged to any member of Parliament, not just to any opposition member of Parliament. I suggest there is no member of the House who knows less about government, and can be less happy about his situation than the backbencher of this government who does not even have the right publicly to complain and criticize.

As a result of the government's attitude, members of Parliament have no right to information. Neither have the members of the press gallery, except those who might have toadied to the Prime Minister or to somebody else and had information leaked to them. Certainly, the ordinary citizens and voters have no rights at all in this connection, other than those that the present Prime Minister, who if he were not king of Canada would be God, deigns to favour.

The policy followed by the government is exemplified by its blanket refusal to release information on the most basic and fundamental questions, by refusing requests for information about studies done by the government and about policies that will lead to legislation which will be of long lasting importance to every citizen of Canada.

I submit that the people of Canada have the right to be given this kind of information. I submit the government is wrong in principle in refusing such requests, that it is wrong in its approach. Although the government talks of democracy, it just does not understand what democracy is. When it does understand what it is, it does not believe it. I submit that my request is not only a legitimate one, one to which the government ought to agree, but is one that the people of Canada have the right to expect the government to grant.

Mr. J. E. Walker (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I agree with one thing the hon. member said. He pointed out that a most important subject, a basic and fundamental question, is before the House today, because we are debating the problem of the dissemination of information to the public through their members of Parliament, as contrasted with the necessity to keep information in certain areas, on which the govern-

ment might take action, confidential. I submit certain information must of necessity be kept confidential if indeed it might form the basis for future government action in certain areas.

The hon. member also pointed out that there was an unprecedented number of motions for the production of papers listed on the Order Paper. Both he and I have been in the House for a number of years, and personally I have never seen such a large number of requests for papers. If the impression I receive from the hon. member's remarks is the correct one, he appeared to blame the government for the number of notices of motions for papers presently on the Order Paper.

Mr. Orlikow: Remaining unanswered.

Mr. Walker: Just the contrary is true.

It is because this is such an important subject that I have gone into it very thoroughly. Having given some study to the matter, rather than address myself to the broad question—and I must say that I felt the hon. member addressed himself to a much wider area than called for by the motion—I will deal with the specific matter raised.

As a result of my research I feel I could make two types of presentations, one of which would deal with the broader aspects. I will save that for later, since I am aware that the hon. member has another motion on the order paper. When that comes up for debate I will at that time cover the waterfront and deal with the general situation, but for the moment I prefer to be specific and speak to the motion itself.

Although the motion has been read I should like to read it again. It provides:

> That an order of the House do issue for a copy of a list of all Cabinet Committees of the Government of Canada and the federal Ministers belonging to each of these committees as mentioned by the Prime Minister at a Press Conference on October 15, 1969 at the National Press Building.

• (5:10 p.m.)

On the surface this seems to be a very reasonable request. On looking into the whole question, I wondered whether the government and those on this side of the House were not being a little oversensitive on this rather small point. The government felt it was not proper, right or fitting, that the members of these committees should be revealed. I was interested enough to find out why.

I found that there are a great many precedents for refusing to reveal the composition of committees of the cabinet. There are many precedents in Canadian practice for the customary refusal by governments to disclose the names of ministers serving on committees of the cabinet. Because this is such an important subject I want to put on the record some of the reasons and some of the precedents so that the hon. member will not feel it is just this government, for small reasons, which refuse to divulge the names of cabinet ministers on specific committees. There have been several references to the British practice of not revealing the composition of cabinet committees. Here, we are concerned with what Canadian precedents there may be for such reticence.

The Right Hon. John G. Diefenbaker, then Prime Minister, put the matter succinctly on February 4, 1960 in reply to the following questions by Mr. Paul Martin, who was then the hon. member for Essex East:

> Has there been a meeting of the cabinet committee on economic and industrial development since September, 1957?

The Prime Minister of the day replied:

> The means by which the cabinet conducts its business are traditionally regarded as its own domestic affair, and questions on the subject are normally neither asked nor answered. It is well known that many committees of ministers are formed from time to time, and meet as and when required, to facilitate the working of the cabinet as a whole. Only the two established by statute have power to exercise any legal authority.

Earlier, on May 8, 1959, Mr. Diefenbaker had said in a parliamentary reply that the treasury board and the committee of the privy council on scientific and industrial research were established by statute. He provided copies of orders in council appointing members to these two committees. The orders contained the names or titles of the members. The Prime Minister also noted that a minister is chairman of the standing committee on public records and that ministers serve with the Speaker of the House of Commons on the committee of internal economy.

Mr. Diefenbaker was expressing the traditional view of Canadian governments that the inner workings of cabinet are not matters for comment or question, a tradition accepted on both sides of the House of Commons. He was expressing the distinction made between ad hoc committees of cabinet, formed to help in the orderly dispatch of business, and statutory committees. The names of those serving on the former are not made known by the administration. We will later examine some reasons why this practice commends itself to governments.

Cabinet Committees and Membership

Reticence about cabinet committees runs like a thread through parliamentary records. The Hon. Robert Winters, asked about the work of a special cabinet committee on labour matters, replied:

> Subject to correction, I do not believe it has been the policy to report to this House on the work of cabinet committees. If I am wrong, I would be glad to be so informed.

He was not corrected.

In June, 1966, the Minister of National Revenue—the hon. gentleman is now the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson)—declined to give the names of the members of the Treasury Board and said:

> —as this is a cabinet committee, I should not like to disclose the names of ministers—

Perhaps the Minister of National Revenue of that day was too cautious. Mr. Diefenbaker had, in 1959, tabled an Order in Council listing the members of the Treasury Board, a statutory committee set up "pursuant to the Financial Administration Act." Nowadays, the Treasury Board is regarded "as a separate ministry with a separate deputy minister and its own staff", to quote the words of Mr. Benson on May 31, 1966. It is evidently quite different in nature to the other committees of cabinet.

The Hon. Judy LaMarsh, looking back on her days in office, said:

> The Cabinet's Committee on broadcasting was chaired by the Prime Minister. Although it has never been the practice to make the personnel of such Committees public, for some reason Mr. Pearson himself did so.

The Trudeau administration reduced the number of cabinet committees, gave them more power of decision and speeded up the whole process of committee work. Anthony Westell, that great newspaper columnist, reporting on these changes said—

An hon. Member: A government apologist.

Mr. Walker: This government needs no apologist. He said:

> It has not been the practice to name ministers serving on cabinet committees and Mr. Trudeau refused to announce committee membership yesterday".

It is clear from these examples that the custom of not supplying lists of members of cabinet committees has been followed and defended by several administrations.

Bourinot gives reasons why motions for production of papers may be refused. If one considers a list of cabinet committee members as a paper, the arguments of Bourinot are pertinent. It would be futile to contend that the safety of the state would be endangered or any serious harm done if cabinet committee names became known, but a government may rightly claim that, as Mr. Diefenbaker said in 1959, the way in which a cabinet does business is "its own domestic affair". Hence the ministry may reject inquiries for such lists by arguing with reason that they are confidential.

During discussion of a motion for production of a list of consultants said to have been prepared in the Postmaster General's office Mr. Pickersgill, then Secretary of State, said it was apparent from page 258 of May's 14th edition that:

> —the only kind of documents for which motions can properly appear on the order paper are papers and correspondence of a public and official character sought from government departments—

This is not a government rule, this is a rule of the people who are recognized as authorities on parliamentary procedure.

Speaker Macnaughton on the same occasion remarked:

> The general principle concerning the character of papers which may be asked for is set out in May's sixteenth edition, page 270, where it is stated: "Parliament is invested with the power of ordering all documents to be laid before it, which are necessary for its information."

Some would argue that it is not necessary for Parliament to know the makeup of cabinet committees any more than it is essential for the conduct of the business for Parliament to know the contents of messages passing between the federal and provincial cabinets.

We should note in passing that Speaker Macnaughton commented:

> There is no rule which states that confidential documents may not be asked for, and in some instances what are ordinarily considered to be confidential documents are tabled.

This is not to argue that when confidential papers are requested they must be tabled.

Tradition is based on unwritten rules to some extent, particularly parliamentary tradition. There is the custom that new ministers do not look back at the conclusions of the earlier administration but follow the well established practice of parliamentary government, by putting aside their conclusions. This is now a practice entrenched in our system. One may contend that refusing to disclose the composition of cabinet committees is a similar time-honoured practice established and maintained because it is useful, even though it may not be based on the kind of logic that one employs in establishing a mathematical proposition.

• (5:20 p.m.)

There are other considerations I wish to place on the record because the hon. member's speech will read very well tomorrow if one does not take into consideration that there are some very good Parliamentary precedents for the refusal of the government in this instance to make public to the House the composition of certain cabinet committees. Sir Ivor Jennings mentions the rule that, generally speaking, information should not be given about existing cabinet committees lest the responsibility of the departmental ministers be undermined. There would be danger that the chairman of a cabinet committee might be regarded as the exponent of government policy rather than the departmental minister.

Lord Morrison explains that during the war it was made known that the prime minister was chairman of the defence committee of cabinet and the Lord President co-ordinator of information services because, for special reasons, Parliament and the people should be aware of these functions. But it is inherent in the cabinet system that decisions of cabinet are supported by all ministers, even though in discussions leading to decisions ministers differ.

Secrecy about what occurs in cabinet is a vital part of the system. It is one of the elements that helps an administration perform heavy and complex tasks and ensure cabinet solidarity. The anonymity of committees appears to be a safeguard for this secrecy. Departmental ministers have the duty of defending their conduct of office in Parliament and may be rightly questioned about matters coming within their responsibility. However, it is not part of the responsibilities of ministers who happen to be chairmen or members of ad hoc or other committees to answer in Parliament for cabinet decisions taken in committee but affecting one or more departments. So, this is not as simple a proposition as the hon. member would make it. The committee is ultimately responsible to the cabinet as a whole and to the Prime Minister rather than to Parliament.

I wanted to place this argument on the record, Mr. Speaker, I do not say that many of the motions for the production of papers on the order paper are frivolous, but I should like to point out that I do not believe, up until this point, there has been any detailed answer other than just a government refusal to produce the papers. Now, we have an answer which gives some background in respect of the reason the government has taken this position on this particular matter of cabinet committees.

I could cover the broader subject, but as I said at the beginning I would rather speak on the specific point about cabinet committees. I believe the hon. member has other motions on the order paper. I think there is one which deals with correspondence between the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and a certain scientific council. Later on when these motions come up I have a more thoroughly researched document which I shall place on the record which I hope will be of assistance to the hon. member. Then, I am sure he will be in a position to go out and acquaint his constituents and others with some of the traditional rules and precedents of Parliament. Therefore, if we are to have proper government operation, not always but from time to time, it is in the public interest and in the parliamentary tradition that these specific names not be revealed.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that I had not intended to take part in this debate. However, I am baffled by the remarks of the parliamentary secretary. I cannot help but think back to a year and a half ago when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was compaigning and portrayed an image of his party. Now, today, we hear the parliamentary secretary to the Prime Minister attempting to justify the activities of the government on the ground of rules and precedents. He has quoted authorities of years gone by to justify the government's refusal to divulge certain information. This is the government which went to the people and said: We are a different political party. We are not the same as we were last year or the year before. We will do things in a different way. We will bring government to the people and allow the people to participate. We are asking the people to become involved. We are throwing away some of the needless old traditions about which one hears so much.

The only justification the parliamentary secretary has given us this afternoon is that traditionally, according to all the precedents he has dug up, this is just not the thing to do. He has based his case strictly on these arguments. This is really baffling when it comes from a government which has called for participatory democracy. More and more we see, not participatory democracy but participatory autocracy, on the part of people in the Prime Minister's office. This is the sort of thing

which bothers me more and more as time goes on. If the government is to be so sensitive in respect of something as minor as revealing the names of people on cabinet committees, then what is to be the situation in respect of the major issues of the day. If we are to rely so much on tradition in respect of a matter of this size and significance, on what are we to rely in respect of some of the social matters of significance we will have to face in the future.

I think many people who realize the nature of the reply we have received today in respect of a matter of this size will also realize very quickly the type of government we have. I believe many people have been misled. I am sure the people are beginning to realize this. I think the action of the government with regard to the production of papers in this instance will expedite this realization very rapidly. I and other members of Parliament at times do wish to know about the composition of the cabinet committees of this government. We desire this information because there are certain issues with which we are concerned. In my case, the desired information may have to do with the cabinet committee on agriculture or finance. The members of such committees will have great influence on the type of policy adopted. Such information is of great significance. I am sure it was of great significance in respect of the decision as to whether or not Canada should remain in NATO. I would think that the composition of that particular committee would be of importance.

I would have liked to have had this information. I was in favour of Canada withdrawing from NATO. Many other members wished Canada to remain in NATO. Regardless of our position, I believe many of us would have liked to know who the members were who influenced the decision of the committee. So, without taking up any more time on this issue, I would ask that we completely reevaluate the situation because it is a ridiculous one. We are moving further and further away from participatory democracy. We are moving toward participatory autocracy.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, the closing remarks of the hon. member who has just spoken might have been prophetic when he said this is absolutely ridiculous, but I think it applies to the motion. The hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) spoke at great length about the destruction of Parliament and democracy, as if the composition of a cabinet committee had anything at all to do with Parliament.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Let us suppose that we knew who were the members of each cabinet committee. Then what? Shall you reproach all ministers on such a committee dealing with one particular subject? Shall you blame, or shall you attach any responsibility to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), the Minister of External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), and the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Côté) for policy on natural resources, if they happen to be sitting on that committee? Surely, ministerial responsibility attaches to the minister in charge of the department, and it does not much matter who is on the committee.

Hon. members opposite have misunderstood the Prime Minister's purpose and reason. At one time all issues were discussed more or less among all members of the cabinet, and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has said, "To make it more efficient we will break it up so that issues are discussed by certain committees, but the whole cabinet and the government take the responsibility." Let us suppose that the membership of a committee is changed. Shall the Prime Minister inform the hon. member for Winnipeg North of all the changes he intends to make in the composition of that cabinet committee? Shall he send him memos of what is to be discussed? To suggest this is utter nonsense.

Democracy and this House are in danger, but they are more in danger from the perversion of the rules with respect to Notices of Motions. The purpose of Notices of Motions is to give an hon. member an honest opportunity to call for papers which are needed and which should be debated. I shall read the names of the members who have Notices of Motions on today's Order Paper. Starting from the first one and continuing to the last, they are: Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Broadbent, Mr. Broadbent, Mr. Skoberg, Mr. Burton, Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Burton, Mr. Harding, Mr. Howard (Skeena), Mr. Mather, Mr. Harding, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. Saltsman, Mr. Saltsman, Mr. Saltsman, Mr. Howard (Skeena), Mr. Saltsman, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Orlikow.

Then we come to Mr. Comeau. How in the world did he ever get in there? I continue: Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre), Mr. Skoberg, Mr. Skoberg, Mr. Skoberg, Mrs. MacInnis, Mr. Saltsman, Mrs. MacInnis, Mr.

Gleave, Mr. Peters, Mr. Broadbent, Mr. Skoberg, Mr. Burton, Mr. Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley), Mr. Burton, Mr. Orlikow, Mr. Skoberg, Mr. Skoberg.

The rules are not being followed. They are being abused by that party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Otto: None of these motions is sincerely meant to be put. They were devised secretly by that little research organization that they have over there, who think of everything to monopolize all the opportunities to speak, whether it is for private members' bills or Notices of Motions. In that way they will destroy Parliament, not the members of committees of the cabinet.

It is said that the government has refused to accept 90 per cent of these motions. Mr. Speaker, the government is justified in refusing to accept 100 per cent of them. They are not meant sincerely; they are merely for partisan purposes. That party has no intention at all of making this House more effective. It wants merely to embarrass the parliamentary system.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. If I read the expression on your face correctly, sir, I believe you were about to suggest the same point of order. I have no objection to the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) disagreeing with what we are doing—I quite enjoy his attacks—but I am afraid that as a Member of Parliament I cannot accept the charge that we do not put these motions on the Order Paper sincerely; that we do not want the information that is asked for in them.

My name was mentioned two or three times. One of the motions in my name seeks a study by the Department of Labour on the minimum wage; another seeks the Willard reports and reviews on social security. Mr. Speaker, I was never more sincere in my life in asking for documents of that kind, particularly the Willard report. The government may want to deny it to me, may even have reason to deny it to me; but it is not the privilege of the hon. member to question my motive or to say that I do not sincerely want that information, and I am sure he would like to correct what he has said.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York East.

Mr. Orlikow: I rise on the same point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) made a suggestion at the conclusion of his point of order, and I anticipated that perhaps the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) wanted to respond. It seems to me a reasonable suggestion, and I am sure the hon. member for York East would want to respond to it. Therefore, I recognize the hon. member for York East.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Speaker, if you review my remarks you will find that I said it was the party, the NDP Party. I did not say it was any of the members. In fact, I also said it was the party organization and the research assistants employed by that party who do all this; and if my motives were imputed, it was to them.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member directly named us. He directly named me. He singled out motions that are mine, and he is now saying that I was not sincere in giving notice of my motions, particularly the one with regard to the Willard report. He says that it was put at the suggestion of the research people. I deny that categorically. If anybody in this House needs to be told of my interest in social security matters, and that I do not need to be prompted on that subject, surely it is not the hon. member. The offer I made to him to modify his language was one that in all wisdom he should have accepted.

Mr. Orlikow: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am not quite the easy-going gentleman that my colleague from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is. I knew, when the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) was speaking, that he was abusing his privileges, that he was imputing motives to me and to other members which he had no right to do; but I considered the source it was coming from. There may be stupider members of the House, but they know enough to keep quiet. Under the circumstances, I did not think it worth while to get up.

Mr. Otto: Well, it wasn't worth while for you to get up.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I am not quite sure where this leaves us, but in view of the exchange we have had the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre might like to make a suggestion.

Agriculture Consultant Studies

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the imputation of motives on both sides be withdrawn.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I am sure that is a reasonable suggestion and that it would be agreed to by all hon. members. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On division.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Motion negatived, on division.

Motion negatived.

CONSULTANT STUDIES—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw) moved:

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all outside consultant studies undertaken for the Department of Agriculture as mentioned in answer to question No, 1,323, tabled on June 25, 1969, as reported in *Hansard* on page 10597.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before asking the minister whether or not he is prepared to accept this motion I think it only proper that we look at the question that is before us, look at the answer that was received, and see whether there was any reason why it should not be placed on the Order Paper as a Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I was somewhat amused—and understandably so—by the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) in his latest barrage of inaccuracies. This follows along the line of what is wrong with this House of Commons today—the complete misunderstanding of hon. members from central Canada of the problems affecting the west and the Maritimes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Skoberg: Listening to the hon. member for York East when he spoke today, and on an earlier occasion when I raised the question of notice for the production of papers, one could see that he is a strong supporter of political patronage in its worst form. If the hon. member would read "The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich," he would realize that this party in particular is determined that all documents shall be public and that all newspapers shall have access to them so they can inform the country in an enlightened way.

The hon. member for York West (Mr. Givens) appeared on television recently and suggested that because 80 per cent of the population of Canada lives in large urban centres, this House should devote 80 per cent of its time to the people of those areas. But, Mr. Speaker, 42 per cent of the people of Canada are either directly or indirectly connected with agriculture. It seems, however, that the people of central Canada are completely unaware of the importance of the agricultural economy.

Mr. McIlraith: That is not a fair charge.

Mr. Skoberg: It is most important, Mr. Speaker, that every Member of Parliament ask this government for all papers pertaining to those things that are important to the people of this country. It is no wonder the west is seriously talking of secession. It is time, before the patient dies, that the government look at this serious situation in an enlightened manner. I sincerely hope that members from central Canada will never sit on a committee looking at the problems of the east, or the west, because they do not understand them.

I should like to ask whether the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is prepared to accept some of this report I have before me in regard to my notice for the production of papers. I know the minister is well aware of the situation in regard to farming throughout Canada and its importance to our economy. I am given to understand that he may be prepared to supply some of this information. In the event that he is not, I wish to complete some of the statements I have to make at this time.

Mr. Olson: When the hon. member has finished his speech, I shall make mine.

Mr. Skoberg: It then appears, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is not prepared to produce the papers.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, it does not mean that at all. If the hon. member wants to be in committee of the whole, that is a different situation.

Mr. Skoberg: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I thought we could find out whether the minister is aware of the situation as it pertains to this particular report.

Mr. Olson: You will find out as soon as I make my speech.

Mr. Skoberg: Although the minister comes from the west, it seems that he is not concerned. Too often in this House things that should be made public, for the benefit of all concerned, are kept private. All this report asks for is certain documents. If some documents are highly privileged, or could be embarrassing to the government, I could understand. I am very surprised that the minister would not make public, right now what has been asked for in the report and thus put a stop to this discussion.

The report says that in 1963-64 there was competitive tendering on various consultant studies; but as time goes on we find that there was no competitive tendering as far as this report is concerned. It is important to note that the report states as follows:

> Please note that the foregoing does not include special studies commissioned by the federal task force on agriculture.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary for me to remind the minister of the serious economic plight of the west. He knows as well as I that the people are quite prepared to accept situations that cannot be remedied immediately. If they get the reports, they can read them themselves; they can digest them and assess the situation as it exists.

In 1964-65 two studies on financial management were competitively tendered, but the study in 1965-66 was not tendered. The hon. member for York East suggested the other day that my knowledge of competitive tendering, and tendering generally, was somewhat limited. But I can assure him that I know that tenders are either private or invitational. I am sure that no one in this House would deny that invitational tenders smack of political patronage, and I believe it is up to us to do something about it. That is one of the reasons why so many notices for the production of papers appear in the name of this party, Mr. Speaker. I make no apology for this. I am prepared to accept my responsibility for any notice for the production of papers. The reason is very evident, and I am sure you will find that the people of Canada are prepared to accept the same reasoning.

Mr. Speaker, the book "Listen to the World" spells out the British system. It seems odd that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister (Mr. Walker) would come here and quote history when we know quite well that the younger generation will not listen to us if we continue this train of thought.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Skoberg: I quote from this book as follows:

> Under the British system, which is ours, no political party can erect a prohibitory barrier to prevent the electors from getting information concerning the policy of government. Freedom of discussion is essential to enlighten public opinion in a democratic state; it cannot be curtailed without affecting the right of the people to be informed through sources independent of the government concerning matters of public interest. There must be an untrammelled publication of the news and political opinions of the political parties contending for ascendancy.

Perhaps the minister will now state that he will make available the various reports asked for. I do not think that is too much to ask, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson) recently stated that he plans to hire a firm of consultants to make an examination of the entire government pay system. The same thing would apply here. All I am asking is that these reports be made public and that in practically all cases they be opened up for competitive tendering.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I think some of the remarks made by the hon. member who moved this motion, with respect to alienation of westerners or easterners, and that sort of thing, are completely irrelevant to the motion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Olson: As a matter of fact, he would have a very difficult time pointing at me and claiming to be more of a westerner than I am. I come from a part of the country that is probably farther west than his, and perhaps I have had as much experience as him, or even a little more, in that part of Canada in deal-

ing with economic problems and many other matters.

Mr. Peters: And in raising hell.

Mr. Olson: I do not accept the hon. member's arguments. In fact, I do not think they are related at all. What the hon. member is asking, if you are to accept his argument, is that all documents relating to these consultant studies be made public. With respect to the hon. member's request for the list of such studies tabled in the House during the previous session in response to question No. 1,323, may I say that 19 consultant studies were undertaken between 1963 and the present year and I am prepared to show each and every one of them to the hon. member and, indeed, to any other hon. member of this House.

Mr. Skoberg: What about the press?

Mr. Olson: I am not prepared to put the public to great expense and reproduce all these documents in response to this kind of motion so that there will be copies for the hon. member and all hon. members of the House, and goodness knows how many thousand copies the hon. member might require in order to make the documents a matter of public information.

Mr. Bigg: It is not necessary to print them.

Mr. Olson: The government has a responsibility to do what is reasonable and to do those things that are useful and reasonable, having regard to the expense involved.

Mr. Bigg: I quite agree.

Mr. Olson: I hope the hon. member will withdraw his Notice of Motion. I will undertake that every one of the 19 consultant studies referred to in his motion will be shown to him and to any other hon. members who may wish to see them, at any time they want to see them, if only they will give us reasonable advance notice as to when they want to see them.

There is nothing in these 19 studies that is so confidential as to make us unwilling to show them. We are not trying to hide anything. This motion and many others like it on the Order Paper would require us to produce thousands and thousands of copies of the kind of material requested. To me that would involve an unjustifiable public expense and that is why I cannot accept the motion the way it is worded. It seems to me that it would be better for the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

I will see to it that he obtains these consultative reports or has a chance to look at them and read them. In future, if we have any such reports, if they are not confidential or involve security or like matters he is also welcome to look at those. There is no problem with regard to the 19 studies alluded to. They form 100 per cent of the list the hon. member has asked for. I therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

If he chooses not to do that, we can vote on the motion. But even if the motion is defeated I will show the hon. member every one of the 19 consultative studies if he will give us reasonable notice as to when he wishes to look at them or read them.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, will the minister permit a question? Will he agree to make available to the press, under the same conditions, copies of all the consultants' reports? Also, is it not correct that whenever the government has received consultants' reports, only one copy has been made available to the member requesting same? Why is the minister, therefore, talking of thousands of copies that will be needed?

Mr. Olson: The hon. member's remarks seem to reinforce my argument. Is he arguing that the members of the public and all hon. members of the House are entitled to these documents, or is he saying that he is the only member who should see them? I do not understand him. I know that we table two copies of such reports, and these are available for hon. members of the House to see. Usually enough are printed for all hon. members to have a copy. It seems to me that the hon. member is asking for consultant studies that go all the way back to 1963, some six to seven years. We do not produce that many copies of each one, but the hon. member can see a copy of every study.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I do not suppose the government needs me to defend it.

Mr. Stanfield: Oh, yes, it does.

Mr. Mongrain: The hon. member's kind words are always welcome.

Mr. Bigg: As a responsible member of this House, and as a member of the Public Accounts Committee, I have often wondered when the dumping of alarming amounts of

printed paper on my desk every day of every week is going to end. For how long can our forests stand this drain of wood used in the manufacture of paper? I fill several wastepaper baskets several times a week and throw out the paper which I do not want and would not order for myself in any circumstances. It clutters up our mail boxes. If we received less of this type of mail, and more legitimate mail, perhaps our postal facilities would not be so jammed and perhaps the pressure could be taken off the Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans).

If Notices of Motions requested papers which enabled hon. members to become "genned-up", perhaps we would accept them unanimously. But requests of the kind now before us, which might involve the production of many thousands of pieces of printed paper, are beyond the capacity of our present staff to fulfil. This Notice of Motion goes too far. In case anyone thinks I am here to hand out bouquets, let me say that I think we have far too large a staff as it is. We should not waste public funds and the time of public servants. We must stop this terrific waste of paper and this terrific waste of the public's time in producing a mountain of useless information. As it is, the work of the Public Accounts Committee is behind. I am perfectly certain that if the hon. member wishes to obtain this type of information, he can obtain it.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CAPE BRETON DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT

GUARANTEE OF REPAYMENT OF MONEYS BORROWED BY COMPANIES AND PERSONS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Marchand (Langelier) that Bill C-138, to amend the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, I am sure most members who were in the House this afternoon listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon.

member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) and the hon. member for Cape Breton-The Sydneys (Mr. Muir). This bill raises many questions for hon. members from other parts of the country. I had the distinction of being a miner for 15 years, and I am very sympathetic to miners in other parts of the country because there is a great similarity in the problems of the various mining communities. Many miners move from one community to another; they are probably the original transient workers of our nation.

I have been very sympathetic to the problem that has developed in Cape Breton over the years. These miners have not had the benefit of the same wages as miners in other parts of the country in the last few years, because of the position in their industry. Because of the interest of hon. members in this situation we undertook to provide the funds necessary to establish Devco, which was to end many of the problems plaguing miners in the Maritime provinces.

Some hon. members who participated in the debate a year ago said that possibly it would be better to pay all the miners in Cape Breton a pension and forget about the whole operation. They suggested that perhaps a more viable operation should be established which would provide employment for the people in that area. They felt it would probably be wise to use the money we were going to spend and pay each miner $5,000 or $6,000 a year until a reasonable retirement age, and close down the operation entirely. The minister of the day, when piloting the Devco legislation through the House, led us to believe that a number of things could be done with the complex in Sydney, and that Devco would not only undertake reclaiming some of the operations in the mines in that area but would expand into other fields.

We listened with interest to the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond. I learned something that I did not know; I read several letters written by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) which indicated that this must have been contemplated at the time of the establishment of Devco, that is, the unemployment insurance fund would be used to supplement the act which stated there would be a $3,000 retirement fund established for each miner.

I am sure that the miners as well as most Members of Parliament believed that the unemployment insurance fund would be used in a normal manner, and that the moneys we had appropriated would be in addition to this

and not part of it. Certainly the unemployment insurance fund is not the type of fund that can be used to get over difficulties in which the government finds itself. It is still an insurance plan under, presumably, an impartial commission which operates in accordance with regulations it has established. Obviously, in this case it did not establish a regulation. The regulation established by the government and operated by Devco allowed them to integrate the amount that would be paid from the unemployment insurance fund to the workers as part of the $3,000 settlement that the miners were to receive. Three thousand dollars is not a very large sum for the pension plan of an industry in which many miners have spent 20 or 30 years.

I think the amount they normally would have received from the unemployment insurance fund should have taken into consideration the fact that the men were available for work and then, as in other parts of Canada, at the end of a certain period other parts of the Unemployment Insurance Act would come into effect. This would mean transferring the workers to areas of high employment. This obviously was not done. There must have been some very dishonest people working in the unemployment insurance office, because these people were not available for work in the true sense of the word. This must have been known to the Unemployment Insurance Commission. There was obviously collusion between these two groups.

When speaking in a debate involving another bill for which the Minister of Regional Economic Development (Mr. Marchand) was responsible, I mentioned that a number of schemes have been operated in the Maritimes. One of them involved a heavy water plant in the same general area as Devco. I suggested at that time there should be legislation which would pick up the tab for whatever must be done to either establish or dispose of the liability for the heavy water plant in Cape Breton. If the government intends to get into this project, I believe it should do so by the front door, not by the back door.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I am sure most hon. members would support the government in any decision to put some money into the heavy water plant, though I believe we would all demand a much greater degree of control over the operation of that plant. We would probably demand that the Atomic Energy Commission give serious consideration to whether it was right in the advice it gave about the best way of producing atomic power. The question as to whether heavy water or enriched uranium is the better material in these circumstances should be decided before Canada is called upon to spend any more money in this direction. We should be making a decision on this question.

The bill, in part, would allow the government, through Devco, to do something about this situation, because it would permit large sums of money to be borrowed. If the operation is not satisfactory, we shall have to pick up the tab anyway, in the event of bankruptcy, and I would prefer assistance to be provided openly rather than through the back door.

Some charges have been made with regard to management. These charges are serious and should be investigated. If staff are being brought from England, and in particular from the National Coal Board whose history is not without calamities, and the appointments include people who cannot operate well in a Canadian context, we should be doing something about the situation.

To judge from the speeches made so far, there is general acceptance of Mr. Campbell; most hon. members have paid tribute to his accomplishments. He is a tough customer, I understand, and he will probably be approaching the government shortly with demands for a clean-up as an alternative to his ceasing to be chairman of the operation.

What we are being asked, in effect, is to confer important new borrowing capacity upon a corporation which, apparently, has not succeeded in doing the job for which it was established. In his outline of the legislation the minister told us that the bill sought to add only two relatively minor amendments to the act which is now in operation. I do not think this approach was entirely fair. If the present legislation is not working as anticipated, when the minister appears before the committee he will be obliged to provide answers to some of the important questions which have been raised. If not, we will have a new minister.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yourself?

Mr. Peters: There is no need for hon. members to travel personally to the Maritimes to find out whether these projects are working effectively. When the representatives from the Maritimes express their views in this House as strongly as they did today, I for one

am prepared to allow that they know what they are talking about—that all is not well.

By simply pouring, say, another $100 million into a sick institution we are not accomplishing much for the institution and we are certainly not making the best possible use of the $100 million. Of course, I have no doubt that the bill will be passed. Politics enter into these considerations and I realize that a political decision will be made in the end. However, I am interested not so much in the politics of the decision as in whether we are doing the right thing by passing this bill, in light of the charges which have been made, supposing that those charges reflect the opinions of the people in the area most directly concerned. The bill refers to $100 million. I do not believe that in Canada we have this kind of money to throw away.

I have been shocked by what I have read, and seen on television, in connection with the heavy water plant. I know this was intended as a big experiment likely to provide additional industry in Nova Scotia. It was felt that a plant of this kind could lead to the establishment of many subsidiary industries in the area and would serve as a base for industrial development. It has not done this. Similarly, we were given to understand that by establishing Devco we were establishing a national agency which would take over from the former owners of the coal industry and provide the people of the area with a viable economic base—an industrial base capable of expansion.

The people who live in the area have a right to assistance, in my opinion, and I believe the people of Canada generally are willing to provide such assistance. But I, for one, am unwilling to provide $100 million as a basis for industrial development if the arrangements which have been established do not appear to be working.

The situation is comparable to that of the Company of Young Canadians, to the extent that one can let things ride for so long, in fact, until poor administration and bad management destroy the principle which it was intended to establish. Something like this is happening in the case of Devco. The minister may not have talked to the people who live in this area. Cape Breton people are, I know, highly political and extremely vocal in expressing their opinions, so this may be a highly political issue.

Nevertheless, if this agency is not working in the opinion of the average guy employed in the mines, or if the man who has been laid off and finds himself unemployed feels that the program is not in his interest, we have not done the right thing. In that case we do not need more, but less of it and we should set up a thorough investigation to find out whether the charges which have been made today are correct.

I listened to the speech of my hon. friend from York South (Mr. Lewis). He has visited Cape Breton Island many times and has many connections with the mineworkers' unions and other organizations there. Others among my hon. friends also have personal knowledge of conditions there. They are all of the opinion that the charges which we have heard are correct that there are abuses in the management of Devco and that the corporation has failed to produce the results it was established to produce. In these circumstances, the provision of another $100 million in borrowing power will not improve the situation.

In coming to Parliament for additional powers at this time, the corporation should be prepared to provide Parliament with an assessment of what has been accomplished to date. In what way has it eased the problems existing in the mining industry? Further, the corporation should provide Parliament with an indication of what use it intends to make of the resources which we are being asked to provide. If these things cannot be done, I think we would be well advised to vote against this legislation.

I am well aware of the consequences for the people of the maritimes, particularly of Cape Breton, who are in desperate straits. There has been little expansion of industry in the region; a large proportion of the population has moved from the island, leaving behind people who cannot easily be retrained to take employment in new enterprises. Devco was established to eliminate these problems, but apparently has been unsuccessful.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I suggest that the minister is shouldering a dual responsibility. I also suggest he may get into a great deal of trouble with me in the future in light of his background, which has consisted of working in the interests of those who have not had their share of the good life. In this regard he has accomplished things. He has, I am sure, been able considerably to raise the standard of living of those he has represented. In doing so he has also been able to increase his own ability and knowledge.

Now he has a personal responsibility to the people we want to help, and his knowledge of

the problems and needs of people puts him in a special category. The minister really cannot say that he does not understand. He has represented people working in industries where there is no pension plan. He has represented people who have not received a fair reward over long periods of time. The minister has seen workers who were left in less than advantageous circumstances and who either retired or were forced to retire.

So I repeat that the minister does have an obligation to meet. So long as he holds this portfolio we have the right to expect him to make more than just an average contribution to these people whom he represents and whose problems he understands. I suggest he will have to make this kind of contribution. Certainly he will have to indicate that he is making this contribution when he appears before the committee otherwise I would be prepared to vote against this legislation on third reading.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise at this point in the debate since normally I like a little more time to prepare what I am going to say. I have just returned, literally within the hour, from Sydney which I visited last evening and today.

An hon. Member: An instant expert!

Mr. Broadbent: By no means do I claim to be an instant expert. I regret not being here to follow what has been said both by the minister and by members on this side of the House.

One thing I should like to convey to the ministers, in all seriousness, is the general feeling or atmosphere which I found in the Sydney area. It seems to me that, whatever the cause, there is overwhelming discontent in this part of Nova Scotia. I come from another industrial part of the country, one that is relatively well off, where there is relatively full employment and good industrial relationships, relatively speaking. Therefore, it was a rather unique experience for me to move into an area where there are unionized workers and firms that have established themselves for many years, and to find the kind of bitter frustration and antagonism which I observed in the Cape Breton area. I inform the minister that this is a genuine feeling that exists in the province, and the minister should be under no illusion that this sense of discontent and frustration is likely to pass quickly.

[Mr. Peters.]

Without going into the details of this bill, may I try to suggest to the minister the kind of problems about which the people of the area spoke to me. First of all, there was a feeling that things were being done to them, rather than by them or with them. There was the feeling that somehow outsiders were imposing their will on the people of the area, and there was little confidence that the outcome would be any better than what exists at the present time.

Second, and directly related to this, of course, was the feeling that the people themselves have had no active say in the operations of Devco. They have not been consulted about what should take the place of the mining industry there. They have not been asked to make any proposals, even with regard to the limited kind of tourist industry that has been newly established. They would like to play some role in this kind of decision-making.

I understand that the House was a little excited this afternoon by some rather blunt language from this side of the House, and some blunt language may be coming from the minister in reply. But I want to repeat to the minister that if the language this afternoon was blunt and forceful, it was probably a very accurate reflection of the feelings of the people in the Sydney and Glace Bay area in particular.

What I should like to suggest at this point is that the Committee on Regional Development move quicky into that area. I suggest this committee not wait a couple of months or until something serious develops in the form of violence; instead, I suggest that very soon the committee visit the Devco site itself. This committee, composed of members on both sides of the House, should make a genuine effort to understand the views of three sets of people. They should listen to the Devco officials. Then they should listen to the union leaders. Above all, they should talk to some of the people there who have this very genuine feeling, which I think has a great deal of foundation, that they are being unjustly dealt with.

It seems to me that this is the least we can do. The expense to the government would be minimal. The committee need not spend a week there; I suspect that two days would be quite sufficient to have frank talks with the people of the area. The committee could determine the basis for their grievances and see whether they are legitimately grounded.

The committee could see, in short, whether the minister has been right in what he has told the House—though I am not suggesting he has attempted to be dishonest, or anything like that.

It is my impression that if this effort is made there will be certain basic changes made, to the legislation if we act appropriately, and to the management attitude of Devco if they act appropriately. I cannot emphasize too much the feeling I had that violence, real violence, could break out at any time in this area. Anything that can be done to de-fuse the situation, to let the people of the area know that we, in this relatively distant place of Ottawa, are concerned at what is happening, should be done. Therefore, I close my remarks with the suggestion that the committee move into the area as quickly as possible and discuss with the people involved the problems that are facing Cape Breton.

• (8:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. I must inform the House that if the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, if I were not aware that there would be an early opportunity to answer all the questions raised in the House this afternoon, I would now go to the trouble of answering each and everyone of them. But I know that I will soon have the occasion to discuss with the hon. members in committee all the problems brought up in the course of the present proceedings.

To my mind all those who know anything of the problems involved in economic development realize how difficult it is for the government, as well as for a Crown corporation or any other agency, to ensure economic planning and development. This is not a simple matter in Canada, not any more than in the United States, England, Sweden or anywhere else. It is a complex and difficult process and I believe that, in its efforts to spur economic growth, it is desirable that the government be continuously submitted to sound criticism in order to reset its sights if need be.

I do not come here professing to be the saviour or healer who has instantaneously solved the problems of underdevelopment in Canada. On the contrary, I come very humbly knowing full well that results so far have not been satisfactory, nor tailored to the size of existing problems in Canada. Therefore I do not rise to apologize inconsiderately for our policy but simply to dispel impressions and question some statements made earlier this afternoon.

What I find hard to take is not that the government or a minister is attacked, because I have often been a target in my life, so that I have become inured. I for one have also often attacked. So I find all this quite normal.

However, there is an unfair and negative way to attack, particularly when the attacks do not lead to fire correction, and thus get off target. Such is the type of attacks that have been made this afternoon.

After all, the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) criticized the vice-president of Devco, asking the minister to get rid of him. I do not know why, but the hon. member does not seem to agree with him, and he talked at great length about him. I suggest that the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond should at least read the legislation.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask the minister a question?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): My remarks will be very short, but all right.

Mr. MacInnis: I want to ask the minister this question to his face before he terminates the debate. I will ask him only one question at this time. Does he agree with the representations made by Mr. Blackmore?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): This is not what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker. I think all this will be discussed in the committee. If the hon. gentleman is there, I think we can discuss it. I am not going to make a trial of Mr. Blackmore's position here in the House—surely not.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, anyone who had taken the trouble to just read the act, which is not complicated, could have seen that the vice-president is appointed by the board of directors and not by the minister. What do the members of the opposition want? That I control Devco? They would then be the first to say: the government wants to control that Crown corporation, depriving it of the autonomy needed for its operations. And there would of course be pathetic speeches on centralization.

The vice-president of Devco reports to the board of directors and more specifically

to the chairman. There is a new chairman of the Board. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond says he has confidence in Mr. Cameron. I believe he is right because I also have confidence in Mr. Cameron. It might be the first time that we agree, since I have been sitting in the House. We will let Mr. Cameron act, because he has some authority on the board of directors of the Corporation. If the vice-president ever behaves like the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond suggests, Mr. Cameron, whom he trusts, will also become aware of it.

Then, what do we do? A minister is asked to dismiss someone when it is a well-known fact that he does not have the authority to do so. Evidently, nobody, not even the members of the opposition, except the member concerned, would approve if I were to dismiss the vice-president of a Crown corporation solely on the opinion of the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond. I am rather allergic to those personal attacks. If there are grievances, we could consider them. Most of those he raised this afternoon are unjustified and unfair for those concerned.

I shall point out another injustice. The member for York South (Mr. Lewis), whose intelligence and knowledge of the sector cannot be questioned, told the House that Devco had done nothing in Cape Breton, that it was a "complete failure". This is a serious accusation. He claimed that many of those who worked in this corporation, who are absolutely honest and whose beliefs are similar to those of some opposition members had accomplished nothing in two years. According to him, that was the summary of the government policy in Cape Breton Island, through the Devco Corporation.

In my opinion, this kind of accusation is serious.

One might well say that with the means that were available to Devco, the company could have done better. In point of fact, it did not manage well enough in the area of development. Its achievements as mentioned in its report, were not sufficient, something I can very well understand. But what I do not understand is the statement of the member for York South who says that we have done nothing for the miners and the people of Cape Breton.

Let us consider the facts, even if it is sometimes tedious. Of course, it is less exciting than talking of the exploitation of miners, because that is undoubtedly exciting. One can talk of the plight of the miners, of their difficulty to make a living, of that part of their lives they spent down in the mines. I, too, can make this kind of speech; indeed, I have all my life, and this is what is easiest. But what is difficult is to know the facts, and when you have a research staff at your disposal, it seems to me that it is imperative to do so. Now what are the facts? I shall quote only a few of them, not to report on the work of Devco, but only to draw attention to the fact that we have here a gratuitous assertion which I am not prepared to accept from a responsible, intelligent man who is able to check the facts. What has Devco done in the field of development? I can quote here a few of its achievements. Thanks to Devco the Nova Scotia Pulp, for instance, has developed to an extent which would not have been possible without Devco.

• (8:40 p.m.)

And what does it mean? That at least 1,000 jobs have been generated in the area. People should know that.

Devco has attracted a strontium development company to the area, thus creating employment for 125 persons. An electronic products manufacturing company employs 150 people, thanks to Devco. Gulf Oil has settled down in the Canso strait area, again thanks to Devco. The corporation helped them and made the necessary efforts to make it happen.

The Hustler Company, which is engaged in manufacturing dashboards for trucks, has 175 employees. They caused an apartment building to be erected. This can be criticized, as the hon. member for York South did this afternoon. There is nothing in the Bible that says that people must necessarily build hotels. It is easy to yield to demagoguery by saying that miners do not stay in hotels. That is the easy part. It is more difficult to find technicians when no adequate housing can be offered to them. That is debatable. However, some 1,700 jobs have been created more or less directly by Devco.

That Company had been asked by the House to progressively eliminate work in the coal mines. That is spelled out in the act. However, Devco was asked to find employment for the miners or to find some way to give them a pension. Has Devco endeavoured to carry out this task? They have succeeded in doing something that the miners understand. The miners do, but not the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond—

[*English*]

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

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): You spoke enough this afternoon.

Mr. MacInnis: The minister keeps bringing my name back into this matter. He is supposed to be explaining to the House what Devco has done. He referred to 1,000-odd jobs provided by Devco. I ask the minister, who says he is interested in the miners, to tell us how many miners got these jobs. On my question of privilege, I want to correct the minister on the remark he made about unsubstantiated charges made—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): There is no question of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, you are not without help. The minister in referring to my remarks said—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. This is not a question of privilege. The hon. member had the opportunity this afternoon to make his speech. He has already participated in the debate.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on the question of privilege, how can you rule there is no question of privilege when I have not stated what it is. If Mr. Speaker wants to jump the gun again on behalf of his colleagues in the House—

Some hon. Members: Shame.

An hon. Member: The Chair has ruled.

Mr. MacInnis: When the minister stands in his place and says I have made baseless accusations against the officers of Devco, he must substantiate it. I can substantiate all the statements I made. They can be supported, and I will support them with no less than a letter written to me by this minister who claims my statement is baseless. I have in my file a letter signed by the minister himself, which makes a liar out of Mr. Blackmore and makes a fool out of the minister.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, that is the only way the hon. member can discuss things. He says that he can prove his charges. He did not say that he had so far. As for me, I am asked to prove that I am right. We are not before a court here. This is probably why one day when he was in my office with the officials of the United Mine Workers of America, the president said at one point: You know, the M.P. does not give our views on the matters we are discussing.

I recognize it was somewhat humiliating. It happened here, in my office, and there were many witnesses. That was not something new for as regards all the problems we had, to cope with, we tried to have consultations with the miners' union, as Devco has done. Problems may not always be solved to their full satisfaction, but the union leaders who are commissioned to speak on their behaf of the miners, do not speak the same language as the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond. It is another story altogether and as for me, I prefer the opinion of the union leaders to that of the hon. member, who spoke to us all afternoon and is still making tonight assertions that are not only false but somewhat "sickly".

At any rate, what I am trying to say—

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond on a question of privilege.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege arises from the fact that the minister has now stated that a statement I made was false. I would ask the minister to substantiate that statement, or do as would be expected of any hon. member in this House and stake his seat on the fact that he can prove it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I cannot reply to the hon. member as to the number of jobs created for the miners, the list of which I gave a while ago, but I am inclined to believe he is probably right in saying that the majority of those jobs are probably not filled by miners. Although I did not check that assertion, I am ready to admit *a priori*, that he is right, because such a thing is possible. At any rate, I will check that but I am inclined to think that, in that field, his information is correct.

However, I must say that the government asked Devco to create new jobs, to see to the development of Cape Breton Island.

I will simply say that the statements by the hon. member for York South disregard the facts. Indeed, they are too general and unjust, not for the government, because this Crown corporation is an independent body that was created by the House of Commons, but surely for Devco which has made efforts that we may analyze together.

To make here in the House a pompous declaration to the effect that nothing has been done by Devco is unfair and irresponsible.

In the field of coal mining, Devco had no compelling reason to make an effort, for instance, to open a new mine. They did open the Linden mine which employs over 1200 workers. Nothing in the legislation compelled them to do so but they were concerned with that problem and they did do something. You may argue that it is not enough, that more could be done. All right, say so, but do not say that nothing has been done. Nobody would dare to come and say that in front of the miners because they would be the first to deny it, as did their authorized representative when he contradicted the hon. member right in my office.

Just consider, for instance, the pensioners and the pre-retirement fund. Surely, this plan is by no means perfect. No doubt it could be much more generous. We could discuss the matter at length. However, there is something striking about the fact that the miners, 55 to 60 years old, were given the choice between going on working or accepting retirement. Do you know how many of them accepted it from their own free will? I am not speaking of those who had to retire. Well, 78 per cent of those between 55 and 60 chose retirement.

So, here is another field open to criticism. You may say it is not perfect but you cannot argue that nothing has been done. It would simply be unfair. It is the hon. members' duty to inform the House and the public accurately.

I do not want to prevent criticism, far from it. People can criticize but taking the facts into account and in a rational way.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear. Of course I know—

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question? While he is hot on the subject, I want to ask—

[Mr. Marchand (Langelier).]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) wishes to ask a question if the minister will permit it.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): No, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member behaved in a civilized way, I would have no objection to it. I never insulted him in the House. Seeing how he respects others, I do not see why I would show him more respect than he shows me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I know about the lack of income of the miners. With $3,000 a year, it is not possible to spend the winter in Florida. I have no illusion. I say, however, that if we could repeat the experience made by Devco in all parts of Canada where there are problems, this would prevent a lot of human tragedies which happen every day in the country. I know that several factories are closing down and that the workers are not protected. They do not get a pension. They are not offered any. They are simply flat broke. Ask the former employees of Canadian Vickers in Montreal.

The government took the human factor into consideration and understood the nature of the problem by offering a pension to those who had lost their job or who did not want to work in the mines past a certain age. This can be criticized; if we could do more, we should do it. I have no objection to it. But to pretend that nothing has been done for the Cape Breton miners is an insult to the Canadian people who, with their taxes, try to solve the problem. It was not enough but it can be said that a greater effort has been made there than probably anywhere else.

I am thinking, for instance, about the Bell Island mine, in Newfoundland, and the Lauzon dockyards, in Quebec. It does not mean that it is enough; with more money, we could certainly do better.

Devco is a corporation which tried to do its job but which might not have succeeded fully and—

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: Would the minister permit a question? Has the minister investigated himself, or had his officials investigate reports that were given to me within the past 24 hours, that many of the miners accepted early retirement—I agree with the minister that they did so voluntarily—because they were

under a mistaken impression of what that entailed?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, the pre-retirement plan was accepted by the union, which understood it, studied it and indicated to us that it was satisfactory. If I must choose between the judgment of the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond and that of the executive of the union, I prefer that of the executive. If it is insinuated that the representatives of the United Mine Workers of America did not understand, that they allowed their members to be pushed around, it certainly does not prove much respect for the union leaders in Cape Breton. I say I have more respect for them than that.

If there have been new developments, I have no objection to studying them. On the contrary, I would be the first to do so. Still, it was recently stated in the House that we received telegrams from the United Mine Workers of America which, in fact, were official interventions. I looked everywhere; I asked Devco to supply me with them; we do not have any. We have received only one protest from the Retired Miners Union, and not from the United Mine Workers of America which officially represents the miners. I saw no other document. If there are any, I would be happy to see them. I should like to make sure that we were not the only ones to have received those documents and that they were in fact addressed to those concerned.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we will have the opportunity in committee to study more closely each one of the grievances which may have been voiced. We will attempt, in a civilized manner, to determine objectively what the situation is.

What we are asking now is, as I have said, a simple amendment, not a simplistic one. It is not a series of provisions that must be interpreted by comparison with one another, but the bill simply says: We shall authorize the Cape Breton Development Corporation, the DEVCO, to guarantee loans for industrial development to the extent of $100 million. Why? In order to give to DEVCO the same powers which my department enjoys in special areas, which means that DEVCO must not be prevented at some time from developing the area because it has not been authorized to guarantee loans. This is not giving money away, as has been suggested. As a matter of fact, the bill does not provide for that. All the bill provides for is to authorize DEVCO to guarantee loans for industrial development purposes.

Moreover, I am told that this should be done directly by the government. Of course, we shall have occasion to discuss that point with the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), since the corporations set up by the government do not necessarily offer guarantees of success. Besides, the hon. member knows very well that Deuterium of Canada Limited, a corporation controlled by the Nova Scotia government, has not met with much economic success. Because industrial development is carried on by a Crown company does not mean that success is assured automatically.

Anyway, an honest discussion can be entered into, and I am prepared to go along with it any time, except tonight, because now some hon. members are trying to show that this amendment will have very serious consequences, which is not true. It simply puts Devco in respect of the Cape Breton area in a position similar to that of my department in respect of the special areas. No more, no less. Therefore, the point is not to create a precedent, but simply to take steps to prevent the same people charging us with having prevented the development of Cape Breton by refusing to authorize the company to do what is provided for in the amendment.

In fact, it would be very easy to blame the government should we learn one day that a company had been unable to settle in Cape Breton because the government had been mean, had not treated the Island in exactly the same way as the special areas. No doubt we would hear all sorts of comments. We want this company to be unable to find excuses and the region to be on an equal footing with special areas, according to the provisions of the basic legislation establishing the department. The act does not aim at giving money, nor at looking after special friends, but at promoting industrial development, what the corporation has already started to do and, I hope will continue to do.

Mr. Speaker, in that sense it is a simple amendment. We will no doubt have the opportunity to start this whole debate over again in committee and also when the estimates for Devco will be introduced in the house, to criticize Devco again. It is normal that violent attacks should be launched and I will surely not get angry. But when speakers strike below the belt, I react like any human being. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I want to say that we have no right to leave the people of Cape Breton in an inferior condition com-

pared to other special areas and this is what those objecting to the amendment will accomplish. It will be one way of saying to the Cape Breton people: You will not be dealt with like other people in special areas of Canada. In fact, I do not think that anyone would feel it advisable to create such a situation.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. My question of privilege arises out of the fact that the minister has distorted a number of facts and has accused me of so doing. I would first call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that there is no pension plan for retired miners in Cape Breton, something which the minister implied on a number of occasions. He referred to this wonderful pension set-up among Cape Breton miners.

Mr. Deachman: Is this your point of privilege?

Mr. MacInnis: You wouldn't recognize it if you saw it.

Mr. Deachman: Tell the Speaker your point of privilege.

Mr. MacInnis: There is Leady Deach, who can do nothing better than make recommendations around the House which violate the principles of committees. You are the last one who should open his mouth.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member should address his remarks to the Chair. I would remind the hon. member, and other hon. members of the House, that Standing Order 37 provides as follows:

> No member may speak twice to a question except in explanation of a material part of his speech which may have been misquoted or misunderstood, but then he is not to introduce any new matter, and no debate shall be allowed upon such explanation.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, that would give me a lot of leeway, because all my remarks have been completely misunderstood. To begin with, on the question of pensions which has been entirely misunderstood—and you have just ruled that I can only get up and explain those things which were misunderstood—I say again to the minister that there is no pension for those Cape Breton miners who were pre-retired, forcibly retired, or whatever way you wish to look at it. This is his mistake; he continually refers to it as a pension. I do not even allow the Devco authorities to use the word. It is not a pension; it is a pre-retirement leave plan.

• (9:00 p.m.)

The minister also referred to a meeting in his office when the executive officers of the UMW said, "Never mind that fellow; he does not represent us". True, I do not represent the UMW, but I represent each and every person in Cape Breton, whether they be UMW members or not. As long as I have the responsibility to represent them, the minister and those hired in the Crown company who have been selling the big lie in Cape Breton are not going to get away with it.

With respect to the meeting in the minister's office,—and this only requires a yes or no answer—was the minister not informed by union members—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. The hon. member raised a question of privilege; now he is asking a question.

An hon. Member: It is a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member raised a question of privilege, and there is no privilege. I read the hon. member the Standing Order which states that no member may speak twice to a motion.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. My point of order is that it is impossible for me, when Your Honour is on your feet, to say anything. The only time I am permitted to speak is when Your Honour has resumed his seat.

An hon. Member: Stand.

Mr. MacInnis: Yes, I can stand. But, Mr. Speaker, you have already ruled that no member shall speak twice on the same subject unless it is to explain his remarks which have been misunderstood. I repeat, on the same question of privilege, that the minister made accusations about a certain meeting which took place in his office and which I attended. He also made reference to the fact that 78 or 65 per cent, or whatever percentage he used, of the men accepted this pre-retirement leave plan voluntarily. The question to the minister is this: Was it not at that same—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. MacInnis: Was it not at that same meeting—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. The hon. member is now asking a question. He rose on a point of order, and he is asking a question. I would ask the hon. member to state his point of privilege as briefly as possible.

Mr. MacInnis: As I said before, Mr. Speaker, my question of privilege is that I am entitled to explain certain of my remarks which were misunderstood. At the same time, I take exception to the remarks of the minister in answering me, which remarks were far removed from the fact.

In this meeting in the minister's office to which he referred, the minister was informed in the presence of the UMW executive, or one of the mine union locals, and the municipal authorities that the 77 per cent he referred to was a false figure and that many of the men had accepted pre-retirement on the basis of fear. I ask the minister to tell us if that is not so. Isn't that the truth? Isn't that the representation that was made in your office? He cannot deny it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

CRIMINAL RECORDS

PROVISION FOR RELIEF OF CONVICTED PERSONS

The House resumed, from Friday, January 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. McIlraith that Bill C-5, to provide for the relief of persons who have been convicted of offences and have subsequently rehabilitated themselves, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that when we adjourned the debate the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) had the floor—the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) had the floor.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I believe he had concluded his remarks, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peters: I am willing.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is always willing.

[*Translation*]

I believe that the hon. member for Portneuf wishes to take part in the debate, so I now give him the floor.

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, this small bill made up of eight clauses, running to four pages only and entitled the Criminal Records Act is of great interest to me. I hope that this piece of legislation will bring peace and some hope to those who have an undeserved criminal record or one which results from an extremely unfortunate situation.

Since it is quite easy nowadays, in our society, to have such a record, I think that this bill which provides for the expunging of records after five years have elapsed, is most welcome and I wonder why it has not been brought forward sooner.

Moreover, if this act is fairly applied, irrespective of race, language, religion or political affiliation, we can expect very good results from it.

A small enquiry is enough to show that, at the present time, there are too many people who, after having been charged, wind up with a record. Many people in my riding, from all walks of life, have had an opportunity to realize that cases of miscarriage of justice are more numerous than reported by the media. The victims resign themselves to their lot, often for lack of money, or because they just cannot pursue the matter further. This is often caused by a lack of confidence in the courts and because they are sure right from the start that they would lose their case. Whether it be in municipal, provincial or federal courts, I suggest that there are not enough judges, that they use obsolete methods and that they have to examine too many cases at the same time and also to pass judgments without having enough information on the case.

Another abnormal situation is that judges have not all been chosen wisely. Unfortunately, they are appointed to those positions as a reward for political or other services. That some persons whose behaviour has never been exemplary should be in a position to pass judgment on the behaviour of others, that is a puzzle to most people.

I have before me an article published on December 5, 1969, in *La Presse,* one of the most important dailies in America. It reads:

For shoplifting of goods worth $37.21: seven days; For stealing and receiving a value of $160,000: seven days.

Criminal Records

In municipal court, by mere chance, that police officer was shaking his head when a number of female shoplifters were sentenced to seven full days for stealing goods worth some ten dollars in Miracle Mart outlets.

Incidentally, none of them had a record, like that 19-year old girl whose eyes were wet with tears as she walked to a cell for having stolen some pieces of clothing worth $37.21 in all.

One question . . . !

"It's serious, the police officer told us".

"But, asked the same detective, don't you think it is as serious for a 35-year old habitual criminal to steal $160,000?

The people have lost confidence in the courts because some of the jurists have a doubtful past. And it is always the same question: are these people with a doubtful past fit to judge the actions of others? You can imagine a Conservative judge having to render a verdict in the case of a liberal organizer who was responsible for his defeat in the last election.

Besides, old racial grudges might flare up again. Just imagine a Chinaman being judged by a Russian or an English speaking Canadian from Ontario being tried by a Quebec separatist judge. Or else, a unilingual French Canadian of Quebec being judged by a unilingual English speaking judge from another province.

Past events provide us with enough evidence that too many people are given false records. A man from Rimouski visiting Quebec City last spring asked a taxi driver where the Court of Justice was. The driver replied: "Well, my friend, the Court is over there, but you will have to look for Justice!"

I think that legal proceedings are obsolete in many cases. They never end because giving oral testimony is an ancient custom dating back to the days when most people were illiterate, which made it necessary for people to meet personally in order to settle a number of issues.

In my opinion, we should consider giving written testimony as this would do away with much too many postponements.

Since Unemployment Insurance Commission officials generally solve most cases this way, I feel that other courts should consider doing the same thing.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Since in many cases the accused and the witnesses could prepare their own testimonies themselves, it would obviously save the parties concerned some expense as often the accused could dispense with an attorney's services.

[Mr. Godin.]

In police matters, self-examination is also necessary. In order to avoid the opening of certain files, the R.C.M.P. should never intervene without valid reasons. This police body is never too expeditious when it comes to find individuals of the calibre of Lucien Rivard or Georges Lemay. When it comes to arresting a peaceful citizen, however, it is something different. Just by placing a telephone call, anyone can have a man arrested. I am thinking precisely of the particular case of a Quebecer who had become a bit of a nuisance for certain citizens comfortably entrenched on the municipal council. A mere telephone call and our man was "penned" for two months following false testimony.

Such methods are of a blatant dishonesty and I firmly hope that means will be found to put an end to them.

If I might be allowed to make a comparison, Mr. Speaker, in order to qualify for a $200 yearly subsidy, a farmer must submit an affidavit to the Canadian Dairy Commission, and when it is attempted to destroy the reputation of a citizen, it is abnormal, I think, that one anonymous phone call should be enough to set in motion the police machinery. I will quote, if I may, a letter dated November 8, 1968 which was sent to me by the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. It reads as follows:

I shall not mention the name.

On July 15th, 1968, our Quebec detachment was advised by a fictitious source that a stranger was bottlegging alcohol in a car—

Mr. Speaker, the investigation later revealed that the man in question had merely been the victim of a mean trick. As his friends were thinking of having him elected alderman, an opponent had simply put a gallon of "home brew" in the car that was seized.

Allow me to read you the next paragraph:

You will no doubt be pleased to hear that following further investigation no action will be taken under the Excise Act and we have asked our chief of police in Montreal to return the car that was being held.

I say again that my first letter was sent to the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. on September 13th, and I point out that the reply was sent only on November 8th, that is four days after the municipal elections in the area concerned. Needless to say the taxpayer was defeated and finally the purpose of the anonymous phone call achieved.

I should now like to deal with another situation, that of the construction of prisons, federal and provincial. As you know those buildings are filled to capacity. It is not that the citizens have turned evil suddenly, but that with a few exceptions, our citizens are willing to abide by the law provided they are given a chance. Unfortunately, under our present political system, too many Canadians have been refused that chance.

We have proof of this in the number of State boarders in our prisons, which number always bears a relation with the number of unemployed. Every time citizens are drafted, statistics prove that our prisons become empty. On battlefields, in plants, everywhere, citizens find a way of selling their services.

Nowadays, in this quiet era where there is nobody to wage war against us, we must wait and what is more, we must make others wait.

Young people are fed up with waiting, waiting for a scholarship, for a job, for a meagre welfare assistance, for a chance to get married, for a buoyant economy, for their district to become a designated area, for inflation to be checked.

Mr. Speaker, one must not be surprised if all those people who are forced to wait decide at one time or other to help themselves. Thieves who are arrested may be less guilty than some others more clever, more able to monopolize what belongs to others on account of their profession or of the position they hold.

I certainly welcome Bill C-5 which will help to rehabilitate the alleged outlaw, but in my opinion, we need more than that. To pull an inmate out of prison and help him to make a new start in life is not bad, but we should do everything in our power to prevent the judges from passing unacceptable sentences. I feel that nowadays, too many irresponsible actions are done in the name of the law. When the government has reached the point of creating unemployment in order to balance the economy, we have a right to ask questions and the duty to state our views on the problems resulting from bad administration.

I have nothing against a bill suggesting to expunge judicial records after five years. However, we should take steps to prevent people from committing further offences.

Bill C-5 will be automatically ineffective if the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) for instance remains shut up in his office. I think that the economic field should also be considered.

Too many Canadians lack basic necessities and are induced to break the rules and to ignore the laws of the land. If the country has the right to make laws which must be obeyed, the citizens also have rights, the first one being the right to live.

The policy and legislation of the Canadian government will be just when they are obeyed by the administrators and all levels of government.

However, I rely on the understanding of this government and mainly of the Minister of Justice. I hope that he will convince the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to set up a just and honest system, not in the name of the law but in the name of life and the right to live.

[*English*]

Mr. D. R. Tolmie (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) for bringing before the House this bill incorporating the practice of sealing records. From my subsequent remarks it will be noted that I feel if this bill is to be of any real benefit to a convicted person, it must have substantial amendments.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I first became interested in this subject in 1966 and brought in a private member's bill which was later studied by the justice committee. I had no intention that the private bill would become law and used it only as a vehicle to introduce the principle of sealing criminal records. The justice committee held four formal meetings with witnesses, all of whom agreed with the principle of sealing criminal records. A report was made to the House, and later the then Solicitor General, Mr. Pennell, made recommendations to the cabinet which were accepted.

In order to produce an effective bill, one must consider what we are really trying to do by sealing criminal records. This is not an attempt to be soft with criminals; it is not another bleeding-heart crusade. This bill should have one goal only, to restore to the offender as far as possible all the civil and economic rights he enjoyed before the offence was committed.

This type of legislation should relieve people who have paid their debt to society, and taken their place as law-abiding citizens, of the continuing stigma and harassment of past criminal records. The principle of this bill should be based on the concept that a sentence served is expiation for his crime,

and on the grounds that the perpetual retention of a criminal record impedes rehabilitation. In addition, this proposed legislation should endeavour to eliminate the real disabilities a convicted person suffers by the retention of his record.

It has been stated that we sentence, we coerce, we incarcerate, we counsel, we grant probation and parole, but we never forgive. There is considerable evidence to indicate that the failure of the criminal law to clarify the status of the reformed offender impedes the objective of reintegrating him with the society from which he has been estranged. The more heavily he bears the mark of his former offence, the more likely he is to re-offend.

The most troublesome disabilities to the reformed offender are the economic and social reprisals engendered by his brand as an adjudicated criminal. The vagaries of public sentiment often discriminate against persons with a criminal past. This is especially true in the vital matter of employment, which perhaps as much as anything else influences a man's concept of himself and his worth and accordingly influences the values which guide his conduct. The effects of criminal stigma are felt even more strongly in the area of licences and government-regulated occupations than in the sector of public employment. In many cases, employment in the public service, enlistment in the armed forces, employment where bonding is required, and licensed employment such as taxi driving, is refused absolutely or seriously curtailed.

Perhaps in particular the purpose of this bill should be to assist the thousands of Canadians who in their youth incurred a record for some petty offence and are now completely rehabilitated and law-abiding citizens.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Tolmie: The recent number of convictions of young people for marijuana offences illustrates how necessary this type of legislation really is. Many of these young people who have paid their debt to society will continue to be harassed and hurt emotionally and economically to their dying days. I should also add, if one needed further persuasion about the necessity for such legislation, that since the introduction of my private member's bill I have received numerous pleading, heart-rending letters from across Canada urging the early passage of legislation to provide for the sealing of records.

Without going into too much detail, because I hope this bill will go to the justice committee for close scrutiny, I would like to make a few remarks about the principle contained in the bill now before the House. Frankly, although as I have already indicated that I commend the Solicitor General for introducing this legislation, in my opinion in its present form it will not achieve the objectives this type of legislation should achieve.

First, instead of pertaining only to offences under an act of the Parliament of Canada or a regulation made thereunder, this bill should apply to all records under federal jurisdiction even though the offence was against a provincial statute. This certainly would broaden the scope of the act and give relief to many more people, which I presume is the intention of the bill.

Second, after the applicant applies, the act should not state that the Parole Board shall cause proper inquiries to be made in order to ascertain the behaviour of the applicant. People who are applying for the sealing of their records will in the main be those who suffered a conviction years ago and since that time have been living an ordinary life, with the public completely unaware of their past indiscretion. Any investigation would vitiate the very object and spirit of the legislation. This type of applicant would not want officials prying into his private life, asking neighbours if he is a decent citizen and arousing suspicion. It should be accepted policy that if the five-year period has elapsed without a conviction, he has rehabilitated himself and the expungement of the adjudication of his guilt should be made mandatory unless strong affirmative reasons exist for denial. In addition, any judgment denying expungement should be made appealable by the applicant.

The mechanics envisaged by this bill seem unduly tortuous and complicated. An application must be started, followed by a National Parole Board inquiry, followed by a favourable report to the Solicitor General of Canada, followed by referral of the recommendation to the federal cabinet, followed by cabinet consideration and government approval. This is a cumbersome procedure. I submit the application should be made to a competent authority, be it the National Parole Board or a board of convictions review in the Department of Justice, adjudicated upon with the right of appeal to the Governor in Council.

Third, the effect of the pardon as outlined in the bill is of little or no practical benefit to the applicant. What tangible good is it for an applicant to know that the government is satisfied that he has behaved properly and that the pardon granted should no longer reflect adversely on his character? Brave, noble and pious words—but of no practical benefit. The applicant is applying because he wants relief from not only the psychological effect of a record but from the economic consequences. He wants to be able to compete in the marketplace for employment on equal terms with his fellow citizens. This desire is the whole crux of this bill. He has paid the penalty; he does not want a conviction, in many cases incurred years ago, to haunt and taunt him when he seeks employment.

The statute should expressly set forth the effects of the order in restoring the civil rights of the redeemed offender, and it should expressly annul the conviction and the offence. In addition to specifying that the person will thereafter be regarded as never having offended, it should provide that in all cases of employment, application for licence or other civil privilege, examination as a witness and the like, the person may be questioned only with respect to arrests or convictions not annulled or expunged. A person might be questioned about his previous criminal conduct only in language such as the following: Have you ever been arrested for or convicted of a crime which has not been expunged by a competent authority? It is submitted that to restrict the questioning about his offence places the focus where it belong, on the attitudes of society.

Mr. Solicitor General, there has been some indication—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but I would like to bring to his attention that his remarks should be directed to the Chair rather than to the Solicitor General.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Tolmie: There has been some indication that certain Crown corporations and government agencies no longer, in their employment application forms, ask questions about an applicant's record. The Solicitor General apparently favours this trend. Therefore, if such a clause pertaining to limited inquiry about records were placed in the statute, it would be crystal clear that all agencies over which the government has control would be forced to comply with this new concept. This would apply to corporations such as the CBC, Air Canada and the CNR. It would also apply to the Armed Forces and the public service.

I am aware that constitutionally the government of Canada cannot, by legislation, force ordinary employers, individual or corporate, to restrict themselves to the limited inquiry rule. But I do know the Province of Ontario is interested in this type of legislation and I urge the Solicitor General to contact the Attorney General for the Province of Ontario and ask him to introduce similar legislation in Ontario, particularly in relation to limited inquiry about records by employers.

In the fifth place, I believe the principle of limited disclosure should be incorporated into this bill. We know there is a lively traffic in facts about all of us, particularly facts relating to such matters as criminal records. Consideration should be given to requiring that every person, agency and business which keeps records of criminal conviction, whatever may be their purpose, inform the minister of the existence of these records and, upon sealing, all such persons or agencies, other than perhaps the commissioner of the RCMP, should be directed to destroy them.

It should also be noted that Canada is not pioneering this type of legislation. Other countries including Russia, France, Turkey, Bulgaria, Spain, Belgium, Hungary and Italy have legislation aimed at eliminating the effects of a previous conviction. California has held extensive hearings on the question of sealing criminal records and is in the process of drafting a bill. I hope the justice committee will have available for its deliberations memos of this comparative law, which I feel would be most helpful.

Associate professor of law at the University of Santa Clara, Aidan R. Gough, has written a comprehensive and incisive article on the expungement of records, which may be found in the Washington University Law Quarterly, volume 1966, No. 2, April, 1966. I would recommend this article to members who wish to learn more about this important subject.

I do not think that the bill before us, or any revised bill, will cure completely the disability suffered by those with convictions. However, I do feel that such legislation will be of benefit to many decent Canadian citizens. Only when the public generally is educated to the point of view that once a man has paid his penalty, society should not exact further punishment, will the offender find the path to true rehabilitation. Parliament creates the

situation under which a record is brought into being. The use which Parliament allows to be made of that record is also its responsibility.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote from Professor Gough's article in the Washington Law Quarterly as follows:

> Most offenders do not remain criminals all their lives, and we should not treat them as if they do. It is manifestly not the purpose of the penal law to ascribe permanent criminality to a first offender, though that is largely its effect. This article is not intended as a panegyric for a soft-headed penology. It is rather an attempt to point up a serious flaw in our present legal system; the failure to provide means for redefining the status of the rehabilitated transgressor. It is submitted that an expungement process will not serve to hamper effective law enforcement, but will stand as an adjuvant to the goal of the correctional law. It should provide a potent incentive to reformation, and should render our response to criminality less febrile and more effectual. At the very least, it is deserving of serious trial.
>
> We would do well to bear in mind that it is a legal principle that correctional law is forgiving. Forgiveness is part and parcel of rehabilitation, whether of criminals or anyone else who has erred, or who has, in fact, what all of us have—the defects of being human.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing tonight with Bill C-5, an act to provide for the relief of persons who have been convicted of offences. Basically, what we are trying to do here is, in certain circumstances—as the chairman of our Justice and Legal Affairs Committee has so ably put it—expunge the records of those who have been convicted. According to the Oxford Dictionary, "expunge" means to erase, omit or do away with.

First of all, I should like to say that we are very fortunate, I think, in the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, to have a chairman of such high calibre.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: I would say to the minister in charge, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I adopt pretty well everything the hon. member said tonight. That is why my own speech can be brief. He has stated clearly that the bill before us is a great disappointment to anyone who has any knowledge of criminal jurisprudence, and that it will not do the job which the committee recommended to the minister before the measure was introduced in the House.

I now wish to deal with a subject mentioned by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Tolmie) in a brief reference. I refer to the Criminal Code itself. When we talk about great reforms we should realize that the Criminal Code of Canada contains section 12, which states:

> No person shall be convicted of an offence in respect of an act or omission on his part while he was under the age of seven years.

Then it provides—this is section 13 on page 10 of Tremear's Criminal Code—as follows:

> No person shall be convicted of an offence in respect of an act or omission on his part while he was seven years of age or more, but under the age of 14, unless he was competent to know the nature and consequences of his conduct and to appreciate that it was wrong.

We are dealing today with a difficult situation. The Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) may close his eyes to it, but there is a problem facing us in many of our universities and high schools inasmuch as 50 or 60 per cent of the young people of this nation are, whether we like it or not, on marijuana or drugs.

The Code contains a section which provides that a person over the age of seven can be convicted of any offence while he is between the age of seven and 14, provided he knows the nature and consequences of the offence. In other words, we are faced with a situation to which I drew attention in the House of Commons some time ago, in which young men aged 15, 16, 17 and 18 across this nation, in urban centres where 80 per cent of Canadians will be living in the near future, are subject to the Narcotic Control Act and to the Food and Drugs Act, under which they could be incarcerated for more than two years. This would create for them a criminal record which would prevent, for example, their going to the United States.

The problem to which I refer is not confined to Canada and the United States; it is faced by all western countries. We are dealing with a most serious subject in an area in which the law has remained unreformed. Since I have been in the House I have on four occasions introduced a bill to amend this particular section of the Code with reference to the age at which a person may be convicted.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I have brought to the attention of the Solicitor General in the House of Commons cases of young men and women aged 15 or 16 who have been incarcerated in the penitentiary without being given any chance during that time to rehabilitate themselves and expunge their criminal record, thus enabling them to go if they so chose to the United States or any other country. That is the situation that exists today. In addition, once a

young man or young woman who has a criminal record gets into some other difficulty in society and is charged under any section of the Criminal Code, what happens when bail comes to be set? In all our great, sprawling urban centres the Crown counsel reads out the record. If the record is A plus B equals C, what happens? A different scale of bail is set. The record is referred to every time the question of bail arises.

Once a young person has paid his debt to society and goes out to try to obtain employment, what is the situation if he requires to be bonded in order to obtain a job? Since he has a criminal record, the bonding company will not make him bondable.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether in making his last statement the hon. member is being up-to-date on that subject. The fact is that there is a procedure whereby bonding companies do grant bonds to persons who have been previously convicted. This fact was the subject of a public announcement last fall, when a great deal of detail was given.

Mr. Woolliams: The Solicitor General may want to make a speech on the subject, but he knows as well as I do that when an application is made to a bonding company by a person with a criminal record, the bonding company will take a tough look at it. The company uses its discretion whether to grant the person a bond.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member is not up-to-date at all on that.

Mr. Woolliams: As far as I am concerned, that is what is going on in Canada today. Let the minister check it out.

Mr. McIlraith: It has not been going on for the last six months.

Mr. Woolliams: My hon. friend says that I am not up-to-date. He is so up-to-date that when I asked him several months ago whether he had Crown counsel representing the Department of Justice in a matter dealing with drugs, a question I asked him as Solicitor General, as the person who appoints Crown counsel, who are generally Liberal—in politics that is how they are appointed—on the subject of sentence, he used the wishy-washy answer that he knew nothing about the charges or the appointments. I suggest a man who does not know anything about—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the hon. member is not straying from the bill now before the House. I invite him to revert to what we are supposed to be considering, which is the principle of Bill C-5 which is now under consideration.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The only reason I put the question was that this is still a matter of court procedure and concerns the appointment of Crown counsel. Young men and women who come before magistrates and courts and who are dealt with by those the minister appoints, if convicted are given a criminal record. Therefore, I submit my point is admissible in so far as this particular argument is concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may think that, but if the Chair has to make a ruling I would tell the hon. member that what he is saying is irrelevant to the bill.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have always abided by your rulings, but may I say through you that the Solicitor General should be prepared to accept the argument I have put forward with regard to the bonding of young people. The situation today is that people with criminal records, irrespective of under what section of the Criminal Code of Canada they are charged, are not given a bond. I suggest it is high time we took a hard look at this situation.

May I come back to a matter I started with. We have developed a new committee system. The justice committee made certain recommendations to the government and to the minister. In spite of this, the bill has not been drawn along those lines. Committees make recommendations to a minister having made a study of a certain subject and having called before it witnesses from across the nation. In view of this, those recommendations should be accepted by the minister and the government. The committee hears all the pros and cons before making its decision.

The minister has not yet told the House, though he may when he closes the debate, why he has not accepted the recommendations made by the committee and as set out by the hon. member for Welland. If, as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said the other day, we are moving toward the presidential system of government, which means that our committees would take on a new type of responsibility in making recommendations to the government, then surely under such system the recommendations of committees should be accepted. On that ground this bill is

a great disappointment; it has not incorporated the recommendations that have already been made by the committee.

How are committees of the House of Commons formed? The justice committee is probably fortunate in that it is made up of professional people. It is a pretty independent committee and does on occasion make recommendations that are contrary to the policy of the executive. However, if our recommendations are to be ignored, we might as well lock the door of the committee because we are just wasting our time.

If, under this new presidential system, the executive is to take the position that any recommendation made by a committee is all right as a recommendation, that members of the House who are very able are to be kept busy attending committees and studying subjects, but that their recommendations are to be put by the minister into the filing basket and he thereupon comes forward with a bill that is recommended by his own advisers, we are wasting our time. In view of what the chairman of the committee said tonight, what will be the position if the committee makes certain recommendations in regard to this bill? Will the minister come back to the House and tell us that the bill will go through, no matter what the committee has recommended? In the justice committee there are a number of backbenchers who are able professional men, just as able as the minister.

Mr. Deachman: Able men on both sides of the House.

Mr. Woolliams: I am glad the hon. member said both sides of the House. But are we to be merely rubber stamps? If the minister is going to bring in his own bill anyway, then as I see it the committee is wasting its time.

There is a very simple procedure for dealing with this situation. What we should do is to go through, as we are tonight, the sham of second reading of the bill and send it to the committee. No longer does the committee of the whole House study each clause of the bill. The standing committee can waste a few hours for each of two or three weeks studying the clauses and making recommendations to the minister. If the minister, in spite of the remarks made by the chairman of the justice committee tonight, is not prepared to accept the recommendations of his own chairman, a man who doubtless had the approval both of the minister and the Prime Minister, then he is setting himself up as a little tin god. He will be a member of an executive that is going to run to the country its way no matter what the members of the Liberal Party of the opposition say.

• (9:50 p.m.)

This emphasizes once again the waste of time of committees. If the government wants to keep its backbenchers busy—and they are getting wise to this—on projects such as contained in this bill, I hope it will not think we are naïve enough over here that we will be engaged in this kind of project which does not lead to fruition as far as reform of the Criminal Code is concerned.

The recommendation I make is the same as that of the hon. member for Welland. If we are to have effective reforms in respect of those who run afoul of the law so far as the Criminal Code is concerned and are sentenced to penitentiary where they are fingerprinted and catalogued, having served their incarceration and after another five years we should be able to expunge the record and let that man or woman start over again.

I should like to express one last thought. I ask the minister to reconsider his position. I hope when he comes before the committee he will be able to accept the unanimous recommendations of the committee and agree to amend the bill. We will then feel that the committee is doing something and functioning properly, and that the minister and the executives are actually listening to Members of Parliament rather than just running this country as little tin gods and dictators.

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the debate on Bill C-5 which, when passed, will provide relief for persons who have been convicted of offences and subsequently have rehabilitated themselves. However, not being a lawyer like those who preceded me, I am not going to deal with the technicalities of the law but rather with the compassion that this legislation will rouse in the hearts of men.

I have a special interest in this bill because a member of my family has been very active in the work of the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Societies of Thunder Bay. It is a bill, as was pointed out by the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), that is an honest attempt by the government to bring forward legislation that will deal with the aspect of rehabilitation of persons who have been convicted of an offence and have subsequently

shown evidence of good character, to whom the National Parole Board, upon application, would grant a pardon and cancel the conviction and, in addition, provide the withdrawal of criminal records.

Personally, I wish to congratulate the Solicitor General for introducing a bill which will enable the National Parole Board to consider deserving applicants for pardon.

I am also certain that the principle of relief for rehabilitated offenders will be supported by members of all parties and by the vast majority of the public. Punishment is the easiest but not necessarily the most successful way to deal with criminals. They are put behind bars, confined within walls of dreary rooms like so much surplus humanity. We are confident that while they are there they will not commit the same offences and hopefully believe that others warned by their punishment will avoid engaging in similar offences. The trouble is that it does not seem to deter crime. In the Middle Ages convicts were branded with hot irons, or their heads were cut off, but in spite of these and other punishments crime continued to flourish, especially in the slums of big cities.

The government of Canada is to be commended for introducing a policy which may well reduce the crime rate and at the same time save the nation millions of dollars a year. A few months ago the chairman of the National Parole Board made a statement to the effect that allowing a prisoner to return to a productive life produces savings in two ways: the state is no longer responsible for his maintenance and he is usually able to support himself, his wife and family.

He also gave us a very interesting report on paroled offenders. For one month it showed that 2,284, or 86 per cent, were gainfully employed. Their gross earnings for the month were over $673,000 and they were supporting 2,514 dependants. Multiply these earnings by 12, and the total income is over $8 million for the full year, with the parolees subject to normal income tax and other taxes that all Canadians must pay.

The cost of keeping an inmate in a federal penal institution ranges from $3,600 to nearly $5,000 a year, while the cost of keeping a man on parole is only $300 to $500. Money is a big factor, but not necessarily the most important one. It is also reassuring that almost 90 per cent of paroled men complete their parole periods satisfactorily.

Therefore, it is quite evident that parole is not only effective in rehabilitation but represents a tremendous saving to the taxpayer. But what is even more important is that in the year 1968, for which I have the figures, 3,689 paroles were granted and of this number only 480 paroles were revoked.

It may not be generally known that the Parole Board consults judges about prisoners whom they have sentenced. It is impossible to have a parole system unless we release persons from prison. Mr. Justice Ouimet once stated in a report:

> Parole is a treatment-oriented correctional measure, not a sentence-correcting method. It is in no way aimed at reviewing the sentence of the court... As part of the correctional process, its function is rather to determine the portion of the sentence which is to be spent in the community and the kind of control and supervision which will be needed...
>
> At the same time, for the offender, parole is an opportunity and a test of his self control and ability to get along in the community. For society it offers immediate protection through a degree of surveillance and control over offender behaviour and long term protection through a reduced likelihood of recidivism.

There will always be individuals who cannot be trusted as members of society because of problems which make them dangerous at all time. They must be kept segregated. On the other hand, this bill is a move to long overdue, more humane and more sensible treatment of the average person who breaks the law.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Some years ago Sir Winston Churchill, writing about crime and brutality, wrote these words:

> The mood and temper of the public with regard to the treatment of crime and criminals is one of the most unfailing tests of the civilization of any country. A calm dispassionate recognition of the rights of the accused, and even of the convicted criminal against the state; a constant heart searching by all charged with the duty of punishment; a desire and an eagerness to rehabilitate...tireless efforts, unfailing faith that there is a treasure, if you can find it, in the heart of every man. These are the symbols which... mark and measure the stored up strength of a nation... proof of the living virtue in it.

The substance of this bill is a heartwarming decision on the part of the government. The changes will depend largely on fuller use of probation and parole services.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but it is approximately ten o'clock. Has the hon. member unanimous consent to complete his remarks?

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: I believe there is agreement to allow the hon. member to conclude his remarks within approximately five minutes.

Mr. Badanai: Thank you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members. The John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Societies are doing a tremendous job with limited and inadequate financial resources. Here I appeal to the Solicitor General to be more generous in granting financial assistance to these societies which are composed of men and women dedicated to the rehabilitation of the unfortunate young and old who happen to fall into the channels of crime.

To give an example, the executive secretary of the John Howard Society of Thunder Bay, who visits the Manitoba penitentiary 12 times a year to see the inmates from Ontario and who also looks after the parolees from the province of Ontario, receives only $1,500 a year toward an operating budget of $21,000. The balance has to be obtained from the Thunder Bay United Appeal and membership subscriptions. This is always a haphazard dependence because in some years the United Appeal fails to reach its objective, and membership decreases.

In 1969 the society looked after 14 parolees. It could handle more if it had more money. Therefore, I suggest that a revision of the relationship between the federal government and the John Howard Society be carried out with the object of increasing the latter's effectiveness by greater financial support.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, on a question of order, before we move on to the next item of business perhaps I might confirm that it would be the intention tomorrow to call this measure after the two which have been announced.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS—STEPHENVILLE, NFLD—CONSTRUCTION OF NEW FACILITIES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I should first like to apologize to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) for having been brought back at this late hour, especially since I did not have an opportunity last year to thank him for announcing to me that my district was to have a $2½ million harbour development. This was much to the consternation of another minister who had wanted to make the announcement first. However, I was able to beat him to the punch.

I should like to deal with a question in respect of which I have difficulty in obtaining answers. Ordinarily I like to deal with members of the staff rather than bother the minister and take up the time of the House. Last year a meeting was held at the town of Stephenville among members of the town council, the chambers of commerce and all interested leaders of the surrounding communities to discuss the need for expanded postal facilities due to the projected expansion of the town by way of potential industry and the resultant need of expanded postal communication.

It was agreed by the district postal supervisor, who attended the meeting along with myself, that in view of the potential growth of the area a study should be made of the expanded projected growth commensurate with the planned increase in population due to growth of planned industry. Furthermore, it was agreed that the existing post office was located at a dangerous intersection where normal access was difficult due to the danger of being in a school area which endangered this access, and in turn endangered the safety of hundreds of children.

After serious consideration it was agreed after further study that to facilitate economy of purpose, consideration should be given to the establishment of a federal building not only to house the post office but other federal agencies which the government was leasing, which tended to destroy centralization of purpose to facilitate proper administration.

My grievance is not with the action of government but is only raised to indicate my inability to follow progress with regard to the eventual decision to provide the facility. I cannot understand why I cannot get a definite, straightforward answer with regard to progress, as a Member of Parliament who is only trying to obtain the information asked for by the people whom I represent. I would not mind if I were told to mind my own business or, "We don't tell you anything." But to be kept waiting and being offered procrastinating excuses, that I will have the answer

[Mr. Speaker.]

tomorrow—and tomorrow never comes—is becoming difficult to bear.

Sooner or later, Mr. Speaker, we will have to treat one another with respect. I only ask to be told—as is my right on behalf of the people I represent—at what stage of progress is the consideration of the construction of a federal building for the community of Stephenville to serve the governmental needs of the people of the Port au Port peninsula. I ask the minister to indicate the intentions of the government, so that I can fulfil my obligations to these people who deserve an answer, and get on with the many other problems of my district. I request this answer with the great respect which I have for the Minister of Public Works.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, after the double-edged speech that the hon. member has made, in which he first thanked me for having made an error, I do not know how I can handle this question. I will endeavour not to repeat the error that I apparently made last year, so that when he leaves tonight he will probably not know a great deal more than he knows now, and probably not a great deal more than I know.

I agree with the hon. member that we are speaking of an area that is a potential growth area, an area which has come to the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). I agree with him that the present location of the post office is inadequate, in that it is directly across the street from a large school and the traffic is dangerous to the school children. Our difficulty is that the total plans of the government with respect to the growth of the area are not yet fully formulated.

If my hon. friend asked me tonight what is going into that federal building, I could not tell him now. Although some departments require space in it, they have not yet indicated to us their full requirements. But I can assure him that the longer this matter is put off, the larger the building will be, because that is generally the case.

It is our hope—and I am not going to publish tonight any indication of my estimates which will be tabled in the House in a week or two—that in my estimates there will be an item that will enable us to make an additional acquisition of property there of about 200 feet by 200 feet, and this in a good area of the city. In addition, it will enable us to draw up the plan for the building which might commence, subject to the approval of the government in respect of those estimates, in the following year.

• (10:10 p.m.)

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—INFLATION—INCREASE IN BANK DIRECTORS' FEES

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, on January 21 I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) whether he would give consideration to requesting restraint by officials of the Toronto Dominion Bank who had announced the day before that the annual fees paid to directors of the bank were to be increased from $6,000 to $8,100, an increase of 33 per cent at one time. In view of the government's program of austerity and moderation, it seemed to me that the minister might ask the officers of the bank for restraint.

The minister answered facetiously that he was pleased that I was a supporter of moderation in wage demands. I will come back to that in a moment. The policy of the minister and of the government is obviously influenced by the kind of advice they are getting from the governor of the Royal Bank of Canada, the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission and, I presume, the Deputy Minister of Finance.

I do not need to reiterate the kind of speeches the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission has been making. They are well known to every Canadian citizen who reads a newspaper or watches television. The governor of the Bank of Canada made a speech to the Canadian Club in Montreal a few days ago which was reported in the *Globe and Mail* of February 3. I read a couple of sentences from the newspaper report as follows:

> Louis Rasminsky, governor of the Bank of Canada, defended Canada's anti-inflation measures yesterday by saying that without the restraints, the situation would have been worse.

He went on to say:

> Wages and salaries in Canada continue to show a year to year gain in the range of 7 to 7.5 per cent which was greatly in excess of the trend of productivity increases—

> He put his support firmly behind the commission: "The Prices and Incomes Commission has recently taken an important initiative, which deserves the full support of the whole community."

Mr. Speaker, it is that kind of thinking which has led the governor of the Bank of Canada and the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission to urge working people to show restraint in the wage increases they

are claiming, and to urge leaders of the labour movement to go to their members and try to sell this type of program. They have been joined by the press and other news media who have been, to say the least, unenthusiastic about a policy of wage restraint.

I do not believe wage restraint can work. I say to the Minister of Finance—or I would if he were here—and to the government that the only way wage restraint would have a chance of working would be if the government really meant business and were to show the ordinary working people that restraint is for everybody. I think they should start with just the people I have spoken about. The governor of the Bank of Canada recently had his salary increased from $50,000 to $75,000 a year. I submit that does not show much restraint.

In 1966 the Deputy Minister of Finance was paid a salary of $27,000 a year, but he now receives between $37,000 and $40,000 a year, which is an increase of at least 37 per cent in less than four years. The chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission is also paid $37,000 to $40,000 a year, which I suggest is substantially more than he made as a professor at the University of British Columbia. I am not suggesting that they are being paid too much; I am simply saying there is not much restraint here.

Looking at self-employed people we see the same pattern. The income of doctors and surgeons in ten years from 1957 to 1967 has increased by 95 per cent to a total in 1967 of $27,000. The income of engineers and architects in those ten years has increased by 51.6 per cent to over $22,000. The incomes of lawyers and notaries has gone up on the average by 66.2 per cent, their average income in 1967 being over $22,000.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting this is too much, but I am simply suggesting that if the government believes in restraint it must demonstrate its belief by demanding equity. If sacrifices have to be made, in other words, I suggest it is unfair and completely wrong for the government to urge restraint and sacrifice by ordinary working people. We have heard a great deal about tremendous increases in wages, the so-called inflationary wage increases that have gone to our supposedly higher paid steel workers and auto workers.

The Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gray) from Windsor knows how much auto workers earn. Few auto workers or steel workers in this country earn more than $8,000—not a great income but one which enables them to get by at a certain standard of living. If the government believes in restraint, it can demonstrate its belief by saying to people like the directors of the Toronto-Dominion Bank and other captains of industry, "Do not ask for restraint on the part of others. Do not try to stop inflation by putting the blocks to ordinary working people. Instead, let us see you setting an example by showing some restraint." If and when they do that—and I submit they have not yet begun to do it—the leaders of trade unions in this country might be persuaded to go to their members with the kind of appeal the government has been making in recent days.

[Mr. Orlikow.]

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, the government has set up as part of its fight against inflation the Prices and Incomes Commission. The commission has been working to create a program of voluntary restraint on the part of all sectors of the economy as a method of breaking into the inflationary spiral and in this way speeding up the process of stemming the pressures of inflation. In its efforts the commission appears to have taken into account the views of certain labour leaders to the effect that attention be given to restraining rises in prices before looking into ways of restraining wages and salaries.

The commission, therefore, has been working to obtain a consensus from the business community on a formula to limit increases in prices. The leaders of several large business groups have given their support to this concept. Several key companies and key industries have at the request of the government agreed not to put into effect certain prices increases at least until March 1.

The Prices and Incomes Commission will hold next week in Ottawa a conference of business leaders to attempt to develop and confirm such a consensus. Once this is done the commission will be able to turn its attention to the role of other sectors. As the hon. member has said, no one suffers more from the effects of inflation than the working man—people in the low-income group. That is why we are calling for the support of all sectors for the efforts of the Prices and Incomes Commission and for the efforts of the government to stem the process of inflation before it does further harm to the Canadian economy.

As the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) said, he was very pleased to hear the remarks

that the hon. member made in the House which seemed to indicate support for moderation in wage demands. This is very significant, coming as it does from a member of the NDP, the party which some leaders of the labour movement refer to as the official voice of the labour movement. Many will say it is very encouraging, Mr. Speaker.

CANADIAN PACIFIC—MONTREAL-QUEBEC LINE —CLOSING OF STATIONS AFTER SIX O'CLOCK —LACK OF COMFORT FOR PASSENGERS

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I will confess right away that I have had a very innocent and interesting passion all my life: I have kept cats and dogs. I would have blamed myself, and my fellow citizens would have blamed me, if I had kept these charming animals freezing outside in cold weather such as we have had lately. But the Canadian Pacific does this regularly. The CPR has no heart or soul; sometimes we wonder if the CPR has any conscience when it leaves its customers frozen on the platforms of our railway stations.

• (10:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

I have raised that question because before the departure of the CPR evening train from Montreal to Quebec, the waiting rooms are kept closed, which forces the passengers, for all kinds of reasons, to wait in the cold on the station platform, while they sometimes come from far away or accompany sick women or children.

I ask the minister to intervene with the Canadian Transport Commission to have that situation corrected immediately, because I have the feeling that the Canadian Pacific deceives the people.

History will probably tell that it is the fraud of the century, since from the outset the CPR has obtained from Canadians fabulous wealth and exemptions which bring it fantastic returns and turned many Canadians into millionaires. The Canadian people have no objection to that provided that the Canadian Pacific supplies a proper service, but the company is not keeping its promise since it has created separate companies in paying sectors but complains that the passenger service is not profitable enough. It hopes to be able one day to turn its management over to the government.

It is time to remind the CPR that it is bound by a commitment to the Canadian people, that of giving proper service. One should not forget that the Canadian public has given with an overwhelming generosity very substantial sums of money to that company.

Those are signs of a gigantic fraud that should alarm Parliament and the public opinion, and which should be terminated very soon.

Mr. Gérard Loiselle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the hon. member for Trois-Rivières (Mr. Mongrain) for his rousing speech against the closing of some railway stations between Quebec and Montreal.

I will not go so far as to say, as the hon. member did, that it is a gigantic fraud, but I shall limit myself to answering the question he asked in the House yesterday, to the effect that certain stations between Montreal and Quebec are closed at night.

I know the hon. member for Trois-Rivières is alarmed. The people who have travelled on Canadian Pacific trains and have had to wait at stations are right in complaining to their members. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières is right in pointing out the matter to the minister's attention.

On the other hand, it should perhaps be recognized—not that I want in any way to protect the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific—that for certain reasons a few stations had to be closed. But between Montreal and Quebec, four stations are open at night: those at L'Épiphanie, Portneuf, Pont-Rouge and Lorette. I see the hon. member making signs that it is not so. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but that is the information I received this afternoon from Canadian Pacific officials. I shall have to tell them tomorrow morning, through the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), perhaps not that they lied to me but that they gave me inaccurate information. However, I must pass along the information I received.

Other stations have been closed because the employees leave at five o'clock. Formerly, a part of the waiting room remained open to passengers after office hours.

Vandalistic acts against office equipment resulting in heavy damages have compelled the management of the Canadian Pacific to close those stations.

As for the four stations which I mentioned a while ago, stating that they were open to the public, although the hon. member

motioned to me that they were closed, representations were made by the citizens of those communities and as a result, the Canadian Pacific has accepted—I repeat has accepted, because I am told that those stations are open—to leave the waiting rooms at the disposal of the clients.

As for the other stations, seven trains are on a flag stop basis and two stop on Fridays.

If the hon. member has special cases to draw to the minister's attention, I will gladly point them out to him, especially since tomorrow morning I will communicate to whom it may concern the false information which I provided this evening. I shall check this point with the department tomorrow morning. I shall be happy to give this.

I am also happy to tell the hon. member that Canadian Pacific officials have assured us that the problem of waiting-rooms would be studied, each case separately. We hope that with the re-opening of this waiting-room, the hon. member for Trois-Rivières—

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

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.23 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, February 6, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

POLLUTION

STATEMENT ON PHOSPHATE CONTROL

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the question of the control of phosphate nutrients as an essential step toward the cleaning of polluted waters is one in which this House and the public generally have recently demonstrated great concern.

The report of the pollution reference board on the lower Great Lakes to the International Joint Commission has recently highlighted the most critical aspects of the problem with respect to Lakes Erie and Ontario.

In view of the undoubted seriousness of the problem, my department has been active in looking further into potential solutions to the problem of eutrophication caused in some considerable part by the use of phosphates in Canada.

Shortly after the report of the reference board to the IJC was published, I held discussions with my United States counterpart, Secretary Hickel, and informed him of our point of view on the need for joint action. In addition, senior officials from my department specifically discussed the phosphate problem on the Great Lakes with senior officials of the Department of the Interior of the United States. Other officials from governments in Canada and the United States were sent to Sweden to investigate the phosphate control program in that country and still others were dispatched to discuss research and development of phosphate alternatives with a major United States detergent producer. Furthermore, I held discussions with industry representatives to hear their point of view and to inform them of the gravity with which we viewed the problem, and to determine whether action and self-discipline on their part on a voluntary basis could be the successful approach to the problem.

With respect to the Great Lakes, it clearly appeared that there was little point in Canada acting alone, since most of the phosphates entering those waters emanated from the United States. United States action, as well as Canadian, was therefore essential if any real solution to the question was to be achieved, and if Canadian action to ban or control was to be anything more than an empty gesture.

I am, therefore, most pleased to report to the House that on February 4 at hearings in Rochester the U.S. federal water pollution control administration took a fresh look at its position and is now calling for the reduction of phosphates in detergents as recommended in the report to the IJC. The U.S. federal water pollution control administration have asserted their willingness to control phosphates within minimum practicable levels immediately and to look to the complete replacement of phosphates as soon as possible.

My department supports the recommendations to the IJC concerning phosphate control and looks forward to the commission's report to the governments of Canada and the United States.

• (11:10 a.m.)

I have instructed my department to work in close conjunction with the United States federal water pollution control administration to attempt to achieve a co-ordinated plan of control and an imminent complete replacement of phosphates. I shall be consulting with my counterpart ministers in the provinces to attempt to achieve a plan of control and ultimate replacement of phosphates that is mutually acceptable and which will thus have the support of any provincial action required under our constitution.

I have further instructed my departmental officials to advise the IJC, at their public hearing today in Brockville, of our intention to act on this matter.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that intelligent comments are impossible, as we received the release only two minutes before coming to the House.

This problem which is of great interest to all hon. members has not only been mentioned in the House on many occasions, but has also been referred to the committee which is presently studying Bill C-144.

Though the release recommends that measures be taken with regard to the use of phosphates, it does not give any details with regard to such measures. We hope that the minister and the senior officials of his department will, within the committee, succeed in establishing a program and in determining the measures they intend to take.

The public can certainly and rightly ask that those products be taken off the market. The government is taking the very measures Ontario has already taken to ban the sale of such substances.

It is my opinion that the committee will be extremely interested in delving further into this matter.

[*English*]

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, we in this party welcome most heartily the announcement of the minister today, particularly as it comes in advance of the International Joint Commission meeting in Brockville. It seems as though the government is doing a great deal. I commend the minister for having made public some of the things that the government is apparently doing because I firmly believe an informed public can and will support anti-pollution measures. This might not be the case if the public were kept in the dark.

I was pleased to hear that there have been discussions and that these discussions are continuing with the United States authorities, particularly with regard to the Great Lakes. Obviously this is essential so far as the Great Lakes are concerned.

We in this party feel that the Canadian government should take the initiative with regard to our waterways, lakes and coastal waters which do not come within joint jurisdiction. The federal government must take the initiative with regard to pollution of these waters and not wait until such time as there can be agreement with the United States authorities on an over-all program. I was pleased to learn that the minister caused his officials to go to Sweden to ascertain what is being done in that country, and also to discuss with a major United States detergent producer the development of phosphate alternatives.

We in this party are not sanguine with regard to the minister's opinion that perhaps voluntary action will achieve the desired result. We believe there will have to be definite target dates set not only for the reduction but also the elimination of phosphates. I know the minister referred to elimination as soon as is practicable. But this will not be hastened along without a good deal more effort than the hon. gentleman is putting into it now. I hope the minister is getting the kind of mail I am receiving these days—worried protests from women all across Canada who will not be satisfied to be told to go back to soap or to find out which detergent already on the market contains the least amount of phosphate. They want the government to arrange for the kind of research which will enable us to eliminate phosphate detergents completely.

We welcome the minister's announcement and urge him to continue the good work he is doing.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, the minister's statement, this morning, shows good intentions concerning pollution control. We have unfortunately had little time to study the document he tabled in the House, as we have just seen it.

Nevertheless, reading the first page of the statement, we see the government has good intentions in connection with control of water pollution, aiming to eliminate the use of chemicals such as phosphates as much as possible. However, one passage of the text surprises me. In effect, the minister says he will initiate discussions with a major United States detergent producer.

We know now that phosphates and soaps are the main factors of water pollution. What results can the minister expect from discussions with phosphate and soap producers if he wants to check pollution caused by the use of these products? In preparing his policy, I think he should instead consult scientists, who would likely recommend using biodegradable products which do not pollute water at all. He should confer with people who are not directly involved in phosphate or soap production or sales in order to be able to take measures likely to fight efficiently water pollution in Canada.

The minister has pointed out that the cooperation of businessmen involved should be voluntary. However, the problem of pollution is so acute in Canada now that we should do more than merely ask those who have been

directly polluting our waters for 25 years to share voluntarily in the fight against pollution.

The proposed policy is not drastic enough, because it contains only pious recommendations which suggest no new means of scientifically controlling water pollution.

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PROVISION OF RESEARCH ASSISTANCE TO LIBERAL MEMBERS

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the autumn of 1968 the government made available to the opposition parties in this House sums of money for research purposes to assist them in their vitally important task of analysing and criticizing government legislative measures and offering constructive alternatives. Following discussions with the opposition parties, a sum of $125,000 per annum was made available to the Progressive Conservative Party and a sum of $35,000 per annum was provided to each of the other two opposition parties. This money permits the employment of special staff by the House of Commons upon nomination by the several party leaders, and available to them. I am informed that this sum of $195,000 per year has permitted the opposition parties the use of research offices which now employ some 22 full-time and 5 part-time employees.

• (11:20 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

I think it fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that this scheme has worked well and has given to the opposition Members of Parliament means to carry on research which have never before been made available. This was but one of several measures which this government has taken to permit the private Member of Parliament to play a more effective role, and in so doing enhance the importance of Parliament as an institution.

As a result of the visible benefits of this new system which, I repeat, has been available only to opposition members, the government has decided to make funds available to private members on this side of the House as well.

A sum of money smaller than that available to all of the opposition parties, $130,000 as compared with $195,000, has been allotted for this task, as recognition of the fact that a heavy task of research falls also, on the government supporters.

[*English*]

I am glad to see that all hon. members welcome this announcement, Mr. Speaker. It is another step in the conscious plans of this government to strengthen Parliament and to assist the members who play such a vital role in our democratic processes.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we all welcome this effort on the part of the government to put its supporters in the House in a better position to enable them to play a full part in the work of Parliament. I do not know what will be the terms of reference of the grant, but I would think that quite possibly one of the major areas of research that private members on the other side of the House would have to undertake would be, at least in the initial stages, not so much research into specific subject matters but into how they can make their views known, how they can get their views across to members of the government.

I simply want to say that not only do I welcome this move to improve the position of the supporters of the government in the House, but if we can be of any assistance to members on the other side of the House in regard to how they may make their views be of more influence in their own ranks, then please, Mr. Speaker, may I convey the message to them not to be reluctant to consult us.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are happy to indicate our support for the announcement made this morning by the Prime Minister. I suppose that the first and obvious comment to make about assistance being provided to government backbenchers is: "For heaven's sake, they need it."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I note that that sentiment is applauded by those on the government side of the House. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister will recall that when the present deputy leader of this party and I called on him to discuss this matter shortly after the election in 1968 we made this very proposal, namely, that research assistance should be made available to all parties in the House. We repeated that suggestion when the matter was discussed on the floor.

I think it is perfectly correct that if research assistance is going to be made available to those who are not in the cabinet, then

all members should be treated alike. In this respect I am sure that neither the Prime Minister nor anybody else will be surprised when I say that we think that the allocation of funds is not in proportion to the strength of the parties. We think that the amount accorded to our party should be greater, and we shall continue to press for this, but in any case we are making the fullest use that we can of the amount that is made available to our party.

A particular reason for our being in support of this proposition is that we believe it is proper that it should be the Members of Parliament, on whatever side of the House they sit, from whom the government should be getting its advice. We are disturbed over the extent to which the coterie of people who are attached to the Prime Minister's Office and the offices of ministers is growing and is producing what people sometimes refer to as the presidential system. I see the action announced today as an antidote to that.

When we complain about a presidential system we are not thinking just in terms of a name, of the Prime Minister being called the president instead of the Prime Minister, or being greeted with "Hail to the Chief" or something like that. We are thinking rather of the fact that under a presidential system the president makes the decisions on the basis of the advice he gets from those with whom he surrounds himself—his staff, which is responsible only to him. We think that is going in the wrong direction, and that it is to go in the right direction to get more advice from Parliament itself, either on this floor or from the members of the various parties. To the extent that strengthening the work hon. members on the government side can do is an antidote to any movement in the other direction, we welcome it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister was quite right when he noted that his proposal has the support of all parties in the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, for some time I had been expecting such a statement. As a matter of fact, when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) decided to make certain sums of money available to opposition parties for research purposes I wondered why members on the government side did not enjoy the same privileges.

At the time I surmised that the government was no doubt providing them with other documentation facilities. I feel that the action announced by the Prime Minister is excellent since the same advantages are given to all members.

On our part, Mr. Speaker, we have used the funds at our disposal to the best advantage, but people will admit that even before this became the practice we were not doing too badly.

[*English*]

Mr. Ryan: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, it will be quite apparent to Your Honour and to all hon. members that there is discrimination here against the independent party consisting of yourself and myself, and I would hope that the government would hasten to remedy this situation.

An hon. Member: Come back to this side, Perry.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a comment on the announcement, if I may.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is not my impression that the hon. member has that status required by the Standing Orders. I should not think that he can make a statement at this time.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

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

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the backbenchers who have not had an opportunity to express themselves, I was going to thank the government for this action.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

VETERANS AFFAIRS

ALLOWANCES AND DISABILITY PENSIONS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent of the House to make the following motion under Standing Order 43:

> That the matter of increases in war veterans allowances and disability pensions be referred to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

I move the motion for the following reasons, and I will be brief. First, the concern with regard to the need for increases in assistance for veterans is continually being

brought to the attention of the government and all Members of Parliament, which emphasizes the hardships being experienced. Second, it is alarming to note that at present the maximum allowable income for single and married war veterans falls far below the accepted poverty line as laid down by the Economic Council of Canada.

• (11:30 a.m.)

While it is realized that the government is reviewing the whole area of social legislation and while it is recognized on this side of the House that there is need to combat inflation, it must be considered of urgent concern that many veterans are reaching that age in life when immediate attention must be given to their needs and to the steadily increasing hardships caused to veterans due to rising costs and the effect on the living conditions of those citizens who are limited in their ability to earn for themselves due to service to our country.

Mr. Speaker: This is the type of motion which requires the unanimous agreement of the House. Is there unanimous agreement?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimous agreement. Therefore it is not possible for the Chair to put the motion at this time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

LABOUR RELATIONS

BRITISH COLUMBIA—ACTION TO REOPEN WEST COAST PORTS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Labour who I had hoped would be here in view of the apparently deteriorating situation at some of the west coast ports, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether the government has yet reached any decision concerning what action can be taken to reopen the ports or to ensure that the ports will open shortly so that the produce of the country can continue to move into export markets?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have already discussed this matter and have made a decision. Any further action will be announced in due course.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary, please. In view of the fact that we in Parliament seem to be continually faced with these problems which affect the nation's exports, I should like to ask when the government will bring in legislation to bring about a better relationship between management and labour so that our exports can be kept moving to the markets of the world?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Regina East.

GRAIN

WHEAT—STATEMENT RESPECTING REDUCED PRODUCTION—FINANCIAL INCENTIVES TO FARMERS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Was the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board expressing government policy when he indicated in London that prairie farmers will probably be advised to reduce wheat production in the next crop year? Also, is the government contemplating financial incentives for farmers who switch to alternate crops or increase their summerfallow acreage?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not verified what the minister said in London. As to the second part of the question, the minister answered that question in the House last week.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Is the government considering a price guarantee based on the International Grains Arrangement minimum or some other suitable basis if a limitation on crop production is introduced or encouraged? Is a similar guarantee contemplated for the 1968-69 final crop payment or for the current crop year?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making various suggestions. Last week he made such suggestions and the minister told him he would announce his policy in due course.

Mr. George Muir (Lisgar): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Finance. In view of the reported statement in London of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Wheat Board to the effect that farmers may have to leave their wheat land idle this year in order to reduce the grain surplus, has any decision been reached by the

government to assist the farmers in achieving this objective so they will not be forced out of business?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Lang), as the Prime Minister has pointed out, said in respect of this matter in the House last week that if the government has an announcement to make in this regard it will be made in the normal manner.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the deepening financial crisis on the prairies, is the government now considering a deficiency payment to western farmers? I ask the question because the minister did not give us any indication in this regard.

Mr. Trudeau: This question was asked by the hon. member and answered by the minister, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, this is not the case. The minister did not make a statement regarding a deficiency payment.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

WHEAT—NEW QUOTA DELIVERY SYSTEM

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. In light of the previous questions, is the government able to announce whether it intends to come out with a new quota system for the delivery of wheat by farmers in the near future?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I keep repeating the same answer. The minister is constantly confronted with such propositions. The government has its own policy and will announce any further steps in due course.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

AGENDA FOR NEXT CONFERENCE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I should like to answer a question asked yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition concerning the agenda for the forthcoming federal-provincial conference. There are three items on the agenda. The first is the economic situation. The second is pollution and the third is the report of the tax structure committee. Of course these items are fairly broad and no doubt the provinces will want to elaborate on each of them.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, in view of the nature of the agenda and particularly in view of the importance of these topics, would the Prime Minister agree it would be desirable to have representatives of the opposition parties attend the conference as observers with a view to the opposition parties being fully informed concerning the nature of these discussions and the form of the conclusions?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, of course such a matter could not be decided unilaterally by the federal government. I must say there has been no inclination on the part of any of the governments at the time of an in-camera conference to invite opposition members as observers at such in-camera conferences. This I believe has never been the practice even at the time the hon. member was leader of a provincial government.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister not agree it has always been a matter for the leader of the federal government to decide who is to be included in the delegations and that if a provincial premier, for example, were to include the leader or a member of an opposition party no other delegation would have the slightest objection to this?

Mr. Trudeau: I believe that would be correct. If it so happened that a provincial government wanted to include in its delegation members of the opposition, certainly we would have no desire to exercise any veto over such a composition of the delegation, but this supposes that in some places they do find opposition members who are co-operative and constructive.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In view of what the Prime Minister has just said, would he not agree that if the government of Canada included—surely there are some co-operative members in the opposition parties in the House—representatives of the opposition parties he has no reason to believe that any provincial delegation would object?

Mr. Trudeau: I am sure the provinces would not be in a position to object, but as a government we have reached the quite firm conclusion that in the matter, for instance, of the economic situation the opposition par-

ties in this House have proven to be a hindrance rather than a help to the government in its fight against inflation.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will give the floor to the Leader of the Opposition in a moment but I am wondering whether we are embarking on a debate and whether we should in a moment try another subject.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I think we have made some progress in this matter. I simply ask the Prime Minister whether he has not in the past given the impression that the opposition to including members of opposition parties stemmed from some understanding with the provinces whereas now he is disclosing it is purely a decision of this government?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—LESSENING OF FISCAL BURDEN

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker I wish to put a question to the Prime Minister.

In order to help consumers faced with the economic recession the United States government recently reduced their so-called "Vietnam" surtax. Could the Prime Minister tell the House if he considers alleviating the tax burden of Canadians, and if so, what kind of action he intends to take?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that the hon. member's question is much too general. If he wants an answer he might put his question on the order paper.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

INCLUSION ON CONFERENCE AGENDA OF RIGHT OF PROVINCES TO ENTER INTO CULTURAL AGREEMENTS

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

In connection with the federal-provincial conference would the Prime Minister object to the inclusion on the agenda of the said conference of the opportunity or right of the provinces to conclude cultural agreements with other countries having the same culture?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am surprised to note that a member of the opposition wishes to have constitutional matters put on the agenda of that conference. Some have already complained that the government and the provinces spoke too much about the constitution and they have asked that such conferences should not deal with constitutional matters. Now a non-constitutional conference is proposed and the hon. member suggests that a discussion on the constitution should be put on the agenda. I am surprised.

Mr. Valade: I think the Prime Minister is greatly mistaken about my question, Mr. Speaker. It concerns the provinces and the opportunity they have to create cultural relations with other countries having the same culture.

[*English*]

POLLUTION

PHOSPHATES—VOLUNTARY CO-OPERATION BY DETERGENT MANUFACTURERS

Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in connection with his statement in the House earlier this morning. Does the minister intend to rely on voluntary co-operation on the part of detergent manufacturers to carry out his program?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I thought the statement was clear—possibly it was not clear enough.

An hon. Member: It was clear to us on this side.

Mr. Greene: As there are very few manufacturers of phosphates and detergents containing phosphates and as they are largely the same companies on both sides of the border, it was a very attractive thought that they might be willing to co-operate on a voluntary basis and on a basis of self-discipline to reduce gradually and ultimately eliminate the phosphate content in detergents. Hence, I tried this approach, but I fear that gentle persuasion would not be successful and therefore more forceful action is required as indicated in the statement.

Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary): I wish to ask the minister whether he has considered the possibility of requiring detergent manufacturers to print on their packages the percentage of phosphate contained therein?

Mr. Greene: We have considered that, but have discovered from research not only carried out in this country but in other countries where similar approaches have actually been tried, a strange manifestation of the female of our species, that she would be likely to buy detergents with the highest phosphate content which washed the old man's clothes cleaner.

Mr. Fairweather: His shirts may be white but his lakes are polluted.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INFLATION—PROPOSALS BY MINISTERS TO PROVINCIAL PREMIERS

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Finance. Can he inform the House what specific proposals for inflation control the four cabinet ministers are now presently carrying to the provincial governments?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The general discussions with the premiers of the provinces are taking place prior to the meeting merely to outline some of our thoughts in this direction.

Mr. Ritchie: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the government intend to introduce selective or regional anti-inflationary measures in the near future which would alleviate some of the worst effects on the depressed regions of the country?

Mr. Benson: If the government intended to do any such thing it would be our policy to announce it to the House in the ordinary manner.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INCREASE IN PRICE OF MILK—INQUIRY AS TO ACTION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the minister whether it has been brought to his attention that while he was away a firm in Toronto announced an increase in the price of milk contrary to the expressed wishes of the minister before he left. Does the minister propose to do anything about this himself in order to keep the Prices and Incomes Commission in a position where it can have a satisfactory conference?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I understand that while I was away the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs looked into this matter and made a statement in that regard, but I am not sure of that.

[Mr. Howard (Okanagan Boundary).]

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Finance consult the record and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to find out whether the latter really did anything because, according to his statement in the House, he was not going to do anything about it at all?

Mr. Benson: I am always pleased to consult even with the Leader of the Opposition.

THE BUDGET

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the concern expressed across the country about the white paper on tax reform, can the minister tell us when he hopes to bring down his budget so that we may view it in light of the white paper controversy?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Very early in March.

FINANCE

SUGGESTED REMOVAL OF SALES TAX ON MARGARINE

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Having in mind his concern about inflated prices in the country, would he say what consideration is being given to the representations of consumer groups urging the removal of the 12 per cent sales tax on margarine?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The matter is being considered. I have received representations in this regard, both from manufacturers and consumers, and of course we are considering the matter.

FLOODS

NEW BRUNSWICK—ASSISTANCE TO VICTIMS

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): I have a question for the Prime Minister, of which I have given him notice. Will the government agree to co-ordinate its efforts with the provincial government of New Brunswick to help the victims of the severe flood damage in southern New Brunswick, and will

the Prime Minister agree to take extraordinary measures to alleviate the severe hardship caused by this unusual phenomenon?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for having notified my office of his question. The steps he suggests are already under way. I received a telephone call from the Premier of New Brunswick at my office some time yesterday, but of course, before that, I had been informed by the province of the storm and its effects. We are assisting the New Brunswick government in every way possible.

The RCMP and the Canadian Armed Forces are engaged in assisting in the evacuation of persons from flooded areas. The forces yesterday commenced construction of a temporary 150-foot bridge to replace a highway traffic bridge that has been washed away, and the Emergency Measures Organization has offered its assistance to the New Brunswick Department of Municipal Affairs to form a joint team to assess the extent of damage and estimate the best method of repair as well as the cost. The federal Department of Public Works has instructed its local officers to assist in this respect. Finally, the financial assistance of the federal government is available to the province of New Brunswick under the formula employed in the past with all provinces once the damage estimates are complete and, of course, if the Premier of New Brunswick should request such federal assistance.

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ST. HYACINTHE—LAYING-OFF OF GOODYEAR EMPLOYEES

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, I should like to ask a question to his parliamentary secretary.

Can he tell the House whether the minister has received a telegram from the Central Council of the town of St. Hyacinthe informing him that 40 employees of the Goodyear Company were being laid off?

Mr. Speaker: I do not believe that the hon. member can simply ask whether a telegram or a message has been received by the minister concerned. In such terms, the question is out of order.

Mr. Ricard: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Prime Minister.

As the economic situation deteriorates constantly in St. Hyacinthe, would the Prime Minister be prepared to give particular attention to the matter and to suggest to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to make of the St. Hyacinthe region a designated area?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is making a suggestion to the government and he should assume that it will be considered.

[*English*]

FISHERIES

ACTION RESPECTING DEPLETION OF RESOURCES BY FOREIGN FISHERMEN

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Fisheries. In his absence I would normally direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary, but since he is absent I can only direct it to the Acting Minister of Fisheries, whoever he may be. In view of the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries in Montreal that the U.S.S.R. and Poland are depleting Canada's fisheries resources, what steps has the government taken to bring this matter before the international panel of experts at the United Nations, and what steps will be taken to call an immediate international conference on this matter which is of such vital concern to Atlantic Canada?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister of National Revenue): I will take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a number of supplementaries. This is an urgent matter, and I think there is a question of privilege here. There is no Acting Minister of Fisheries here today, although the friend of the minister fielded the question and the Parliamentary Secretary is not here. This situation is continuing day after day even though the minister is designated to be present. Here is an urgent matter of international importance and we have no one to answer for the government. This is very critical.

GRAIN

FINAL PAYMENTS ON DURUM WHEAT

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. Pending government action in reply to questions asked earlier this week on this subject, will the Prime Minister have an Order in Council

passed authorizing disbursement of the surplus in the Durum wheat account of the Canadian Wheat Board to the Durum producers, which apparently is prevented at present because of a technicality in the Canadian Wheat Board Act?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is a suggestion which I shall refer to the minister when he returns.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON BASE CONSOLIDATION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to my good friend, the Minister of National Defence. In his poetic way is he now prepared to give some indication when his report on base consolidation in Canada will be ready? I ask the question in light of the very serious and worsening situation at Fairey of Canada's plant at Eastern Passage.

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as everybody knows there is not much left to be done in the way of base consolidation except the final consolidation of the report which will not be possible before the end of April.

Mr. Woolliams: Abolish many more and you won't have a job.

POST OFFICE

LIFTING OF FREEZE ON LETTER CARRIER DELIVERY

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the President of the Treasury Board on behalf of the Postmaster General in view of his statement to me yesterday. When will the freeze on the extension of letter carrier services across Canada be lifted so that the Postmaster General can supply these services to which communities are ordinarily entitled?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for raising this matter on behalf of the Postmaster General. I shall be talking to him about it soon.

TRANSPORT

RAISING OF RAILWAY GRADE CROSSING FUND CEILING

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether he has given consideration to the restrictive ceiling on applications to the railroad grade crossing fund being raised?

[Mr. McIntosh.]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the whole matter of the railway grade crossing fund is being examined. The problem is that it would have to be raised from somewhere in the neighbourhood of $250,000 to $25 million and we are trying to find some other solution. I have had discussions with the province of Manitoba on this matter, and others will be forthcoming in a few weeks.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I wonder when the minister might be in a position to make an announcement as to the changes?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, it may be some time, and by that I mean a matter of a few months, because of the complexity of the problem. Because of the meetings held with the government of Manitoba last Monday, for example, there is a committee representing Manitoba and my department and also the office of the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. We are all looking at it in that context. I hope we can speed up the discussions but I do not want to hold out any hopes that it can come within days or weeks.

[*Translation*]

POLLUTION

LEGISLATION RESPECTING BIODEGRADABILITY OF DETERGENTS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Does he intend to introduce in 1970 legislation to compel detergent manufacturers to make biodegradable or non-polluting products that do not contain phosphates?

[*English*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, these products have already been made biodegradable by virtue of voluntary arrangements that were made some time ago with the phosphate manufacturers. Unfortunately, biodegradability has not solved the problem, so it is not the issue. With respect to the measures whereby we enforce the announcement I made this morning, this is under very active consideration and as stated in the announcement, I will be discussing the matter with my provincial counterparts to try to enlist their co-operation.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Since the minister has stated that he would initiate discussions with some detergent manufacturers in the United States, could he not also consult them about marketing at this time entirely biodegradable products, which are the only ones allowed in some American states?

[*English*]

Mr. Greene: Again, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian product is already biodegradable. I do not intend to have further consultations with the manufacturers as I think I did everything I could usefully have done in this regard. As indicated, I think governmental action is required, not a voluntary method of discipline.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on the matter of biodegradable detergents. Can the minister explain whether biodegradability applies only to non-phosphate components of detergents or also to phosphate components? I think this is an important question arising out of one asked earlier.

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure of the technical connotation of the question. It is my understanding that biodegradability was achieved by a voluntary process in which the companies co-operated some time ago. It was because of successes in that regard that I was encouraged to think that possibly we could achieve similar successes in the entire field of phosphates. The companies have taken the view that, (a) there is no substitute at the present and, (b) that the answer is to build or develop sewage disposal plants to clear up the phosphates rather than prevent their use, inasmuch as phosphates themselves are not harmful. They merely enable algae to live and grow. The companies feel that cleaning up after the use of phosphates would be the answer. I deemed, therefore, that I could not obtain the kind of co-operation with respect to phosphate control which had been obtained on the issue of biodegradability.

TRADE

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON SALE OF DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Based on the apparent success of his department in obtaining a larger part of the Japanese market for food on a commodity to commodity basis, would he now consider placing special emphasis on the sale of dairy products to alleviate the very serious problem here in Canada?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I will consider that, Mr. Speaker, in regard to Japan or any other areas. We try hard in all areas.

An hon. Member: Do your very best.

POWER

MINAS BASIN—PUBLICATION OF STUDY

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Further to his indication to me a couple of weeks ago, could he now give some indication when the government might be receiving or be in a position to release the feasibility study on Minas Basin tidal power?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I understand the problem now is a question of printing. It is at that stage, in which case I think we should have it available very soon.

Mr. Forrestall: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate if he or his department has made any decision on whether this report will be released?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, the report was made in conjunction with the provinces and that decision will have to be the subject of negotiation. Such decision at the negotiation table has not yet been made.

TRANSPORT

DEFENCE OF CTC RAILWAY COSTING FORMULA

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. The importance of this matter relates to the pending applications for rail line abandonments and more specifically as they affect western Canada. Can the minister advise the House what steps, if any, he has taken to defend the Canadian Transport Commission's costing formula before the Supreme Court of Canada?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder whether the question asked is in order. The hon. member is

inviting the minister to make a statement about action that has been taken or not taken previously. In these circumstances I think this information should be given on motions or the question placed on the Order Paper.

Mr. Southam: Mr. Speaker, this question has been put to the minister on several occasions and he has advised the House that he would look into the matter. I think it is important that he should give us some statement on this very important matter.

Mr. Speaker: My suggestion was that the question be answered by way of a statement. The minister might indicate whether he proposes to make such a statement.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, at some time very soon I will make a statement indicating that the whole matter is very much under consideration.

POLLUTION

REGULATIONS RESPECTING OIL TANKERS IN TERRITORIAL WATERS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Transport whether his or any other government department exercises any regulation over the entry of oil tankers into our territorial waters?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This was a matter discussed during debate a few days ago. There are limitations on our authority at the moment. As outlined, we are proposing improvements in the Canada Shipping Act. With the indulgence of the Speaker, may I give a report on the situation as it stands in Nova Scotia?

The *Imperial Acadia* is now on the scene. It now appears that the *Arrow* struck on its starboard bow and five forward starboard tanks are tidal out of 30 tanks. The engine room and boiler rooms are intact. The engine-room crew is back on board proceeding to get up steam in an attempt to refloat the vessel and also, if necessary, to transfer the oil to other ships which are now moving into the area. Little oil is escaping at the moment and the oil slick, about three miles long but very narrow, is thin and not visible from another boat.

The Department of National Defence is arranging to provide a heavy lift helicopter for ferrying salvage equipment if required.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister whether he meant to indicate that the authority of Canada is restricted now with regard to such regulations within our own territorial waters?

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I did not answer the question as fully as I ought to have. The position is, in terms of accidental spills of one kind or another, that we have quite adequate controlling and remedial measures at our disposal. What we do not have, pending the outcome of the Brussels conference and an international agreement, is a means through which to attribute liability in the event of accidents of this kind; we do not have it specifically yet. I indicated to the House a few days ago that we would be introducing amendments to the Canada Shipping Act giving to us within those waters under Canada's control the same kind of authority as we were seeking internationally but which we failed to obtain in Brussels.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister confirm reports that Imperial Oil, the owners of the cargo on board the *Arrow*, have now accepted full financial liability for any damage that may be caused?

Mr. Jamieson: I would have to investigate that, Mr. Speaker, but I can say that Imperial Oil is co-operating fully in the salvage operation. As long as weather conditions remain moderate there is no major threat, as of this moment at any rate.

TRAINING OF COASTGUARD MEMBERS TO ENFORCE STANDARDS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, can the minister answer my question of January 29 which he took as notice? Are members of the coastguard being trained in anti-pollution work?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, some training is being done of coastguard crews, but we find that it is more appropriate to have a group of skilled people who can be moved either by coastguard or by other vessels to locations such as the one referred to. At the present time, a marine industry salvage officer of the department is on the scene in Nova Scotia.

AIR CANADA

ABANDONMENT OF SHORT-RUN SERVICES—PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO OTHER AIRLINES

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport? In view of the fact that Air Canada will abandon its short-run services, will the minister make representations to Air Canada to the end that information this airline has already given to some airlines wishing to apply to the Canadian Transport Commission for this business will be made available to all airlines which may be interested in securing this business?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I will be glad to make these representations to Air Canada.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PRAIRIE PROVINCES—DISCUSSION AT FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL CONFERENCE OF PLANS FOR ASSISTANCE

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the desperate economic situation facing the western provinces at this time, will the Prime Minister indicate whether the government will reveal its plans for the assistance of the western agricultural economy at the forthcoming federal-provincial conference?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, some aspects of the economic situation in all parts of the country will naturally come under discussion. I cannot predict what the representations of the provinces will be and, therefore I cannot predict what position the government will take in response to them.

Mr. Skoberg: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Prime Minister not say whether plans the federal government has prepared for the assistance of the west will be revealed at this conference? Will the government not do that instead of merely taking into consideration what the west is proposing?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, hon. members are asking me to show more respect for Parliament and not make such announcements elsewhere but to Parliament. I will answer his question by saying that I will very seriously consider that suggestion.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED STATES ABM SYSTEM—METHOD OF EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that has alarming implications for the Prime Minister. Are we to believe that caucus leaks are a credible substitute for quiet diplomacy, as attested to in today's *Globe and Mail* which deals with the anger of the right hon. gentleman—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I apologize to the hon. member if I appear to interrupt him, but from what I have heard of the question so far it appears that I would be justified in ruling that it is not in order.

Mr. Fairweather: Mr. Speaker, I have rephrased the question to meet this contingency. Are there not more effective and orthodox means of registering Canada's disapproval of the ABM Safeguard build-up than caucus leaks?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubts about the rephrased question. I will rephrase my ruling and say that the rephrased question is argumentative.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUPPLEMENTARY PENSIONS BENEFITS BILL

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the President of the Privy Council with reference to the business of the House. Inasmuch as the order paper, particularly so far as government orders are concerned, is becoming a bit thin, I wonder if the bills to be dealt with between now and Easter can be introduced and given first reading so that we can study them, and so that the new research people will have something to put their teeth into? In particular, and very seriously, may I ask if we may expect very early the bill on supplemental pension benefits which the government promised would be in effect by April?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (President of the Privy Council): Yes, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member will read the notice paper he will see that three bills have been added today. Several others on the list, as he may have noted, have been given first reading in the Senate. The bill to which the hon. member referred in particular will, I expect, be available for first reading very probably in the week after next.

Inquiries of the Ministry

LABOUR CONDITIONS

ST. JOHN'S, NFLD.—CLOSING OF PORT FACILITIES—REQUEST FOR REPORT ON MEETING WITH UNION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Is he in a position to report on meetings he has held with the International Longshoremen's Union in St. John's regarding the closing down of port facilities there by Canadian National and the resulting unemployment in that city?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the vice-president, eastern region, of the CNR will be in Ottawa on Monday for discussions with me on this and a number of other related matters, including some referred to by the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Transport. Since the new president of the Newfoundland Board of Trade suggested yesterday that large numbers of citizens should move away from that province, has the minister, in consultation with his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, considered any action to relocate the hon. members for St. John's East, St. John's West, Gander-Twillingate and Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe?

AIR TRANSPORT

CRASH IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—SEARCH AND RESCUE ACTIVITIES

Mr. Bruce Howard (Okanagan Boundary): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Since an aircraft has been missing for over a week in southern British Columbia can the minister tell us what our search and rescue people are doing to find it?

Hon. Léo Cadieux (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, they are doing their very best to find it. Actually to date they have flown over 325 hours and covered 29,000 square miles of territory. We have three Albatrosses and two helicopters engaged in the search.

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL RELATIONS

INCLUSION OF TRANSPORTATION AND FREIGHT RATES ON CONFERENCE AGENDA

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister? Has the right hon. gentleman given assurances to the western premiers that transportation and freight rate matters pertaining to the western economic situation will be placed on the agenda of the forthcoming federal-provincial conference?

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was a request to that effect made to the secretariat and the government accepted the suggestion that such subject be discussed, but I am not quite sure whether all provinces will be prepared to proceed with it. However, if they wish to do so it can easily come under the first item on the agenda, under the heading pertaining to the economic situation. There has been, in other words, some discussion of this. We have agreed to discuss it but we are not sure when it will be brought up and in what form. I can say that we have not received any briefs on this matter.

ESTIMATES

INQUIRY AS TO PROBABLE DATE OF PRESENTATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to ask the President of the Treasury Board whether he is in a position to tell the House when he will be bringing down his estimates?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): I hope it will be next week, Mr. Speaker, mid-week.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

GREECE—PROTEST RESPECTING TORTURE OF PRISONERS

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister with reference to at least half a dozen questions I have directed to him and the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Does the government of Canada intend now or at any time to protest to the government of Greece the fact that it is systematically torturing political prisoners in its jails?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I cannot add anything to the reply the Secretary of State for External Affairs has already made to this question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Clermont: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in the interest of all hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont) on a question of privilege.

Mr. Clermont: Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that members of a certain political party who sit on the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs have handed over their report on interest rates to members of the press gallery.

Mr. Speaker, I have received myself phone calls from certain members of the press gallery who wanted to know what was in the report I intend to table in the House as soon as I receive the French version. I refused to disclose such information because I thought it was my duty to present the report to the House as instructed on June 25 and October 30, 1969.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

DOMINION COAL BOARD DISSOLUTION ACT

MEASURE TO DISSOLVE

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-161, to provide for the dissolution of the Dominion Coal Board and for the repeal of the Canadian Coal Equality Act, the Coal Production Assistance Act and the Dominion Coal Board Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, I would like to pay tribute to the excellent work of the Dominion Coal Board over the past 20 years and more. Without their efforts, our coal industry would not now be able to respond quickly to take advantage of the new markets which are developing for this resource.

The Dominion Coal Board not only brought the industry through difficult times, but working along with the mines branch of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, it took the initiative in opening up the Japanese market to Canadian metallurgical coal.

In the development of this important market, the Board arranged for the technical assistance required to make Canadian coal acceptable, in large volumes, to the Japanese metallurgical industry. The Board also provided financial assistance, during this market development program, to enable Canadian coal to break into this market and achieve viability. These efforts of the Board have been successful because the coal industry is now in a position to undertake large, long term contracts on a strictly commercial basis and consequently the program of federal aid will terminate in 1970-71. The total value of the long term contracts with Japan is now approximately $2¼ billion. Consequently, the yearly value of coal exports to Japan will rise from the present level of about $15 million per year to $125 million in 1970-71 and to $180 million in 1972-73. By the mid-1970's, the value of coal exports to Japan alone is expected to reach $250 million per year. This will make coal one of the leading Canadian exports to Japan.

The Dominion Coal Board was established in 1947 on the recommendation of the 1946 Royal Commission on Coal, the Carroll Commission. It replaced the Dominion Fuel Board which had been established in 1922. That body was composed of federal public servants under the chairmanship of the deputy minister of mines. To replace it, the Carroll Commission recommended that "a statutory board be created with a full-time chairman to keep Canada's energy requirements under continuous review and to advise upon and administer transportation subventions."

Since then, however, there have been widespread and fundamental changes in the energy market, largely because of the enormous increase of discovered reserves of oil and gas in western Canada. There has also been, since 1947, an increased utilization of our hydro power potential. More recently nuclear power has started to supply some of our energy needs, although this new source has yet to make any real impact on our total energy picture.

In 1947, when the Dominion Coal Board Act was passed, coal supplied 59.3 per cent of our national energy requirements, so it is not surprising that special steps were taken to safeguard the continuing supply of a fuel so vital to our national needs. However, in 1968 coal supplied only 9.7 per cent of our energy needs, a tremendous drop from 59.3 per cent. Of this total, Canadian mined coal contributed only 3.3 per cent.

Today, then, coal is only one of a number of energy sources, and as I have mentioned, it has become a relatively minor one. Consequently, it no longer seems appropriate to maintain special legislation and a special administrative agency with respect to this one

energy source. Instead, it seems far better to develop programs and policies for coal in the context of all energy sources.

I would like to say a few words about some of the more important responsibilities of the Dominion Coal Board, to indicate their present status. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I can tell of the arrangements being made to discharge the Board's remaining responsibilities. One of its major assignments has been to administer coal subventions. Over the years since the Coal Board was formed we have moved away from subventions conceived as merely part of the freight rate. Instead, we have given financial assistance to reduce the laid-down cost of coal at the point of consumption, to meet competition from imported fuels. This change has contributed to a steep climb in the annual expenditure for coal subventions. This rose from $1.7 million in the fiscal year 1947-48 to $33.3 million in the fiscal year 1967-68.

Since the subvention system was first introduced in 1928, total payments have exceeded $320 million. These have been administered by the Dominion Coal Board and its predecessor, the Dominion Fuel Board. In the past, subventions have been very useful in marketing Canadian coal. But changes in the Canadian energy industry, particularly the diminishing relative importance of coal, have made the subvention concept obsolete.

The work of the Coal Board has also been reduced by the creation of the Cape Breton Development Corporation, and by Nova Scotia's acceptance of full responsibility for the smaller coal operations in that province. This reduced workload was predicted in 1966 by the Donald Report on the Cape Breton coal problem. This report also stated that "such duties as remain could be administered directly by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the staff of the Board absorbed into that department". Toward this end, the Donald Report recommended that the Dominion Coal Board Act be "reviewed and assessed".

The coal policy agreement between Canada and Nova Scotia was signed on June 13, 1967. Under this agreement Nova Scotia accepts complete financial responsibility for such support of the smaller coal mines as it deems appropriate and necessary.

The act to establish the Cape Breton Development Corporation received royal assent on July 7, 1967. Devco is now operating the Cape Breton mines and related facilities of the Dosco group of companies on Cape Breton Island.

[Mr. Orange.]

The Coal Board's subvention work has also been reduced by an agreement between the federal government and the province of New Brunswick, concluded March 26, 1968. This ended subvention payments to coal producers in the Minto field. Instead, the province is receiving lump sump payments over a five year period, and now is responsible for rationalizing its coal mining industry and attracting new industry to the Minto area. The province was paid $2.8 million in the fiscal year 1968-69 and the agreement calls for another four annual payments of $4,050,000. As well, the federal government transferred to New Brunswick the rights of outstanding loans granted to coal producers in that province under the Coal Production Assistance Act. The value of these loans, as of transfer date, was approximately $513,000.

• (12:20 p.m.)

In western Canada, three major coal operators are receiving subventions for export movements, but all three have now completed long-term contracts for the export of coal to Japan on a completely commercial basis. Consequently, subvention assistance to one of these firms will end this coming March 31 and assistance to the other two will end on or before March 31, 1971.

Subvention assistance is also paid on smaller amounts of coal from Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia shipped to markets in Manitoba and Ontario. Last year this assistance amounted to $252,000, but these subventions also terminate on March 31.

When the Dominion Coal Board is dissolved, the remaining administrative functions concerned with subventions will be relatively few. The residual functions will be transferred to the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. However, the Board has responsibilities other than administering subventions. Section 6 of the Dominion Coal Board Act requires the board to advise the government on policies and measures related to the production, importation, distribution and use of coal in Canada. Section 7 of the Dominion Coal Board Act empowers it to undertake a wide range of research. This may be concerned with such matters as methods of mining and marketing coal and the competitive position of coal vis-à-vis other sources of energy. The Board has also served as a coordinating agency within government, between government and with the industry.

The dissolution of the Coal Board will not mean that these continuing and important

functions will be neglected. On the contrary, now that we are phasing out subventions it is in our interest to devote more time and money to research. This work will go on with a full knowledge of the relative importance of coal in our total energy picture.

The Energy Sector of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources is responsible for co-ordinating federal efforts related to all our energy sources and their utilization. It is therefore planned to attach the Coal Board staff to this section where their knowledge will complement the existing expertise in the fields of oil, gas, uranium and electrical energy. Within this energy sector, and through its ties with other parts of the department, our coal resources will receive continuing and close attention. This will allow their maximum use within a broad national policy which assures that each of our energy sources makes its most effective contribution to our economy.

The bill before us also calls for the withdrawal of the Coal Production Assistance Act and the Canadian Coal Equality Act, both of which are now administered by the Coal Board.

Now that Devco has been established and the coal policy agreement signed with Nova Scotia, there will no longer be a need for special mechanization loans to Nova Scotia coal producers. In New Brunswick the provincial government has accepted responsibility for the coal mines in that province. Meanwhile, the new large-scale export contracts with Japan have shown that the coal industry in western Canada can operate on a sound commercial basis without special loans or financial assistance. These are the reasons why the Coal Production Assistance Act is being withdrawn at this time.

During the 19 years that this Act has been in effect, 31 loans totalling $16.5 million have been made. Of this amount $10.5 million has gone to eastern producers and $6 million to western producers. Needless to say, coal operators whose loans are still outstanding will continue to make repayment.

Now that Devco, a Crown corporation, has taken over the production and marketing of coal in the Sydney area, there will no longer be any need of the Canadian Coal Equality Act. This act was passed in 1930 to aid the Dominion Iron and Steel Company works at Sydney. Under its terms a bounty of 49 cents a ton was paid on Canadian bituminous coal used to produce coke for the manufacture of iron and steel—that is to say, on Sydney area coal for the Dosco steel plant. During the 37 years this act has been in effect, payments have amounted to some $10 million. Devco will now set its coal prices at the levels needed to keep the markets it wishes to retain. And so, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Coal Equality Act is being withdrawn.

At this point, I should like to pay tribute to the members of the Dominion Coal Board who served on the Board since its inception in 1949. I believe they have performed a service not only to the coal industry but to Canada. The Board membership was completely changed last July; it now consists entirely of senior officials of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources.

In summary, the repeal of the Dominion Coal Board Act does not mean that the government has a lessened interest in our coal resources or in the social problems still affecting some segments of the coal mining industry. Rather, it means we must now deal with these problems on the basis of a new approach more appropriate to present-day conditions.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the Parliamentary Secretary permit a question? Can he tell the House whether agreement has been reached with the Dominion Coal Board or with the other Dosco subsidiaries regarding the price the government proposes to pay for the coal mines?

Mr. Orange: I gather that negotiations are still continuing in this regard. I am told there has been a meeting of minds and I am hopeful the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition will be answered very shortly.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): I shall not delay the House very long, Mr. Speaker. I rise to take part in this debate because the major effect of the legislation we are now considering will be felt in the Grand Lake area of the constituency I represent. I hope the plans of the New Brunswick government, which came about as a result of the grants to the Grand Lake Development Corporation, will do something to alleviate the grave anxiety felt for their future by many of the people who live in that area.

When the bill goes to committee I hope we shall be presented with a breakdown of the payments made not only to the government of New Brunswick but to various mines and individuals via the agency set up by the government of New Brunswick, that is, the Grand Lake Development Corporation.

Rationalization is, of course, current jargon quite acceptable to economists when they gather to plan the future of the country, but I plead that when we use such terms here we bring to them a great deal of understanding and sensitivity. Unless we are sensitive to the needs of individuals who have been displaced or who are about to be made redundant, to use another contemporary jargon term, very real hardship may result. Speaking personally, I have no real objection to the plans of the government, though I do take objection when they are so inflexible as not to show a great deal of sensitivity for the problems of miners and their families.

• (12:30 p.m.)

In summary, then, I plead for more humanity. I plead for full disclosure of plans, because this will in large measure allay the fears of people who have given the best of their lives in what is a very tough, dirty and hazardous job. Thirdly, I enter a caveat in connection with some information I have received. I am informed that the Grand Lake Development Corporation has a very large measure of patronage attached to it, and that a good deal of money is being directed toward certain people. This is very hard for the representative of a New Brunswick constituency to understand. Nevertheless, to have people driving around in half-ton trucks making inspections endangers the credibility of people in the future of the Grand Lake Development Corporation.

Lastly, I should like to share with the parliamentary secretary in the warm tribute paid to those members who have served the public interest as members of the Dominion Coal Board for many years. In particular, I should like to single out Mr. Percival Streeter, who has the good sense to live in the constituency of Fundy-Royal.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I too should like to say a few words about Bill C-161, which not only seeks to dissolve the Dominion Coal Board but also to repeal three acts relating to coal operations. We find in clause 4 the repeal of the Canadian Coal Equality Act, the Coal Production Assistance Act and the Dominion Coal Board Act. Personally, I feel the time has come to consolidate the work of the coal board within the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and I have no opposition to this bill in that respect.

I, too, would like to pay tribute to the members of the coal board who over the years have had a tough job to do. I think it is only right as this time that the members of this House recognize the job that they have done, and I believe have done well.

The Dominion Coal Board, as the parliamentary secretary has indicated, dealt with a variety of functions pertaining to coal. I think the primary function of the board was that of setting up and allocating subventions for the various coal mining areas of Canada. The parliamentary secretary has already referred to the amount of the subvention for the year 1967-68, which came to some $33 million.

Personally, I am pleased to see that one year from now most of the subventions, as far as British Columbia and most of the other provinces are concerned, will have disappeared. It is to be noted that the development of certain coal resources has become uneconomic. While subsidies were paid on each ton of coal mined, the number of employees in the industry meant that these subsidies reached as high as almost $3,000 per miner, which I think all will agree is very, very high. In other areas, the subsidy was well over $2,000 per miner. When you reach this stage you begin to wonder whether it is not time to take a look at the industry and see whether there is some other development that could be better served economically by payment of this type of subvention. I am not going to go into this particular question. I am still of the opinion that subventions might have to be continued in certain parts of the country. However, I note that the coal board will be attached to the department, and therefore the board will continue to look into this particular problem.

There are one or two matters I should like to draw to the attention of the House. It seems to me that when you dissolve a department whose whole outlook has been directed toward coal and coal problems you are apt to forget in its incorporation into some new department some of the very important functions that have been carried on, in this case by the coal board. One of these functions was the role played by the board in the setting of freight rates. The board was party to the negotiations between the coal and railway companies when the railway was hauling supplies of coal to various parts of Canada. The Board had to be in the picture. I hope that in the reorganization, if I may call it that, of the coal board this very important function is not going to be overlooked.

In this connection, I should like to spend a moment or two underscoring the need for

taking a look at the important coal traffic problem in the Fernie area of British Columbia. Two of the big corporations with coal leases in the Fernie area have placed before the transport commission an application to build railway links hooking up with the Great Northern Railway in the United States for the purpose of transporting coal from this area over U.S. lines to the Pacific coast, and then back into Canada and up to Roberts Bank. I am 100 per cent opposed to this routing. The coal board had done a good job in getting the transport commission, the railways and the coal companies together to try to work out some kind of formula that would ensure that this coal was hauled over Canadian lines.

May I just put a few figures on the record to show how important this type of approach is. I submit it will be regrettable if the expertise of the coal board is thrown overboard with this transfer of duty. It is estimated that for every one million tons of coal hauled to the Pacific coast, $1.2 million is returned to the area by way of salaries, wages and other related employee benefits, such as pension funds and so forth.

• (12:40 p.m.)

We cannot afford to lose this revenue. Currently, the Canadian Pacific Railway has two contracts to haul coal involving some 5 million tons annually. This means some $6 million a year is returned to the community in the form of wages, salaries and related employee benefits. This just shows you the tremendous input which would be lost if we were stupid enough to allow these reserves from the Fernie area to be transported by another railway line to the Pacific Coast. I cannot express myself too forcefully on this particular matter. We have heard stories that the CPR could not handle the coal traffic from Fernie down to the coast. Mr. Speaker, this is utter rubbish. The CPR can handle many times the quantity of coal which is now being shipped. It could easily handle 20 million tons of coal a year and more without any trouble at all.

I trust that the department concerned, and the coal officials in the department, will make absolutely certain that we as Canadians do not allow this lucrative rail traffic to get away from a Canadian company. I do not want anyone to think I am here speaking on behalf of the CPR because I have given them a first class hammering on many occasions and they will get it again, for example, if they try to do away with our passenger service.

But when it comes to an issue of this nature, then I think we have every right to stand up and say that Canadian resources such as the coal resources in Fernie, should be transported, if at all possible, over an all-Canadian communications route to our seaports, if we have to export them. I just leave this thought with the parliamentary assistant and the minister. I can assure them they are going to hear lots about this in the committee stage because we are not going to drop this issue.

There is one other point I should like to raise in connection with coal. There have been talks about a pipeline to carry coal from the Fernie area to the Pacific Coast. Whether this is feasible or not, I do not know. Whether it is feasible in any part of Canada I do not know. The coal would go in the form of slurry. Again, I would suggest to the department that this is a problem which our research authorities could solve in so far as coal is concerned. Maybe this is another matter which should be looked into, because one of the drawbacks to the use of coal as energy today, Mr. Speaker, is the high cost of transportation. If it can be cut by methods such as this I think feasibility surveys and research should certainly be considered.

I am not going to say anything more, but I do trust that other members in the House, and especially in the committee, will do a lot of delving into the question about the transportation of coal resources, particularly from the Alberta and British Columbia areas, to the Pacific coast. I hope they will make absolutely certain that we retain this commodity for our own Canadian transportation system and keep the benefits which accrue to the economy from this transportation in our own nation.

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Rocky Mountain): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill provides for the dissolution of the Dominion Coal Board. It is not very often that a government, having created a board or agency, later sees fit to abolish it. Such bodies more often have a propensity to perpetuate themselves, regardless of whether the job they do is good or bad, or their existence necessary or unnecessary. The Dominion Coal Board is not being dissolved because it has not done its job. To the contrary it has fulfilled its role so successfully that, in the light of the vastly changing and changed energy demands, the functions of the board can now be carried on satisfactorily through ordinary departmental channels.

Dominion Coal Board Dissolution Act

When the Dominion Coal Board came into being in 1947, coal accounted for about 60 per cent of the energy sources in Canada. Today, it accounts for about 10 per cent. The foundation of the board resulted from the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Coal, composed of the hon. Mr. Justice W. F. Carroll, of Halifax, the chairman; the hon. Mr. Justice C. C. McLauren, Calgary, and Mr. Angus J. Morrison of Calgary. Commissioner Morrison, who was then Secretary Treasurer of district 18 of the United Mineworkers of America made a minority report and he was explicitly emphatic on the necessity of establishing a coal board. His report recommended that:

> A dominion government agency is needed to coordinate the administration of government activity relating to coal now handled by different departments; to undertake new research work with respect to both technical and marketing problems and to distribute information thereon.
>
> A large part of the work of the proposed Canadian Coal Board would deal with the expenditure of public funds and policy relating to such expenditure must be a responsibility of the government. The board would be an administrative and advisory body rather than a policy making body. It would therefore be appropriate to include upon it representatives of the coal mining industry, employers, employees, as well as of the dominion government.

As a result of that recommendation, the government acted quickly to set up the Dominion Coal Board.

It was not long after the coal board began functioning that the coal industry began to face its most critical test. Large scale discoveries of oil and gas in western Canada brought these energy sources into competition with coal, while in Nova Scotia extensive modernization requirements coupled with the competition from imported oil put extreme pressure on the industry. Particularly because of the grave situation in Nova Scotia, the board was asked to study the existing policy in 1953. The board's first recommendation to the government as a result of this study was that:

> The production of coal in Canada continue to be maintained at a level which would preserve the basic structure of the industry and permit rapid and efficient expansion to meet increasing future needs.

I submit that without this determined and foresighted attitude on the part of the board it is entirely possible that the Canadian coal industry could have succumbed. As it was, much of it did not die, particularly in western Canada. Following the oil and gas discoveries in Alberta, markets in western Canada commenced to deteriorate due to the dieselization programs of the railways, the greater use of fuel oil in industry and the building of a vast network of natural gas pipelines which soon covered all the cities and towns of western Canada. This resulted in the permanent closure during the 1950's of most of the bituminous mines, whose principal production was locomotive fuel, and most of the underground mines producing coal for domestic and commercial heating. The ultimate result was that, despite every effort made to assist them by way of subvention, 80 per cent of the mining operations in Alberta and British Columbia were forced to close permanently.

Because of the continuing difficulties faced by the coal industry, the government in 1959 appointed the Hon. Ivan C. Rand a royal commissioner to inquire into the problems relating to coal production. The report of Mr. Justice Rand was made in August, 1960 and amongst its recommendations was that the government cease assistance on the export of coal to Japan. The Dominion Coal Board, to its everlasting credit, reacted strongly in opposition to this recommendation. I am sure that many of the people who are today dependant on the coal industry in western Canada shudder to think what the future would hold for them if it were not for the strong reaction which the Dominion Coal Board took to this recommendation of the royal commission in 1960.

The board felt that such assistance for the export of coal to Japan should continue for at least two or three years, at the end of which time another assessment of the situation could be made. It was because of this insistence that the few western mines still operating were able to continue doing so on a limited scale. As far as the western coal industry is concerned, if the Dominion Coal Board did nothing else, it justified its existence merely by insuring the continuation of assistance to western mines exporting coal to Japan. This assistance was substantial and without it it is difficult to say whether the Alberta coal industry would be as sound as it is today. However, it is most likely that it would now be dormant rather than the thriving force it in fact is. This was ably pointed out by M. F. Clemmer of Kaiser Resources Ltd. at the last Canadian conference on coal when he said:

• (12:50 p.m.)

> The Canadian taxpayer subsidized the small amount of production that did take place just to keep the industry alive as he still does throughout Canada. Let me say that this last was extremely important, because if the industry had been

allowed to die a natural death, it would have been doubly hard to bring it back to life—and that its resurgence might have been delayed much longer than it was. So there is very definitely something to say for keeping a function going even when it appears uneconomic if there is good reason for hope.

The fact that within the last five years the Alberta and Crowsnest coal industry has been rejuvenated as a result of huge export contracts with Japan, is history.

The development of this export business has been the result of a co-operative effort by the producers, the coal board, the mines branch and the federal government itself who, in spite of some doubts and misgivings, agreed to support the movement as long as it continued to show progress. This is one of the real success stories of the coal industry and the results thus far attained make the amounts expended on subvention assistance look very small indeed. A further bonus is that a greatly expanded export of Canadian coal to the western United States is likely to develop in future years so that the western bituminous coal industry now appears to have established itself on a solid basis for the foreseeable future.

The leadership shown by the board in finding stable markets for the western high rank coal presents a good example of the board's use of its intimate knowledge of and close contact with industry in guiding the latter from an uneconomic position to one of viability in its exports to Japan. Without the technical and financial assistance of the board with its specialized knowledge, it is doubtful that there would have been the same degree of success achieved in the development of this important export trade.

The board explored the potential and technical needs of the Japanese steel and gas industries. It suggested and guided a number of technical studies by the research arm of the Energy Mines and Resources Department. This included the implementation of its recommendation to establish in Canada a technical-scale coking coal evaluating facility.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, the Dominion Coal Board has served its purpose very well.

I wish to turn briefly to the impact of some of the foregoing on my area of Alberta, in particular. I do so only because the full force of the operations of the Coal Board has been felt mainly in two regions, Cape Breton and the coal mining areas of the rocky mountain district. All these mountain coal mines are in my riding or immediately adjacent to it, so the significance of the impact is national in character.

Before the advent of oil and gas there were prosperous, boisterous communities throughout the Crowsnest Pass region and at Canmore within the Rocky Mountain riding. Towns such as Blairmore, Bellevue, Coleman, Frank, Hillcrest, Burmis, Cadomin, Robb and Canmore were well known because of the wealth that was brought out from under the ground by the people who lived and worked in them. Then, slowly at first, soon at a quickening pace, the mines started closing as a result of dieselization. The coal branch area became a series of ghost towns. In the Crowsnest Pass area, both in Alberta and British Columbia, communities also declined. The few mines which remained in operation, such as Canmore Mines Ltd. and the predecessors of the present Coleman Collieries Ltd., did so mainly because of the subvention payments made to support the sale of the products of these mines. These subventions were very impressive. Their total for Alberta and the Crowsnest Pass area is more than $60 million. They helped many miners retain their employment. They allowed many families to remain in the communities they loved and called home.

I had the great pleasure some months ago of visiting the mines at Canmore and going underground with the miners. I met many of them who had been working at this mine for thirty or forty years. They probably knew the rooms of the mine, as they are called, as well as most of us know the rooms of our houses. I know these men are very glad the government saw fit to continue the assistance to their mines so that they could continue to work at the jobs they knew best. The same applies to the miners in the Crowsnest Pass area. I recently was in this beautiful and historic region of western Canada and talked to many people regarding the coal industry there. I found that the people were pleased with the revival of the coal industry and optimistic about its future. They are proud of the fact that very soon their mines will be operating without any government financial assistance in the form of subventions, but they are also grateful that these subventions have kept their coal industry alive during its dark years so that there now is a future in the Crowsnest Pass area. Last year there were almost 500 people employed in the coal industry in the Crowsnest Pass area receiving wages of almost $3 million.

But it is not only in these long-time coal producing areas that the industry has been revived. It is also being extended to new areas. The coal branch deposits will again be mined and this is giving a great impetus to the nearby modern town of Hinton where most of the employees will be living. The most impressive development, however, is taking place around an entirely new mining operation, that of McIntyre Porcupine on the Smoky River some 300 miles northwest of Edmonton. There, an entirely new town,

Grande Cache, is being built to accommodate the employees of the new mine. It will be one of the most modern and scenic communities in the entire country. Within a few years it is expected to consist of about 5,000 people. The impact of this development, together with the revitalization of the coal branch, is being felt in almost all communities in the area, including the important towns of Hinton and Edson. All these foregoing developments are in large measure the result of the efforts and the foresight of the individuals who have served on the Dominion Coal Board and are tributes to these people.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

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.

[*Translation*]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FINANCE, TRADE AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

Mr. Gaston Clermont (Gatineau): Mr. Speaker, with leave of the house, I should like to revert to routine proceedings in order to table a committee report.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Clermont: I have the honour to submit the tenth report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, in French and in English.

[*Editor's Note: Text of foregoing report appears in today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

NUCLEAR LIABILITY

MEASURES RESPECTING CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY ACCIDENTS

Hon. Léo Cadieux (for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-158, respecting civil liability for nuclear damage, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, the nuclear liability bill is intended to lay the basis for suitable financial protection against the consequences of accidents that may occur in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, equipment and materials.

Like other industrial plants, nuclear reactors and other major nuclear installations may be subject to accidents involving injury to persons and damage to property. However, in the 27 years that have elapsed since the first reactor was operated, there has not been a single case anywhere in the world, as far as we are aware, of death or injury to health of a person outside a nuclear plant resulting from an accident in it. There has been no case in Canada, and only one abroad, of damage outside the plant property caused by such an accident. Moreover, waste materials from nuclear energy installations have not become objectionable pollutants in our rivers, lakes and atmosphere.

The good safety record of nuclear installations in Canada is partly due to the early provision of appropriate control legislation, establishment of suitable safety standards, and the introduction of adequate protective measures while the industry was still developing, as well as the careful safety review by the Atomic Energy Control Board before approving the design and licensing the operation of these installations. In other words, the legal nature of nuclear materials caused concern 20 or more years ago and action was taken at that time to ensure, not only public safety, but also the protection of our waters and other segments of our environment.

Had we as a nation, and possibly as a world, the concern about the pollution of our waters, our air and our surface then as we have today, and had we taken the effective steps at that time to control the situation, today we would not be facing as a world the serious dilemma we are facing at present in trying to improve and restore our environment.

In spite of the good record, it would be unrealistic to ignore the possibility of accidents causing personal injury and damage outside the boundaries of a plant. Nuclear installations differ from other industrial plants in that maloperation or malfunction

may permit the release of radioactive material in quantities that might be hazardous to health outside the plant and cause contamination of property requiring costly decontamination or disposal. This fact raises a number of considerations which require special provisions in the bill.

Because the mention of radiation injury reminds us of the dreadful effects of nuclear weapons, it is important that we do not exaggerate the dangers from the use of peaceful nuclear installations and nuclear materials. It is physically impossible for a peaceful nuclear installation to explode with the violence of a nuclear weapon and produce such a powerful flash of radiation. Even apart from such unwarranted fears, the fear of being held liable for radiation injury could cause anxiety, for example, to manufacturers of equipment used in nuclear installations about the possibility of being exposed to exceptionally large damage claims. This bill, therefore, provides that each nuclear installation should have not only basic insurance but also subsidiary insurance that could provide, if necessary, for the highly improbable or almost inconceivable catastrophic event.

The need for protection of this kind has been recognized by other countries also. Canada is the only industrially important nation in the western world that has not yet enacted legislation to provide for it. The need in Canada has become more pressing since nuclear reactors are being constructed outside federally owned establishments.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Owing to the difficulties of establishing the contributory causes of a nuclear accident, and because some of its consequences may not be apparent for some time, a costly pyramiding of insurance, much litigation and interminable costly delays in settlement could easily result if unrestricted pursuit of damages were allowed. To meet these difficulties, the bill, resembling in this respect comparable legislation in other countries, would impose a duty on the operator to ensure that no injury or damage in Canada resulted from the operation of his installation. The operator would be absolutely liable for any breach of this duty without the claimant having to prove any fault or negligence. Financial responsibility would be channelled to one person, the operator, and subject to minor exceptions he would be the only one liable to third parties for injuries or damages.

The operator's financial responsibility would be limited to $75 million for any one nuclear incident. Toward this amount, the operator would be required to take out basic insurance with an approved insurer for an amount fixed by the Atomic Energy Control Board with the approval of Treasury Board. The amount of this basic insurance would be fixed after consideration of such things as the type and power of the reactor and its location in relation to population and to geographical features. This basic insurance might be quite small for, say, a research reactor of a well proven type. For large nuclear power stations it would probably approach the limit of commercially available insurance, understood to be about $25 million. Firm quotations for premium rates cannot, of course, be obtained until this bill has been passed, but on the basis of some figures suggested by insurers' representatives it would seem that the premiums should not unduly burden the industry. The terms and conditions of both the basic insurance, which would not be reinsured by the government, and the supplementary insurance, which would be reinsured, would require approval of the minister.

The difference between the amount of the basic insurance and the total of $75 million which is to be available for the protection of the public would be reinsured by the government under an agreement between the minister and the insurers approved by the Treasury Board. The bill provides that a fee may be charged for this supplementary insurance and the amount of this fee would be worked out with the Department of Finance.

If the claims exceeded the $75 million, Parliament could intervene to provide additional funds as it has in the past in cases of major disasters, and these funds would be administered under the terms of the act.

Due to the need for prompt relief in a nuclear incident of catastrophic proportions, the bill provides for setting up a Nuclear Damage Claims Commission when the circumstances warrant. This commission would have wide powers to determine and pay claims.

The bill provides also for compensation for injury or damage outside Canada where suitable reciprocal arrangements exist or have been made with another country.

At the present time, all operating nuclear reactors except one are the property of Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, and that crown company has agreed to indemnify all operators, suppliers and contractors against

liability in the event of an accident in these reactors that is not due to gross negligence or wilful default of a senior officer of the operator. The one operating reactor not owned by AECL is a research reactor at McMaster University. Under an existing arrangement, it is indemnified by AECL against liability for claims in excess of $500,000 for which amount the university is required to carry insurance. This arrangement would be superseded by the application of this legislation. It is anticipated that the cost to the university would, if anything, be lower under this bill.

The bill provides that it shall not affect the operation of such things as employees' compensation, health and other insurance, and pension plans. Since the bill was introduced and received first reading in November last, it has been widely circulated among scientists, utilities and others concerned. To date, comments have indicated that the general principles of the bill are acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, as we move the bill to the Committee on National Resources and Public Works the committee will have an opportunity to examine some of the technicalities—basically I would say that the bill is a technical bill—and to provide assurances to the Canadian public that in the unlikely event of a catastrophe in the field of nuclear science there would be protection for the people of this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to the chairman of the Atomic Energy Control Board, Dr. Lawrence, and the former and still active legal adviser, Mr. Jarvis. Both gentlemen have been involved in the business of controlling and policing atomic energy uses in Canada. They have made a great contribution and I believe that we, as a Parliament, should recognize their contribution to our country.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mankind stands on the threshold of a new era. He is harnessing the greatest power known to man and beginning to turn it to his peaceful purposes. The potential peaceful purposes of nuclear power are immense. Indeed, the ultimate potential probably lies beyond man's limited imagination. Certainly, the most important of the present prospects is the generation of electricity.

The second half of the 1960's marks the time when the use of nuclear energy for the generation of electricity became a commercial reality after more than 20 years of research and development. In this achievement, Canada has been one of the pioneers. We owe a great debt to our scientists, researchers and nuclear administrators. Our dependence on nuclear energy for our supply of electricity is bound to increase. A recent study by the National Energy Board projected our energy demands to 1990. That demand will grow by over 6 per cent annually and it is forecast that nuclear installations will soon be providing about one-third of that requirement.

This harnessing of nuclear power is a double boon for mankind. The western world has suddenly awakened with a dreadful start to the pollution and corruption of its environment. Nuclear power will represent a positive step toward the control of air pollution since, unlike power stations using fossil fuels, they emit no fumes into the atmosphere. In fact, most industrial applications of nuclear energy cause little or no contamination of the environment. We will have to become very careful of what is being called thermal pollution. This is a general problem with thermal power stations but there appears to be a bigger threat from nuclear stations because of the greater heat discharge. When water drawn from adjacent rivers or lakes for cooling purposes is returned, it may disrupt the total ecology of aquatic life. We will have progressed very little, Mr. Speaker, if we simply stop killing our fish with phosphates to start killing them with heat.

However, mankind should be thankful that the advent of the peaceful use of nuclear energy is giving man another chance to come to a peaceful reconciliation with his environment. It is an opportunity we cannot afford to miss.

Nuclear power can be a great benefit to Canadians. Our first nuclear power station began producing in 1962 at Chalk River. Expansion has continued since then: Douglas Point on Lake Huron, Pickering, the Bruce plant at Douglas Point, Gentilly—these are the names of Canada's nuclear record. We have met numerable technological problems. Basic decisions have to be made with regard to the future orientation of our peaceful nuclear energy program. But today is not a time to dwell on these matters, however important they may be. The use of nuclear energy is spreading rapidly in our industries and universities. Transportation is another area of potential nuclear development.

• (2:20 p.m.)

The bill before us today, which I am sure will receive support from all parts of this House, relates to an important matter which I

am sure is of general concern. We must insure that nuclear energy is a total benefit to mankind. We must make it safe. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the provisions which are contained in this bill are never used. I hope we will never have a nuclear incident which could endanger the lives and surroundings of Canadian men, women and children. But we certainly must make provision against that unthinkable day.

We on this side of the House, therefore, welcome this bill. In general, we think it is a good bill, one obviously based on the experience gained from the operations of other Canadian claims commissions, especially the War Claims Commission. The provisions to do with ensuring absolute liability of the operator, the setting up of controls over the insurance carried by operators, and the establishment of the mechanism for possible claims commissions fill gaps in the Canadian law.

There are a number of points in the bill which I feel need very careful consideration by the committee. Four points in particular that I feel must be changed are as follows: First, there is a need for a review procedure. Clause 24, subclause 6, provides that a single member of the commission may hear and decide claims, and that his decision has the same effect as if it had been rendered by the entire commission. This is unacceptable in this form. There must be some procedure either in the legislation or in the administrative mechanisms of the commission which assures the right of appeal to every claimant. Only through such review can the uniformity of treatment which is the very essence of justice be preserved. Experiences of the War Claims Commission which operated during the 1950's must be instructive in this regard. I shall not belabour this point, but I submit it is something to which the committee will have to give serious consideration.

Second, unless the minister can come up with a good explanation, clause 28 will also have to be changed. As it reads now, the minister has the discretion to refuse to pay any claim awarded by the commission. No sensible, concerned minister would do so. However, I can see no good reason for leaving this discretion in the bill, and it is another point to which the committee must give its most serious consideration.

Third, perhaps the most serious point to be looked at with regard to this bill is the question of the setting of the limit of liability. Seventy-five million dollars is the limit set in the bill. The committee will have to look very hard at this figure and will have to cross-examine the minister and his officials very carefully to see what the basis was for the setting of this figure. A nuclear incident in one of our crowded cities could very conceivably cause damage to humans and surroundings which could exceed that figure. This fundamental principle must not be abridged; every person must receive full compensation for any injury or damage which is inflicted upon him. Human suffering cannot be repaid at 50 cents on the dollar. If this limit is not found adequate for every conceivable situation, then the committee must change it.

We have no reason to be complacent about the problems of regulating our nuclear activity. The recent problems which developed with the 3,000 megawatt Bruce Plant at Douglas Point are vivid illustrations of that. The belated shift of construction to avoid the risk of endangering the labour force with hydrogen sulphide emission is a clear signal that we must give more attention to the way we have been supervising the construction and operation of our nuclear installations. We cannot wait for a major mishap to stir us from our lethargy.

My fourth and last point is a small one, but it could be important. We must have an adequate explanation of subclause 4 of clause 34. As it reads this subclause gives wide, wide, power to the cabinet to amend the very legislation which we are passing. There may be some justification for having a leverage with which to negotiate reciprocal treatment of Canadians in foreign countries, but we must consider this section very carefully to guard against any abuse of it.

These four points I have mentioned are important and, as I have said each time, the committee must look at them carefully. But the general structure of the bill is good, and I must congratulate the minister on it. I only wish that the other bill he is presently involved with, the Canada water bill, could deserve similar applause.

Mr. Fairweather: The government gets a big zero for that bill.

Mr. Comeau: In rounding out my comments on this bill, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make this rather personal observation. This modern age continually forces us to think and talk about the "unthinkable". The catastrophe of loss of life and permanent injury of human bodies through a nuclear incident is one of those "unthinkables". As I said earlier, my sincerest hope is that the second part of this

bill will never, never be used. And to insure that, Mr. Speaker, we must take a twofold approach to nuclear safety in Canada. This bill represents the second approach; the necessary but second approach. The first approach must be the most rigorous and vigilantly applied standards of operation, transit, and administration of our nuclear installations. Human safety of employees and the general public must be our primary concern. Only in this way will we ever realize my present hope that the provisions of this bill will never be used.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, our party does not wish to impede the progress of this bill to committee, where it will receive further consideration. May I point out in my introductory remarks that this bill, which was originally presented to the Liberal caucus as the nuclear hazards bill has now been brought in under the more comforting title of nuclear liability bill. I presume it was thus not as likely to frighten anybody. The parliamentary secretary attempted to play down the horror of a nuclear holocaust. In any event this bill, I feel, is enlightened in that it recognizes the growing use of fissionable material in Canada in industry, agriculture and medicine. We can expect the use of such material to grow in future. It will be a possible source of electrical energy. This, on one hand, may bring about improvements to our ecology but, on the other, harm our ecology. Possibly, the building of nuclear plants will make unnecessary large hydroelectric dams which block our rivers and desecrate large and beautiful valleys in different parts of rural Canada. Alternatively, the nuclear installations may raise the water temperature and, although that temperature may be adjusted only a few degrees by using river water to cool the plants, the whole spawning process of anadromous fish may be disrupted.

The bill looks forward to the time when nuclear power plants will drive ships, aeroplanes and perhaps even cars. It attempts to provide some measure of insurance protection against nuclear leaks or the failure of operators of nuclear installations to protect the public generally. From that point of view, the bill certainly is worth while.

I notice however, that under the definition of radioactive waste products, products to be used in medicine, agriculture and in commercial products are excluded from the provisions of the bill. I am disturbed by this omission. We are constantly learning that material we once thought to be non-toxic is toxic because of its cumulative effect. It is possible that the thousands of different and complex chemicals which are being put into our environment every day may, in the long run, cause us damage that, in the first instance, is not readily apparent. Certain chemicals, as is well known, build up in the body over a considerable period of time.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Consider problems associated with the uses of the drug thalidomide, pest control agents DDT and compounds of mercury, the latter being used on the prairies. These chemicals which formerly we thought were safe to use we now know, as the result of several years of experience, are not safe at all. I think the same thing might be said about nuclear material which will be used in medicine, agriculture and other parts of industry which we may not now feel has any toxicity but may, because of their build-up, lead to all kinds of horrors that at the moment we hesitate to contemplate. I think the public recognizes the horror of nuclear explosives. All over the world ban-the-bomb groups have marched to show their concern for the future of humanity. We are not dealing with some plaything when we are dealing with nuclear energy. But until recently only minor concern has been expressed over the threat to human survival on this planet if we fail to introduce bold anti-pollution measures. This is why I tend to be over-emphasizing my concern, so that it will be blatantly clear to anyone who will listen and read about this matter that the public is becoming alarmed at the dangers to its very survival.

Scientists tell us that we have just about one generation left to make a choice between a balanced ecology and disaster. Whether it is pollution disaster or nuclear disaster, it is really a Hobson's choice and the results will be the same. Since the public is becoming more aware and alarmed, it is getting to the point where a consensus is developing which will support strong and bold measures to protect the future existence of life on this planet.

I think there have been great and justifiable outcries about the underground testing of nuclear weapons, certainly over the testing in Amchitka in the Aleutian Islands last year. The proposed tests have raised considerable public concern not only in Canada, but in the United States, Japan and other parts of the world. Conservation groups are concerned as are seismologists about earthquakes. Even Governor Egan has expressed opposition to

these tests on behalf of Alaska. Despite this, nuclear testing continues. It has not stopped, it has just gone underground.

We can now look forward to the detonation of an atomic test proposed to be three times as large as the original test last fall. A stupid and possibly devastating nuclear escalation is now going on through ABM and related underground tests. I think these tests pose a potentially greater threat than anything that could be covered by this bill.

While this bill is an important measure dealing with the peaceful uses of atomic material, there is nothing in it that accords the public any kind of protection for the kind of things that occur when we have underground bomb tests and other tests which go on from time to time. Our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) made some stern remarks lately about the United States moves which are euphemistically called defensive measures. I hope Canada's stance will be much more stern than the last time. I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) a question regarding Amchitka on July 15 and he did not get around to sending a note to the United States about this matter until September 19.

I notice this bill includes exemption from liability for damage caused during times of war. I can understand why no insurance company would be interested in providing this protection during times of war, but I wonder about the fact that the bill appears to neglect the possibility of mishaps in military installations where ground-to-air missiles or other like atomic weapons are stocked for defensive purposes. I think the committee should consider this particular matter. I think while war is one situation, a possible mistake or error causing unlimited damage by atomic weapons stored on Canadian soil is certainly a very serious matter for Canadians to consider.

I could go into a great deal of detail about the possible threats of radiation, fall-out and genetic adjustment concerning the island of Amchitka, but perhaps this is beyond the purview of this bill. While I would like to express it because it concerns me and many other Canadians very greatly, I will not trespass upon Your Honour's good humour and get into that discussion at this time.

I feel that Canada has had a very good safety record with the nuclear installations in this country. We have had no major disaster associated with these reactors. Since we have had no major disaster concerning nuclear and fissionable installations, I wonder why the insurance companies have been so reluctant to move into the protective field, and why it is necessary for the government to guarantee these insurance companies in the way it is planning to do in this bill. It seems if money were to be made and the risks were slight, this would be exactly the kind of situation into which the insurance companies would be delighted to move. Obviously, because the insurance companies have displayed reluctance up until now to get into this field, it has been necessary to produce a bill which would allow a limited liability backed by the government rather than an unlimited one.

This situation is closely paralleled by the oil spills on Canadian waters. As hon. members know, when we were considering the Canada Shipping Act, a subclause covering unlimited liability for such spills was taken out of the act on the grounds that no insurance company would cover all the damage caused by such a disaster. We are now faced with a potentially major disaster off Nova Scotia. Although the minister did assure me during the debate on the Canada Shipping Act that he would take this matter of unlimited liability to the international conference, which he did, the fact still remains that at the moment we have no real protection against the possibility of a commercial disaster of the proportions of the one which could possibly occur right now while I am speaking.

This may reflect the same kind of reasoning that is behind Bill C-158. It is because of the gargantuan costs involved in possible damages that no insurance company will cover them. In instances such as this a limited liability is imposed and the public must be responsible for any other remaining damage costs which result. The insurance companies will not cover this. They feel they cannot do so because the financial risks are too great. Whenever disasters of this kind take place the public, through taxes and other disaster measures are required to pick up the tab.

• (2:40 p.m.)

In case any hon. member feels there is no risk to atomic waste disposal, I wish to read a rather lengthy letter written to the editor of the Montreal *Star* recently by F. H. Knelman, chairman of the humanities of science, Sir George Williams University. It is headed: "The Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy—Perils of Pollution must be Emphasized." Mr. Knelman is replying to a letter from Dean R. E. Bell of McGill, commenting on an article by Mr. Knelman "Myth of the Peaceful Atom".

Mr. Knelman, in his letter to the *Star*, takes up the specific points raised by Dean Bell. He writes:

1. Radiation Protection—The history of this issue offers so much support of my position, namely, the lag in the establishment of proper limits behind the total accumulated exposure from all sources, that it would require several issues of this newspaper to provide the evidence. After a dozen years of intense involvement in the issue of radiation hazards, I read Dean Bell's comments with a powerful sense of it all having happened before—the glib assurances of "tame" scientists and government atomic energy officials followed inevitably by the voluminous eating of their own words. I might paraphrase Dean Bell by stating that anyone who has the faintest knowledge of the subject couldn't possibly challenge my point. Ernest C. Tsivoglou, professor of sanitary engineering at Georgia Tech (chief of radiological water pollution control, U.S. Public Health Service, 1956 to 1966) has indicated that the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) constantly neglects both the problem of multiple sources and local conditions of high exposure. Moreover they ignore considerations of potential harm to lower organisms. Also they leave no reserve capacity for accident or expansion of radiation sources.

2. Water Pollution by Radioactive Substances—Here Mr. Bell reveals misquotation, misunderstanding and outright ecological ignorance. Let me cite some documented cases:

(a) A study of the Columbia River by Norman Lansdell revealed serious radioactive pollution and uptake by all forms of river life.

(b) Some radioactive isotopes from civil reactors such as Zinc 65 find their way into humans. Thus people in the Columbia River Valley have greater amounts of radiation in their systems than allowed for people in atomic energy installations.

(c) The fish kills and genetic mutations at White Oaks Lake, Tennessee as reported by Dr. Robert Pendleton of the University of Utah.

(d) A recent investigation found plankton in the ocean having radioactive levels 150,000 times that of the water. Dr. Lamont Cole, world famous ecologist at Cornell University, has argued that introduction of biologically active substances into the ocean could prove calamitous by destroying the diatoms which produce most of the earth's photosynthetic oxygen. Bell's supercillious, parenthetical date-dropping and public school posture just reflects his insensitivity to the hazards involved.

3. Thermal Pollution—there Bell once again reveals his ignorance. The fact that a coal fuelled power station can cause thermal pollution in no way detracts from the issue. Is Bell not aware of the Great Indian Point fish kill (Indian Point, N.Y.) or the Lake Cayuga controversy? A report by J. G. Terrill, Jr. to the American Society of Civil Engineers established that fossil fuel plants have thermal efficiencies about 1.5 times that of nuclear plants which therefore results in higher thermal pollution from the latter.

The letter continues at even greater length than I have quoted, Mr. Speaker. I shall not quote from it further. It goes on to indicate that we should be concerned not only about protection from possible atomic explosions, but also about the cumulative effects of radiation pollution.

I believe the committee, when it considers this subject, should propose amendments to the bill designed to prevent radioactive build-up, regulate transport of nuclear materials, and ensure that what has happened in the United States through neglect of such precautions does not happen in this country.

[Mr. Rose.]

Mr. Ray Perrault (Burnaby-Seymour): Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of representing Canada at the United Nations during the recent session of the United Nations. After reviewing the report of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the effects of atomic radiation, and having listened to testimony at the United Nations I can only say there is no reason for complacency on the part of any of us.

Increasingly we are discovering that serious dangers are attached not only to nuclear testing in the atmosphere but to underground testing and even to minor, peaceful applications of nuclear power. The United Nations Scientific Committee studying the effects of atomic radiation was established in December of 1955. This marked the beginning of the kind of co-operation which I believe is required increasingly in this world. Here was a committee not concerned with ideological differences; it was not concerned with the battle between communism, capitalism or the other "isms" in the world. It was concerned with trying to save poor, battered mankind from making itself extinct. Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, Britain and the United States are among the nations which make up the Scientific Committee.

This must be one of the rare instances in the history of mankind when Soviet scientists sat down with United States, British and French scientists to decide what might be done to save mankind. This is what they have been doing. Today, I want to tell the House briefly some of the frightening evidence which has just come out. The terms of reference given the committee were as follows:

(a) To receive and assemble in an appropriate and useful form the following radiological information furnished by States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies:

(i) Reports on observed levels of ionizing radiation and radio-activity in the environment;

(ii) Reports on scientific observations and experiments relevant to the effects of ionizing radiation upon man and his environment already under way or later undertaken by national scientific bodies or by authorities of national governments;

(b) To recommend uniform standards with respect to procedures for sample collection and instrumentation and radiation counting procedures to be used in analyses of samples;

(c) To compile and assemble in an integrated manner the various reports, on observed radiological levels;

(d) To review and collate national reports, evaluating each report to determine its usefulness for the purposes of the committee;

(e) To make yearly progress reports and to develop by July 1, 1958, or earlier if the assembled facts warrant, a summary of the reports received on radiation levels and radiation effects on man and his environment and indications of research projects which might require further study;

(f) To transmit from time to time, as it deems appropriate, the documents and evaluations referred to above to the Secretary-General for publication and dissemination to States Members of the United Nations or members of the specialized agencies.

There is no secrecy in this field. Oh, there may be secrecy about the emplacement of ABM's or of Soviet missiles and the rest, but world scientists are sharing information relating to radiation in Iowa and Irkutsk, Desmoines and Minsk, centres in the United States and Liverpool over in England, and centres all over the world, and we have provided our quota of this information.

From 1955 to the present day there has been an admirable degree of co-operation between members of this committee and, indeed, between all members of the 126-member United Nations organization on this subject. The speaker who has just preceded me mentioned Amchitka. Many people harbour the thought that testing underground is a safe form of testing. This is a complete fallacy. I quote from the report of the World Scientific Community issued by the United Nations. On page 14 of the report reference is made to radiation levels in 1969:

• (2:50 p.m.)

Temporarily increased surface-air activities have been observed from time to time. The composition of the radioactive material suggests that it has originated from underground explosions.

There is also concern, and rightly so, about continued United States nuclear testing at Amchitka. We should make our position very clear on this point. We should also make it crystal clear that we are not concerned with criticizing one ideology or another. We should be just as stern and critical when talking to the Soviet Union about continued underground nuclear testing on Soviet territory. Such testing is a continuous threat to the whole world.

The report states that debris from nuclear tests in the atmosphere is still the major radioactive man-made contaminant of the environment. The report continues:

Small amounts of radioactive material have leaked from a few underground tests, and the crash of an aeroplane carrying nuclear weapons resulted in a localized contamination by plutonium-239 off the coast of northern Greenland in January 1968.

That instance did not result from an atmospheric test. We do not have to be concerned about the effects of radiation from peaceful uses of atomic energy.

What else did we learn from this discussion of radiation levels? We have learned that brain damage has resulted from radiation exposure in the case of unborn babies. As a result of this, safeguards to prevent exposure are increasingly being improved; nevertheless such radiation has done a great deal of damage and affected a great many lives.

What else have we learned from this report? I should like to make reference to paragraph 10 on page 5, which deals with a matter that relates not to atmospheric testing or underground military testing. The report reads:

That severe damage to the nervous system can be induced in man also is shown by a number of observations of children born to mothers irradiated for medical reasons during pregnancy. Doses are unknown but are believed to have been high. A number of cases of reduction of head size, often accompanied by severe mental retardation, have been reported among these children as a result of irradiation from the second through the sixth month of intra-uterine life. However, contrary to what animal experiments would lead one to expect, major structural changes of the nervous system have seldom been observed, perhaps because these would be incompatible with sufficiently long survival of the human embryo for the damage to be detected at birth.

This radiation resulted from the peaceful use of atomic energy, and that is why I suggest this is one of the most important bills to come before the House in years. The report continues:

In children, on the other hand, the evidence suggests that, at least with regard to the induction of malignancies, the nervous tissue might be about as susceptible as other tissues such as the thyroid and blood-forming tissues. It is, however, in the pre-natal period that the vulnerability of the nervous system is highest. There is clear evidence that, from the second to the sixth month of pre-natal life, doses from 50 rads onwards are associated with increases in mental retardation and microcephaly. Evidence on the effects of lower doses during this

same period of pre-natal life is still extremely tenuous and does not permit exclusion of the possibility that increased incidence of the same effects may be a result of exposure in this lower range.

It is said that we must fight pollution today at all levels—pollution of our soil, our air and our water. And so we do, Mr. Speaker. But we also have a threat posed by nuclear pollution, and all of mankind is affected by that threat, regardless of ideology.

According to page 9 of the report, exposure to radiation may result in an increase in the number of chromosomal aberrations. These aberrations are clearly of genetic importance and may in fact comprise the major component of the genetic damage resulting from radiation exposure. Scientists of the world are working feverishly to check the findings gathered thus far, which indicate that the very chromosomes which decide the future genetics of mankind and the ability of man to survive are affected by nuclear testing.

I do not claim, nor does anybody else on the government side claim, that this was a Liberal inspiration because I am sure all Canadians give their support, but I am proud to say that at the United Nations Canada has acquired the reputation of being the nation that presents the resolution dealing with the continuation of scientific testing of nuclear levels throughout the world. This year Canada again moved a similar resolution, supported by Czechoslovakia. Although there may be some disheartening moments at the international level, when a Canadian resolution is supported by Czechoslovakia, the United States, the U.S.S.R., South Africa, Israel, Great Britain, France and all the rest of the nations, it is an indication that Canada is taking an initiative which mankind believes to be useful. We believe that in its 14 years of existence this committee of world scientists has conscientiously discharged its responsibilities. During this same period the world has experienced a rapid and alarming rise in radiation levels, happily followed by a substantial reduction as a result of the partial test ban treaty of 1963.

However, nuclear tests, be they atmospheric or underground are, I repeat, far from being the only source of radiation to which the world population is exposed. As the report to which I referred indicates, the peaceful application of nuclear energy, valuable though it is, carries with it a constant hazard. As these uses grow and spread, the importance of continued monitoring and the interpretation of contamination data will assume even more significant dimensions. In his speech to world scientists on May 7, 1969 the Secretary General referred to the assistance that the nations of the world derive from these scientific reports. He expressed the concern of all mankind when he stressed the importance of measures to deal with environmental radiation and its dangers.

There is one difficulty with this report that has been issued on the dangers inherent in military and even peaceful applications of atomic energy. That difficulty is that the report is a highly scientific document which it is difficult for people generally to understand. If the masses of the world were to understand what the scientists of the world were trying to tell them about the dangers of radiation, then they would be just as alarmed about nuclear pollution as they have now become alarmed about pollution of their water, air and the rest of the environment in this biosphere.

Next year the scientific committee will issue a popular pamphlet. The final chapter of this scientific report will be written in layman's language. I hope that a good journalist with a scientific background will write that chapter. A couple of members of this House have experience in that field. The report should be made available to every Canadian, hopefully to every resident of the world. In this way will they understand the dangers which are an inherent part of the scientific advances that have been made.

The report that the scientific committee has just completed represents a continuation of its previous activities. As I have already said, the Canadian resolution had the unanimous support of all nations at the United Nations. Another scientific report will be published next year and the scientific committee will be carrying on its work.

The importance and rapid development of three subjects critically reviewed by the committee, namely radiation carcinogenesis in man, the genetic risks of ionizing radiation and radiation-induced chromosome anomalies in man, will mean that they must be reviewed even more intensively during the coming 12 months and another report issued.

• (3:00 p.m.)

We said at the United Nations that we are confident that in the discharge of the full range of its responsibilities with respect to the levels of radiation to which the world population is or may become exposed, involving careful assessments of a wide range of

data, the committee of scientists will continue to perform the excellent service we have come to expect of it.

I wanted to rise and express my support for Bill C-158 and to urge at the same time that this government not stop here, but continue its efforts at the international and at the national level to protect the citizens of the world and the citizens of this nation against nuclear pollution wherever it may occur.

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I rise not to make a speech but to ask a question. As I understand the bill which we are discussing, it would fix compensation for persons injured as a result of the peaceful use of nuclear energy. I think I am right in saying that. The parliamentary secretary to the minister in introducing this measure was at some pains to point out the unlikelihood of any such loss or damage, and the fact that it would be very small or almost negligible.

Having this in mind, I wonder whether the government, which has given so much consideration to fixing compensation in respect of people who very likely will not be injured, has considered providing compensation for those Canadians who are in more immediate danger of suffering loss as a result of the impending nuclear underground explosion to be conducted by our friends to the south, in the North Pacific within the next few months. I raise this question now because it will be recalled that last year, when a similar but much smaller test was undertaken, our government told Washington that it would hold the United States responsible for damage incurred by our citizens as the result of that test.

I thought it would be timely today—although it has nothing to do specifically with this measure—to ask the representative of the minister to accept this as a question which he might raise with the government. Inasmuch as we are going to provide some protection for civilians in respect of damage resulting from the peaceful use of nuclear energy, we in this group think it is much more timely to act to protect citizens who are in potential danger from this impending, very massive nuclear blast in the North Pacific.

I agree with the speaker who has just concluded his remarks, that Canada is playing an important role in seeking to bring about between the United States and the U.S.S.R. a test ban treaty on underground explosions. I hope that in line with general protection for civilians which the government has in mind, this effort will be stepped-up.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

[*Translation*]

CRIMINAL RECORDS

PROVISION FOR RELIEF OF CONVICTED PERSONS

The House resumed, from February 5, consideration of the motion of the Solicitor General of Canada that Bill C-5, to provide for the relief of persons who have been convicted of offences and have subsequently rehabilitated themselves, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

[*English*]

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, we have Bill C-5 before us. It is an important measure, and if it is not carefully considered in the House and by the committee it may have very serious consequences to the welfare of Canada both as it affects the individual members of our society and the nation as a whole. At first view it may appear innocent enough, but for those who do not know what Bill C-5 is all about let me say it is an act to provide for the relief of persons who have been convicted of offences and have subsequently rehabilitated themselves. If we take the last part first, as a humanitarian and a person raised in the Christian ethic I would be the first to say let us destroy all criminal records and start anew. Unfortunately, those people who may find themselves responsible for making this decision do not have very many of the facts at their disposal.

This matter might be fairly simple in the case of a juvenile. We have had some very commendable suggestions both by the committee and in the House, that when the offender is a juvenile and becomes of age the sins of his youth should be largely forgiven. I go along with that provided of course, he has been rehabilitated. I agree with the last speaker that nobody wants to see a child of tender years carry a criminal record for the rest of his life after he has reached the age of discretion. This is particularly true if the mild correction he received from society had the desired effect and there is no real danger of his again breaking the law. We must have very firm guidelines.

As we learn more about penal psychology, which is the subject we are discussing, we find that in our genes inherited from our

ancestors there are weaknesses or weak tendencies which do not necessarily have an effect upon character in so far as criminal make-up is concerned. Unfortunately, this relates to the behaviour pattern of the child or grown-up in society. We have to be very careful to separate, outline and define what we are talking about—a person's character or the mathematical chance, if you like to put it that way, of a recurrence of a very serious crime. I do not think we should be carried away by our sentiments, certainly not to any unlimited degree, in suggesting that we wipe the slate clean.

As I always attempt to do, I shall cite a number of cases other than personal ones in respect of which I think everybody would agree that we cannot wipe the slate clean. Let us consider a case where the prison psychologist or doctor is consulted before an individual is convicted of a sex offence, in order to determine whether the individual is in fact in his right mind. Such an individual, according to the prison psychologist or doctor, may not be dangerous in that he will necessarily repeat the offence. If that individual's behaviour was so abnormal, even in our permissive society, that he attacked another child or grown-up, the chances are that short of a miracle he will at some time in his life repeat the offence.

I remember one terrible case that occurred in the city of Winnipeg, I believe back in 1945. A small boy was murdered in a coal yard. I was not in the police force at that time, but the Winnipeg city police told me, as one who lived in the district where the offence occurred and as an ex-policeman who was trying to help solve the crime, that they had 300 deviates in their records and any one of them might have committed this offence. It was commendable that they went to the trouble of checking each one of these 300 people. They did not find the criminal among them; he was located in another urban centre. I understand he was found because the police did their work in checking all those persons who were capable of committing the offence and had done this sort of thing before, whether to a child or an adult. The police were able to come up with a solution to the crime.

• (3:10 p.m.)

If we are to wipe out the records of offenders, they should receive forgiveness and an opportunity to rehabilitate themselves. This is not only a Christian but a sensible approach, if these people are to be rehabilitated. I believe the chairman of the committee said there is great economic advantage to society in these people not being hounded for the rest of their lives by an overactive police force or ambitious members of a law enforcement body. Again, that is not to suggest that all offenders should be given carte blanche; nor does it suggest that because we have forgiveness in our hearts, the forgiveness should go to the point of wiping out all criminal records after an arbitrary five-year period.

There is also the situation in respect of the security of Canada involving a person who may have been actively engaged in a serious riot, subversive activity or violence toward a person or society. It might well be that such a person, having done his dirty work in Canada, would move to another country where the labour situation seemed ripe for the same kind of unrest, and after a period of five years when what he had done had been forgotten, he would come back and do it again.

Another point made during the committee hearings was that it is almost impossible to destroy records. One might think of the story about the small boy whose mother had a system of recording his small crimes by driving a nail in the wall every time he did something wrong. Pretty soon there were a number of nails in the wall. Then after the boy had a change of heart and began to fill the wood box or attend to his school work properly, his mother would pull out a nail until eventually there were none and he became well adjusted.

One day he came to his mother and told her he was not feeling very well. She asked him what was wrong. He told her that although she had pulled out all the nails, the holes were still in the wall. So I suggest when a person has committed a series of offences, or an offence, it is difficult for a policeman to forget that perhaps such a person had stolen a car in his youth. But it is equally true that by far the largest number of good policemen do forget, at least to the point that the person is forgiven. Policemen are not out to destroy the life of a young man. As a matter of fact, most policemen I have met I am proud to say have spent a great deal more time attempting to keep young people out of trouble than bringing them before the courts.

I hope that after a little more tailoring has been done to the bill, and a little more thought has been given to it, it will pass. I hope it will go a long way toward removing any chance of the persecution of people

who have seen the light. If there is any way in which this can be done, it will certainly have my support and, I am sure, the support of every member of this House. But I suggest that we should not necessarily destroy all criminal records merely because those of us who are more adjusted in society believe a criminal should get a break.

There is another very important point to keep in mind. I refer to the protection of society. I could go so far as to say that one protection we have is by making sure that the criminal is not mollycoddled or treated too well, because the fact that he has a record may encourage him not to make it any worse.

In matters concerning the security of Canada I have no hesitation in saying that when a person has proven himself to be an enemy of society, some permanent record should be kept in the event that in the future he may endanger a citizen or Canada as a whole. Having served in the force myself, I am pleased to see that "commissioner" in the bill refers to a commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. I think that permanent records such as those kept at the headquarters of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police would not be abused.

In cases where it is thought by the Solicitor General, the Attorney General of Canada or the Governor in Council that the person is dangerous, a permanent record should certainly be kept. I cannot imagine a safer place than the headquarters of our highly respected and responsible force. This is a great responsibility and I know that in the past responsibility has been undertaken with great decorum. I hope we never lose the feeling of satisfaction we have with the way this force has carried out its duties.

Because the treatment of our police in general has been somewhat severe in recent years, and because I am afraid there has been almost a campaign against the police, I suggest that we do not spend sufficient money to make sure that we have proper law enforcement officers across this nation. From my own experience I would suggest several things might be done. One would be to have a series of police colleges across Canada at which policemen who come in contact with members of the public in respect of law enforcement would have an opportunity to be properly trained. I believe we should take a broader view in respect of this whole problem and decide to spend the necessary money on training our police officers.

I would refer to the unfortunate incident which was recently reported in the newspapers involving an official of the British Columbia government who was manhandled. I shall not pass judgment on this incident, but from what I have read it would appear to be the type of incident which should not occur anywhere in the world and certainly not in Canada. I am sure this type of incident could be prevented if we had a proper school and screening for our law enforcement officers.

The type of police college I have in mind would be available to police officers preferably before they go out on the beat. At the colleges these persons would have instilled in them the spirit of police work and their duties would be outlined. This would involve the expenditure of a certain amount of money, but the money would be an investment not only in respect of the prevention of crime but in terms of the respect all citizens would have for law and order.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Revenge has largely gone out of our law. We have come a long way in the last 150 years when under the British law and our tradition at least 120 offences carried capital punishment. We thought nothing of sending our young men and women as far away as we could from their own country to prison camps in Australia for offences such as stealing a sheep, or in some cases for being suspected of stealing a sheep. It was a corrupt law, but we have come a long way since then.

However, I enter my plea that we must not become so soft that all our attentions are directed at making things soft for the criminal. We still have to protect society. We must not become so broadminded that our brains fall out. I am sometimes accused of being a little emotional, but I do not think this is one of the areas in which we can afford to be mere flag-raisers. I think that the protection of society is as important as the humanitarian treatment of the offender. Our security and the protection of past offenders is our main duty here.

I cannot possibly cover the whole question of rehabilitation in the short time that I have at my disposal. I agree with those who have said that it is no good putting our young people out of circulation unless we intend to do something positive for them. Revenge is out, and rehabilitation is expensive. It costs a lot of money to bring a boy back after he has started on the wrong road. I am not one who underrates rehabilitation, but I want to harp

once more on an old and favourite belief of mine. The cost of rehabilitation can be cut down a great deal by taking another, very positive step, that is, by giving these young people proper guidance before they commit their first offence. Let us spend more money on physical fitness programs, backyard baseball and community efforts of the family, thus eradicating the need for rehabilitation after the event. The prevention of crime pays us off a hundredfold. The John Howard and Elizabeth Fry Societies have done noble work with limited funds and in the limited atmosphere in which they work.

Before I sit down I should like to make one more suggestion. In the treatment of criminals—and I use that word in a charitable sense, meaning people who have broken the law or who have been caught breaking the law—we should ensure that we keep in mind, first, when they come to court the importance of treating them like gentlemen or young ladies. Let us show them for the first time what their duty is to us, by the way we treat them. Let us make sure that our jails are not places of punishment but places of rehabilitation; I do not mean places where they run the jail, but jails which are fit for human beings. Instead of taking a boy out of a more or less innocent group of petty offenders on the street corner and putting him into jail for a long time among hardened criminals, where he has nothing to do but learn worse habits than he had before, let us rehabilitate him. This, again, will require the spending of a lot of our hard-earned money on well-planned and properly built places of incarceration.

We must encourage lawyers to not only exert themselves to win cases but to win back to society the men they have in their care, and to convince their clients that they should not perjure themselves and compound the felony. A young man who has only stolen a bicycle is now taught that if he lies convincingly he may be acquitted, or if he robs a bank he may be able to buy justice. I think that our trained professional men have to take another look at their profession and realize that they not only have a duty to protect young offenders but they must try to get these young men back on the rails as soon as possible.

My view is that hard and cruel sentences never did anybody any good. I venture to suggest that a young man going to jail suffers the greatest shock in the first 48 hours in jail. If you are ever to impress them that this is not the right environment for them, that is the time to do it. If being locked in a steel cage for 48 hours does not impress a young man with any pride or decency in him, he is a difficult case. I do not suggest that he should be sprung immediately. Perhaps he needs more time to think things over. I suggest that in a great many cases the sentences should be indeterminate. The offender should be taken immediately out of circulation and his rehabilitation should be started shortly after his arrest, not five or seven years later when it is far too late. His rehabilitation should start almost as soon as he is arrested, and he should be given fair treatment but not more than he is allowed.

Mr. Gibson: Let us first make sure that he is guilty.

Mr. Bigg: That is another point. My experience is that there are very few innocent people languishing in jail. If there were, I would be willing to take time off from the House of Commons to defend them. I am a lawyer as well as a tired, old policeman. I do not think there are many innocent people languishing in jail, but from my own experience I believe an indeterminate sentence would do the most good once a man has been convicted and put in a steel tank.

Once a man demonstrates that he has seen the error of his ways and is ready to co-operate, he might be given an indeterminate sentence. Then he could get out on parole almost immediately, particularly in the case of the first offender and the young offender. He could be put in the charge of someone from the John Howard or Elizabeth Fry Societies who will arrange for him a good, clean, satisfactory environment under control while on parole. This would give him time to rehabilitate himself, before there is talk of wiping out his record. Let us not concentrate on wiping out the record but, rather, as one of my hecklers pointed out so well, let us first make sure whether he is guilty. I was assuming that under our law he would be found guilty before he got as far as jail.

Let us ensure that the rehabilitation of an offender is started right away, instead of putting him in an environment much worse than the one in which he was when he committed a petty offence. The atmosphere in any jail that I have seen—and I have seen a good many of them—is not conductive to the formation of a better character and the longer you leave these young offenders there, the worse they are likely to be. We should adopt a common sense approach. On the other hand,

I do not think that coddling these people will make them into nice little boys, telling them that they did nothing wrong and society is the real offender, or that he would have been a nice fellow if his mother had loved him more and allowed him to have his own way. In a great many cases a boy has a much better chance of making something of himself if he is not given his own way and if society treats him fairly and firmly and starts him on the road back. This is where we should concentrate our efforts.

I hope this bill will be taken back to committee. There we will take a close look at it to ensure that we are not just using the whitewash brush, and that where serious cases are involved and the security of individuals or of the realm is to be protected, we will not be sentimental and do a big whitewash, erasing job. On the other hand, criminal records should not be abused. If we are doing this because of police brutality, I say we are working at the wrong end. We should improve the standard of our police force, because that is where the trouble lies. Presumably, if the right people are in charge of records no offender would have any complaint about the way he is treated in our Canadian society.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, it has become apparent during the course of the debate that practically everyone in this chamber is in favour of the general principle of this bill. I have no intention of going over that general ground because at this stage almost everything has been said not once but many times. I believe we all feel it has contributed quite a bit to straightening our thinking to have the bill in this form of granting a respite or a second chance to people, rather than trying to expunge records. I do not think it is conducive to straight-thinking to suggest that the past can ever be wiped out. It cannot be. As Omar Khayyam said:

The moving finger writes; and, having writ,
Moves on: nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

The past is gone; yet its memory is still there. What this bill is trying to do is wipe out the possibilities of persecution once people have been rehabilitated and returned to society. There is one point which I have not heard discussed in this debate. I hope the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) will listen carefully, and perhaps when he replies he will give me an answer to my question. The bill itself has gone far to straighten out our thinking on this matter, but there is still one point which is just not logical to me and that is the whole idea of a pardon.

If a person has committed an offence, if he has served his sentence and made restitution to society as far as he is able, he has paid his debt to society and that should be finished. I am not a lawyer but as a lay person I feel it is not logical to talk in terms of a pardon when the debt has already been paid. I can understand one saying that a person is rehabilitated, gets a second chance or that the slate is wiped clean, but for the life of me I cannot understand why he should have to ask for a pardon when he has already committed the sin and has been convicted and sentenced. Apparently he has paid his debt to society.

This may be a small point, but every time I have looked over the bill I wonder why we think in terms of a pardon. The man is not coming up for a pardon he is coming up to make sure that there will not be any discrimination when he starts afresh in society, that he will not be discriminated against because of his past.

That is all I want to say on this bill, Mr. Speaker. I should like to hear the reasoning of the minister as to why he talks in terms of a pardon. Maybe it is legal language that I do not understand. Goodness knows, there is a great deal of legal language that does not make sense even to lawyers.

I see the minister is now interested to the point that he will try to tell me what was in his mind when he talked about pardon. The only pardon I know of is one in connection with a crime when a person has committed a murder or a serious offence and is granted a pardon, so that the sentence is not executed against him. But in this case he has served a sentence and paid a penalty for his crime, so it is a pardon for what? It is not a pardon for his offence; he had paid for that. I would be extremely glad to know the reason for this, if the minister would be so gracious as to explain it.

I wish this bill well. I believe all of us in this corner of the House and in the chamber generally think this is a real attempt to give a person a fresh start and treat him like a human being instead of a second-class citizen for the rest of his life, and someone to be persecuted and made into a pariah. I will now resume my seat, Mr. Speaker. I hope the bill will have reasonably swift passage through the committee and back to this House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): The hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Fortin) made a brilliant plea yesterday, the realism, truth and sincerity of which impressed me greatly.

The bill now before us concerning the records of criminals deals with a most controversial matter. Although our other institutions have evolved, our judicial system has remained the same. We indulge in senseless talk and pettifoggery while we forget the human being. We still act as if the convicted man was a horrible beast. Most of our prisons and penitentiaries are schools of crime, with small, dark quarters, and unhealthy atmosphere, which bring to mind conditions in medieval times. This situation is painful enough without having to add the indelible stigma, that 20th century disgrace: the criminal record.

The principle of this bill is therefore justifiable, for it is high time we should get rid of those antiquated laws because of which the individual who gets caught—and I repeat, the man who gets caught is branded for life. God knows that countless thieves, crooks, bandits go about freely, very often wear white collars and are considered quite respectable.

As I was saying, the man who gets caught thereby becomes branded for life with the seal of approbrium. It should therefore be proved that much more is needed than a mere "minor reform". Major reforms must be made. Rumour has it that the convicted will be granted a pardon. One should also wonder if a condemnation was always just. Is there anything more revolting than getting a police record merely because the police wants to get even, or because the Crown wants to win its case, or even because a judge has allowed himself to be influenced?

I should like to illustrate what I mean through concrete examples in order to convince hon. members. In today's *Montréal-Matin* one can read the following heading:

The deputy minister claims he was beaten and thrown naked into a prison cell—

• (3:40 p.m.)

In view of the fact that a deputy minister from British Columbia is involved, the matter will be dealt with more rapidly, the police will plead guilty and the Quebec government will simply apologize. However, had an individual been involved, the police might have wanted to be right at all costs. I am simply quoting a newspaper report regarding the misfortune of Mr. Redel. Here is what it says, and I quote:

Within the hour following his arrival at the police station, he received medical attention and then sent home.

That is what the police claim. However, Mr. Walter Robert Redel, from Victoria, deputy minister in the government of British Columbia, contends the opposite. I continue with the quotation:

—stripped of all his clothes and deprived of his personal belongings he was left in a cell, stark-naked, for three hours.

Finally Mr. Redel asked one of the guards to call for a doctor. Half an hour later a doctor arrived. Mr. Redel had a skull injury and the bone above his left eye had been fractured.

Later on, four or five men came to question him and they finally admitted their error, following a telephone call to the Department of Lands and Forests of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, is it conceivable that such things can happen in a civilized country such as ours? Is it possible that we can witness such stupidity, such errors? In most cases, when ordinary people are involved, they are unfairly convicted and this is how new criminals are made.

I am for criminal records being wiped clean after a certain time. If untrained police forces, as the Quebec police in particular, are left to do what they want and if we let Crown attorneys do what they want to win their cases at any price, we shall end by creating a kind of society that makes me think of the one described in the film "Z".

I have personally lived through very practical experiences which I would like to expound in this House. This will help prove that it is really time to do away with criminal records and to question our police methods as well as our legal system so that we can begin to really respect the human being.

Last August 23, I was stopped by two officers of the Quebec municipal city on the grounds that I was driving at 49 miles per hour in a 30-mile zone and that I had been spotted on the radar screen.

It can be said without exaggerating that all automobile drivers break regularly highway regulations, either by running through a red light or by forgetting to make a stop or by parking illegally or too long and especially by failing to drive within the speed limit. Therefore, it is not necessary to be a genius or even intelligent to arrest anybody at any time and for any reason. Thus, a good number of our policemen, whose worth is measured in

inches, feet and pounds, go driver hunting with gusto. Their favourite weapon is the traffic ticket.

Another invention, radar, is still more deadly. On the look-out in the traffic jungle, they watch and stop just in case the first driver that comes along. It even becomes a game, sometimes. They decide, for instance, to stop the driver of every fifth car or of every green car, or so as to make it easier for themselves still, the driver of the car that came to a stop at the red light, as the others are getting away too fast. That is what happened on August 23, 1969.

Who will dare argue in such circumstances? The policeman, hunter and not protector as he should be, invested with the supreme authority that goes with his uniform and his revolver, is infallible. Insinuations, lies, perjury, he is allowed everything. His word is worth more than that of an honest and respected man in public life, even if he is supported by his wife and other eye witnesses. Why? There is the uniform, the club, the revolver, we know that, but there is also the fact that an ineluctable law has been established for the police, namely that they must not lose any case. With his club and his big flat nose, the policeman would sell his own mother if that could help him win a case or save his skin.

A Crown attorney asked me why I argued with the policemen who stopped me since, knowing the law, I could always speak for myself in court, and that is what I did. The results are there to be seen. The good people of this country have known for a long time that it is better to pay $3, $5, $10 or even $20, even when one is right, than to be insulted in court, where one's word is worth nothing compared to that of a hoodlum policeman and where any citizen can finally get ruined.

As I wished to prove that justice is justice after all, I pleaded not guilty on the four charges with which a sensation-hungry policeman had saddled me on that August 23, 1969. But it was a waste of time. The evidence from my wife and two eye witnesses, apart from myself, could not outweigh the untrue statements of a policeman, supported by a buddy who, wishing at all costs to keep his job and for reasons of solidarity, was willing to corroborate anything, provided he was told about it first. The judge had seemed very sympathetic to me, even though he was employed by the town, as the policemen, and the evidence of my innocence was so crushing that I took it for granted that the four cases would be won. The policeman's blatant insincerity about two charges could only confirm my innocence as far as the first two were concerned.

You might think that the incident has no relation whatsoever with the bill before us. Maybe, but the very fact I was charged with abusing the police, with opposing arrest, has made of me a criminal. When did you ever see a man driving at 49 miles per hour in a 30 miles per hour zone being handcuffed and taken to jail? Confronted with such flagrant injustice, I thought there would still be men able to use their common sense.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I believe the hon. member was right and that he is getting away somewhat from the subject.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I could not be closer to my subject and that is what my remarks have tried to prove from the start. The point I am making is that one can have a criminal record simply because of an unfair sentence, thus proving that criminal records should be vacated right after the sentence has been rendered or the fine paid. But what I really want to show is that a lot of people have criminal records and that, for no reason whatsoever.

I would like to give you an example. I described in detail, in a letter addressed to the mayor of Quebec, copy of which I sent to the chief of police, the incidents in which I had been involved.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, completely disregarding the facts stated by a public man who is, I believe, respected as are all our colleagues here, a unilateral decision was rendered. The letter ends as follows:

> In view of the complete lack of ethics of these two brutes: I urge and demand that official apologies to my wife and myself be made by the City of Quebec and its police force.
>
> I strongly urge that the municipal police eliminate such fiends from its ranks.
>
> Obviously all charges brought against me should immediately be withdrawn.
>
> The foregoing is without prejudice of any action for damages that could be filed, particularly in relation to the effects of this incident on the health of my wife—

—who was eight months' pregnant at that time.

> We all work to build a just society. As a member of Parliament, I must defend fearlessly the interests of all my fellow-citizens.

I am not afraid to say, right in the House, in front of the Prime Minister himself, what I have in mind. And I shall not be deprived of that sacred democratic right by two ruffian cops badly in want of sensation.

I thank you in advance knowing that you will deign follow up my petition.

And what was done then?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. We are now debating a bill of federal jurisdiction and I would ask the hon. member to limit his remarks to the subject matter of the bill and not to refer to the jurisdiction of another authority.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I just want to demonstrate that having a record is often due to the police seeking revenge, the Crown seeking to win at all costs, or a judge unwilling to commit himself.

The role of a policeman is above all to protect the citizen against incidents or persons who may attack his reputation and integrity. It too often happens that the public is seen by police as an opponent. Children fear them, teen-agers avoid them, and adults do not like their neighbours to see that police is inquiring in their homes. Why? Because there are too much "mini-brains" in "maxi-bodies" within the police corps.

I recognize their essential role for the smooth functioning of society and the maintenance of order, and I admit that they must be respected and helped. But support and respect must be conditioned by sound protection. If ever a citizen cannot defend himself fairly and win a case similar to mine, the public will gradually lose faith in the advent of the just society.

I would like to speak on behalf of an incalculable number of individuals who, injustly, are born losers. Besides having huge expenses to defray, they are unable to fight this unfair law whereby the police are always right. In these trying years, when public figures are always criticized, insulted, run down and often physically assaulted—remember for instance the Kennedy brothers, Martin Luther King and the Prime Minister of Canada when he attended the St. Jean Baptiste parade in Montreal—it is even harder for him, especially if he is on the wrong political side, to maintain his dignity and his honour if the police are allowed to mistreat him.

To put it another way, in the example quoted a minute ago, should there have been two charges because I was a member of Parliament? Should I have had to pay the maximum fine of $50 for having allegedly insulted a policeman? The next day another judge ordered an individual who had assaulted a policeman with his fists to pay the same fine.

This incident, which resembles somewhat La Fontaine's fable "The Wolf and the Lamb", took place on August 23, 1969. The assailant, a policeman, abused and handled an individual roughly. In order to justify his behaviour, he accused the other of the misdeed he himself is guilty of. The devilish satisfaction with which this police officer wrote up and gave out tickets was something to see. Since when is the victim to be condemned? I am puzzled by this situation and I would like to intervene in order to ensure the disappearance of this climate of constant conflict between the protector, which is the police, and the taxpayer who should have a right to protection.

Naturally, I am bitter, and the 50 witnesses to the disgraceful incident that took place on August 23, 1969, understand what I mean. Many immediately came to the aid of my wife, and I take this opportunity to thank them publicly. I believed that two or three of those witnesses would be enough at my trial, but I had believed in the impossible, since the police is always right.

We have a part to play here, that of safeguarding the rights of the citizen, of endeavouring to improve the lot of the human being and of allowing everyone to develop fully. We must not allow our police forces or our legal systems to be mainly responsible for the wave of crimes of which we are the unfortunate witnesses.

This extremely important matter prompts youth to lose faith in the established authorities. Why? Because it is too often the witness of those glaring injustices. It rests with us to see that a stop is put to those injustices, so that everyone may be truly himself, without having to experience the disadvantages of the offences which are becoming more and more serious.

Perhaps I let myself be carried away while making those comments, but I was involved in those incidents and this shows that it is time to do something. That is why I am making a suggestion which should be taken into consideration.

The fact that a man is arrested does not mean he is automatically guilty. Everyone has heard about the recent incident when a deputy minister of British Columbia had his nose and brow ridges fractured. That is absolutely ridiculous.

For the police, anyone who is arrested, is guilty. The law should provide better protection for the citizen. For example, if the police were not allowed to bring anyone to a police station or to put anyone in jail—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. This has nothing to do with the matter before us and for the third time I would ask the hon. member to limit his remarks to the subject.

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, if the bill does not refer to convictions, if the measure before us is not titled "An Act to provide for the relief of persons who have been convicted of offences and have subsequently rehabilitated themselves", I wonder what I am talking about, since it is what I am reading in the bill.

All I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that you do not lose patience with me, I have almost finished.

I just wanted to conclude by making a suggestion that has some merit, I think. If we accepted it, we would never see in the newspapers and on television what has happened recently and, what is in my view most unfortunate. I am a bit ashamed of being from Quebec when I see the Provincial Police doing such stupid things before the eyes of the whole population.

We must put an end to that, that is why I am making the following suggestion: When a person is arrested and jailed by a police officer, an impartial witness should be on the spot, to ascertain that the accused is not ill-treated, that he is not knocked on the head, that he is not handcuffed uselessly before it is ascertained that the charge is justified.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order, please. It being four o'clock p.m., the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely notices of motion, public bills, private bills.

Mr. Bell: Mr. Speaker, I have checked on this side, and I think in the House generally there is some disposition to waive the private members' hour. The hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) has very graciously agreed to stand his motion, so it will not be charged against him and will be debated later. May I suggest we go on with this bill and, hopefully, finish it before five o'clock? Certainly we will not sit past five. In fact, if we could have another one or two short speeches we might finish a few minutes after four o'clock and we could repay the staff for the extra time we asked them to sit a couple of weeks ago.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Speaker, I had decided to end my speech on these words, but if the House wishes to hear the rest, I can go on.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): The hon. member for Sarnia.

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recognize it is somewhat hard for the Chair to see a backbencher this far back in the House, and sometimes it is difficult to be heard.

Mr. Comeau: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not wish to delay our proceedings unduly; I wish to co-operate with the House by forfeiting the time available to me in the private members' hour. But what puzzles me a little is that last week a fisheries bill was under discussion in the House, the question was put and thereafter there was no chance for anyone to make a speech or to go back to the bill. However, today we have passed a bill and it appears there is an opportunity for someone to speak on it.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): I should like to apologize to the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen). I failed to notice him when he got to his feet and I had to recognize him afterwards. I should like to remind him that the House has agreed to go on with this bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Lundrigan: I rise on the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to be difficult; I am interested in hearing from the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen). Nevertheless, I should like to give Your Honour the precedent upon which we are basing our observations. Last week a bill came before the House, a vote was called and an agree-

ment was made. Subsequently, even though the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse), who was sitting there, raised the point vigorously and six or seven members pursued it for almost an hour, we could not get the decision reversed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Béchard): Order. I recognize the argument of the hon. member, but there was no condition attached to the unanimous consent given this afternoon.

Mr. Cullen: Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I express my thanks to the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) for giving up the time on his private members' motion. I do not intend to impose unduly on the time of the House, but I have a few remarks which I shall try to summarize.

I think it is incumbent upon me to compliment the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), because I think he set a high tone for this debate when he led off for the opposition. I was not in the House when the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) spoke, but I have read his comments. I was very pleased to note that he commented on the contribution made by his colleague the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) who has done pioneer work in this field.

One other hon. member who I feel must be mentioned is my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. Tolmie), who is chairman of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. He put forward a private member's bill which was referred to that committee for study, and last meeting he gave what can be described as a comprehensive and thought-provoking address upon this subject for the consideration of the minister and of his committee.

I was not a member of the last Parliament and at the present time I am not a member of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. My opinion, therefore, might best be described as having been shaped by the citizens with whom I dealt in the 12 years I spent in the practice of law. During that time—although my practice was not solely dedicated to defence, prosecution or criminal work—I did have contact with officials of police courts and with members of the John Howard Society and the Elizabeth Fry Society, as well as with citizens who were endeavouring to organize homes which would provide a transitional home environment for men and women who had served prison sentences and had to make adjustments.

I was also involved with legal aid work both before and after the legislation passed by the province of Ontario. In this capacity I had occasion to deal with those who needed and sought the kind of legislation we have before us today. I feel, then, that I have been in contact with individuals who endeavoured to rehabilitate themselves and who subsequently found that their records still stood as a matter of public information—this was, so to speak, their albatross.

I want to congratulate the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) for bringing in this bill and for devoting the time, effort and study which has obviously gone into the legislation. It is natural to criticize almost any bill on the ground that it does not go far enough. I think this is a valid criticism as far as the measure before us is concerned. I am cheered, however, by the minister's comment, recorded in *Hansard* of January 30 at page 3045:

> I hope it will get quick passage through the House, then be re-examined at the end of two or three years' experience when we shall be in a better position to know what improvements can be made in the administrative procedure and what changes and other improvements should be made to its provisions.

First, I want to say I am not too happy with the word "pardon". For a while I thought the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and I must have been using the same research assistant. The hon. member said she was not a lawyer. Well, I am a lawyer, but it seems to me that in the ordinary context or use of this word one thinks of an individual who has committed a crime, perhaps served part of his sentence and then received a pardon.

We are dealing here with individuals who have served such time as was necessary and have afterward been successful in rehabilitating themselves. Now we are saying to them, "You are not only a free man, but you are free from this blight—your criminal record." We are, in essence, telling a man or a woman that they have wiped the slate clean; that they have not only served their sentence but have proved they can be good citizens in the community. This may not appear an important point, but in view of the fact we are breaking new ground I feel a more appropriate word might have been found. I still like the word "expunge" as applied to records, because it denotes the kind of thing this legislation seeks to accomplish.

The next point I wish to make bears repetition although it has been touched on by other hon. members, including the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. I share the concern expressed with regard to the

question which we find appearing on so many forms, namely, "Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence?" I cannot imagine forms being changed in the way the minister has suggested. It is my view that a provision should be inserted in the bill clearly stating that when a man is asked this particular question he should be able to say, unequivocally, that the answer is no.

The hon. member for Welland referred to the countless letters he has received on this subject. I have received many myself, and there is one in particular from which I should like to read, because in many ways it is typical. This letter came to me after I had been elected. It was sent by an individual who was aware of my interest locally in this particular field. I shall not read enough of it to identify the writer; I simply wish to draw attention to the difficulty with which he is faced.

Dear Mr. Cullen:

I wish to enquire into the possibility of obtaining a pardon. At the age of 17 I was convicted of a break and enter charge and was sentenced to 12 months in the Ontario Reformatory at Guelph. I am now 29 years old and have been working steadily for 11 years. During this time I have increased my job qualification by passing numerous examinations and courses. At the present time I am employed in a supervisory capacity. I hold a current second-class stationary engineers certificate from the Ontario department of labour. I am married with children and I am paying for my own home. On different occasions I have tried to further myself and my experience by applying for other employment and each time I have run into the question on the application forms: Have you ever been convicted under the Criminal Code? In these cases I must answer, yes. This holds true even for civil service applications. Surely this must come under human rights or have I forefeited the right to be human?

I doubt very much that this individual would have difficulty is securing a pardon, as the word is used in the bill. I like to think of this legislation as amounting to an operation "clean slate" in favour of individuals who have proven to the community that they have rehabilitated themselves. Once a person has secured this pardon he is given a clean slate, and the records of his offence should be treated as dead records; they should not be trotted out again or revived for any purpose.

I was interested to hear the comments of the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg). I confess he raised arguments which I had not previously considered. Perhaps they ought to be considered. If the individual concerned subsequent to being pardoned commits a further offence, I believe it should be looked on as a first offence. I do not like the word "pardon," but I do like the idea of a provisional pardon.

• (4:10 p.m.)

In conclusion may I stress my final point. I am opposed to the individual having to make the kind of application that is suggested in the bill. An individual may not have chosen to tell his wife, his family or his neighbours about his criminal activities. If he seeks a pardon, are we not denying him the right to make even this choice? He has decided in his own mind to lead the life he feels best meets his need, and if five or ten years hence he wishes to apply for a pardon we are even taking away from him this choice.

I am also a little concerned about good behaviour and about what might be considered to be an exemplary life. In his comments the minister stated that the application should not be automatic. I should like to see something more dramatic in this bill. I think we should consider making the application automatic.

In the first instance there would be a flood of applications. Are we going to discourage those individuals who apply by making bureaucratic excuses to the effect that we have had so many applications that we have not had time to deal with them all, or that this is something new, that we are breaking new ground? If we are going to take a serious look at the act in two or three years' time, let us do something dramatic now. Let us remove the necessity of applying to any board. Let us set up a situation whereby an individual can say that he committed an offence on a particular date; that in his opinion he has rehabilitated himself; that he has now secured a job, has not committed an offence during the past five years and feels he should qualify for a pardon.

If this situation is abused, we will be able to change the act later. But let us at least give these individuals the benefit of our mistake, for a change. I submit that this kind of legislation is not only a second chance or a second opportunity for a man with a criminal record; but it is a second chance for a society which may have been responsible for the man's criminal record in the first place.

It may not seem appropriate to a layman's interpretation of the way the House should operate that a member on the government side should be critical. I disagree with this basic philosophy or tenet. I think government members have an obligation to be critical. However, they have an obligation to be critical in a constructive fashion, and this is what I am trying to do.

I endorse this legislation because I think it is a great step forward in the humane treatment of individuals who have found themselves in trouble, individuals who by dint of good work and decent living have been able to rehabilitate themselves. I have no hesitancy in supporting this bill, even in the form it is now, just as I have no hesitancy in offering what I hope will be taken as constructive criticism of some of its provisions. Hopefully, some of the provisions will be amended when the bill goes to the committee.

Many good points have been raised by members on all sides of the House. Knowing the minister's sympathetic tendencies in this particular field, I hope these suggestions will not fall on deaf ears. I hope that immediately this legislation passes the minister and his department will commence work on phase two of the bill, which seeks to bring into law some of the splendid ideas the minister has heard expounded in this House.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I will not be very long. I think the hon. member for Sarnia (Mr. Cullen) and others have put the core question, and I am sure the committee will be looking very carefully into it and perhaps the minister will want to give it new consideration. The core question is: What is the legislative position regarding the practice of pardon? Pardon is not a new phenomenon to criminal procedures, but how does the citizen reply to application forms given him by the civil service in this regard? A more serious, or potentially more serious matter is: How does the citizen answer certain questions on visa applications prepared by governments such as that of the United States?

I should like to recount to the House an incident in which I was involved. I had an office in New Brunswick and arranged parole for a person who had been convicted of criminal negligence. This person was a university graduate. He was paroled in order that he could attend university where he obtained his B.Sc., went on to get his M.Sc., and is now making a very worth-while contribution to the country. Incidentally, he also received a pardon. The unfortunate aspect is that he is still unable to travel to the United States since he is unable honestly to answer that question which is found on so many forms.

I do not think we should be alarmed at the technique of expunging criminal records. This is a phenomenon that any lawyer knows is found, for instance, in adoption cases. The birth certificate of an adopted child, once final adoption is made, bears no evidence whatever of the origin of the child; and for the purpose of filling in forms the child is regarded as a natural-born child.

Apparently the statisticians took a little time to swallow this practice since they were used to dealing with exactitudes. However, if this practice can be adopted in a human and proper way in the case of adoption, there is absolutely no reason why a similar technique could not be followed in the expunging of records of those who have been previously convicted.

It has been made plain throughout this debate that the usefulness of a Member of Parliament lies in his acting as a sort of ombudsman between state and citizen. I think that our role of ombudsman has been fulfilled in this debate. After all, as members we have an opportunity of meeting these individuals who may be hung up, if I may use the expression, over the effect of what they feel is an insensitive decision.

Like the hon. member for Sarnia and others, I wholeheartedly support the principle of this bill. Nevertheless, I think we will have to make some improvements when the bill gets to committee if it is to have full effect, certainly the effect that I have noted members on all sides of the House wish it to have.

I do not want to be anecdotal at 4.20 on a Friday afternoon, but I would like to give the House one other example of the sort of difficulty that can arise. Another parole that I recall involved a man who had committed a rather unpleasant crime. The crime was committed at a very young age and the person concerned had rehabilitated himself. His former employer was very willing to have him back and showed social conscience, and so on. Unfortunately, the Post Office Department of this country, where the man was engaged delivering special-delivery letters, refused to employ him in view of his previous conviction.

This is another example of the kind of bind we can get into unless departments of state are tuned in to the progressive reforms that the minister is putting before us within the terms of this bill. It is no secret if I tell you that it took the most intense pressure on the part of the then Attorney General of New Brunswick and the then Minister of Justice of Canada to get the Post Office Department to understand the social implications of their

act, which was, of course, quite in conflict with this whole new theory of probation.

I make one last comment. The Chair has displayed generosity in regard to the tragic incident that recently occurred in Quebec. Apparently we are now free game. My feeling about this is that the tragedy, surely, was not that an official of the British Columbia government was concerned, but that any police department would render a beating to any citizen of this country, no matter what stage the proceedings in question had reached.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It is my duty under our Standing Orders to remind the House that if the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I will seek to keep my remarks down to a reasonable length. The subject itself, the speeches which have been made, interest me very much. Much as I should like to go through each speech in a detailed way, I will try to refrain from that exercise. I hope that all hon. members who have raised points or questions with which I do not deal will understand that it is not that I think they may be unimportant points, but rather that they may be of a nature that can be more easily and more properly dealt with in the committee than during the second reading stage of the bill. I should like, if I may, to try to answer some of the main points raised.

The bill is an attempt to get something practical which will work to assist those unfortunate people who are not being treated fairly in society by reason of the fact that at one point in their lives they had a conviction registered against them, even though they have long since rehabilitated themselves. This involves finding a method of dealing with that situation. It does not involve the objective, because I think there is unanimous agreement on that. The debate has indicated that we should try and remove this unfortunate and unjust circumstance in respect of persons such as I have described.

After a lot of examination of the 1966 private member's bill, and the evidence given before the committee which studied it in an attempt to deal with the subject, it was finally found that it simply did not meet the objectives it was intended to meet. We can go into those reasons when we get the bill before the committee; at that time we can deal with this matter in a detailed manner.

After an examination of the many proposed methods of dealing with this situation—and there are not many statistics, much information or experience on this subject that is very helpful—we came up with this method. We decided we should adopt the idea of granting pardons. I will deal with that word in a moment. We said that the granting of a pardon would vacate the conviction. The significance of that has apparently been missed in the debate.

Once a conviction is vacanted, a lot of consequences in law flow from that action. For example, this means that the legislation or local provisions dealing with licencing by the various jurisdictions, or the running for local office and all sorts of other things, no longer apply, the conviction having been vacated. That point, which was covered by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin), is one of the difficulties that confronts these persons but which will be removed by this legislation.

In addition to the granting of a pardon and making that pardon vacate the conviction, we have achieved the purpose of the earlier private member's bill. We have provided for the drawing in of the records and the sealing of them. That point seems to me to have been missed, but that is its significance. It was asserted that we should expunge the records. I think I should make it very clear that very early in our work we found that the use of the word "expunge" did not seem to meet all the needs we were seeking to meet by legislation on this subject. This is not a good word to use.

Having regard to the point raised in a more particular way by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) as to the use of the word "pardon", let me say this is purely a matter of seeking to obtain a method to provide a satisfactory document which will achieve our purpose. The use of the word "pardon" seems to come closer to achieving this than anything else we came up with, because it became clear very early in our attempt to get this legislation into reality that a blanket provision which legislated out of existence these convictions would not achieve this objective.

If you had an automatic blanket removal of all convictions, it was thought that we would be right back where we were because the record of conviction would be found. Make no mistake about that, it would be found. There are always, shall we say, unfriendly friends who will disclose this. There are newspaper

articles, letters and a dozen and one things which might account for such a disclosure. It became quite clear that such a conviction would come to light by some device.

We felt that we needed something for people who seem to have rehabilitated themselves, in order that they could get away from the consequences of having had a conviction registered against them. This measure is intended to cure this, and that is its objective. I think this is clear to hon. members on all sides of the House. The blanket legislation we tried to come up with did not seem to achieve this at all. Indeed, it seemed to put us right back where we were before we started to do anything on this subject. I do not know that I need labour that point any further at this time.

If you are discussing semantics, the word "pardon" may not be the perfect word, but by a considerable margin it certainly is the best we have been able to come up with and the best of any that have been suggested from all sources. There are some points raised by other hon. members which I think I should clarify at once. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken), when dealing with this subject, suggested among other things that juvenile offenders are not covered by this bill. That is quite wrong. The Juvenile Delinquents Act is a federal statute and offences against that act are covered. There was a total miscomprehension of that point.

The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) raised a rather interesting point. He read one of the clauses of the bill in a way which indicated to him that there was no provision for granting a pardon where there was a suspended sentence. That is not a correct reading of that clause. Convictions followed by a suspended sentence are covered by this legislation just as fully as convictions followed by any other sentence.

The hon. member for Portneuf raised a point I was particularly pleased to hear. I must say I was trying to listen to his speech in French at the time. I think I understood the hon. member correctly when he pointed out that in this legislation we must remember we are dealing with individual persons, and that what we are seeking to do here is to assist such individual persons and make life fairer for them. It is not an academic exercise in theory or in creating a nice, paper structure.

I believe I understood the point he raised about persons who apply for local office, and so on. This legislation provides for vacating the conviction and therefore there is no longer a prohibition under other legislation. Many other interesting points were raised. The hon. member for Sarnia spoke about civil service applications. For some time now the question to which he referred has disappeared from civil service application forms; it is no longer asked. I have reference to the letter which related to this.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I think that matter is well under control. We can deal with it perhaps in a more particular way before the committee, but I want the hon. member to know this has now been removed from federal government application forms. I hope the person who wrote the letter has applied for a pardon, because under the royal prerogative of mercy, if the facts are as stated, the pardon would have been granted automatically.

I might say that in an effort to prepare for this legislation and institute a method to alleviate the situation in the meantime, we have been using the royal prerogative of mercy in a way that is very close to the procedure set out in the bill. In the last year 131 such applications were approved. That rate which accelerated in the latter part of the year is at a higher level now. Because of the present procedure there is every reason to expect it will accelerate again.

The machinery exists now in the National Parole Board to handle the legislation immediately it becomes law. We have gathered a great deal of practical knowledge from the considerable contact we have had with persons who have found themselves in the unfortunate position of having a record although they have long since rehabilitated themselves. Also, interestingly enough we have gained a great deal of experience from employers, particularly the larger employers. I shall welcome the opportunity at the committee stage for hon. members to give such information as they have and to learn exactly what we have found out in this connection.

It would certainly seem that by this method employers would be able to avoid considering the matter of a conviction when they know, if there has been no pardon, that they can obtain the information or, if there has been a pardon, they need not even bother attempting to obtain the information. I would also welcome an opportunity to have this subject examined at the committee stage. There are other aspects of the matter which are very important but I do not feel they should be

dealt with at this point in the debate on second reading. I think they can be better dealt with in a more specific manner at the committee stage.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Five o'clock.

At 4.35 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.